

00001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 CAMP BONNEVILLE
9 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

10
11
12
13

14 January 8, 2003
15 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
16 Camp Bonneville
17 KillPack Dining Hall
18 23201 N.E. Pluss Road
19 Vancouver, Washington

20
21

22
23
24

25 COURT REPORTER: Sarah C. Thomas, RMR, CSR

00002

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3 MR. WAEHLING: Thank you all for coming. This is a
4 record crowd for quite some time.

5 My name is Eric Waehling. I am the project manager
6 for Camp Bonneville. My technical title is BRAC environmental
7 coordinator. I work for the Army. My office is up at Fort
8 Lewis.

9 Usually the way we start this meeting is we go
10 around the table so RAB members can identify themselves as
11 present. That way there is an official record that they were
12 here.

13 Anybody is welcome to speak up to have their name
14 recorded with the court reporter, but if you are not a RAB
15 member please don't feel obliged. Don't feel like you have
16 to. We would be more than happy to answer any questions.

17 So I'll start. Again, Eric Waehling, Camp
18 Bonneville, BRAC, U.S. Army.

19 MS. LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB.

20 MR. OVERBAY: Bruce Overbay, RAB.

21 MS. SUTHERLAND: Christine Sutherland, RAB.

22 MR. MARSH: Marsh, FBI.

23 MR. KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver Parks and Recreation
24 Department, Clark County representative department.

25 MR. FUNK: Frank Funk, RAB.

00003

1 MS. GODDARD: Sylvia Goddard.
2 MR. TORRENS: Robert Torrens, representative of Fire
3 District Five, RAB member.
4 MR. JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department of Ecology.
5 MR. SHELDRAKE: Sean Sheldrake, FBI.
6 MR. ROGOWSKI: Barry Rogowski, Department of
7 Ecology.
8 MR. GOMEZ: Anthony Gomez, property opener.
9 MS. WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Fort Lewis and Camp
10 Bonneville administrative coordinator.
11 MR. RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.
12 MS. KINGSTON: Karen Kingston, RAB.
13 MS. JONES: Samdra Jones. I am a neighbor and
14 property owner.
15 MR. JONES: Milton Jones. I'm her husband.
16 MR. WASTLER: Don Wastler, Restoration Advisory
17 Board, neighbor.
18 MS. BROAD: Colleen Broad, RAB.
19 MR. WAEHLING: Before we get started, I want to, I
20 guess, make a correction or there is some confusion at the
21 last meeting over the status of some RAB members. I would --
22 and I would like to say that's been straightened out.
23 I would also like to welcome two new RAB members,
24 Robert Torrens, who has reapplied, been reinstated as a RAB
25 member, and Colleen Broad is also a new member to the RAB. I

00004

1 welcome you both.
2 MS. BROAD: Thank you.
3 MR. WAEHLING: Robert back and Colleen, welcome to
4 the group.
5 Okay. Anyway, so I was in error at the last RAB
6 meeting when I was confused as to Robert's status. He
7 graciously went through the trouble to reapply so we were able
8 to reinstate him as a RAB member.
9 As always, the agenda is very flexible. I did have
10 one request that we possibly switch item number one and item
11 number two. I'm perfectly happy to do so, but I'll leave that
12 up to you folks.
13 MS. WALTERS: I don't think the agendas have gone
14 all the way around.
15 MS. SUTHERLAND: Actually, I was looking at moving
16 the open discussion, just having Parsons talk.
17 MR. WAEHLING: Actually, Parsons wasn't able to make
18 it.
19 MS. SUTHERLAND: Then that was my request and that
20 is fine.
21 MR. WAEHLING: I'd be happy to talk to you. There's
22 nothing. Just take a sec. I'll leave it up to everybody if
23 they want to do that.
24 Anybody have any preference?
25 Okay. I'll kill both updates.

00005

1 At the last meeting I mentioned that Parsons was
2 just getting started on phase two of the site reconnaissance
3 work. I printed up these maps here. This identifies the
4 areas that they have covered to date.
5 The blue dots represent the data points or the areas
6 that they looked at in the phase one of the site
7 reconnaissance work. At the request of BCT -- and I think it
8 was a good idea, also -- we were conducting a phase two site
9 reconnaissance work in the regional park areas, basically the
10 areas that are west of Lacamas Creek. And the blue dots cover
11 the areas that they've done their reconnaissance work on to
12 date.
13 MR. TORRENS: I think, just for the benefit of our
14 new people tonight, if we could maybe be purposeful in
15 refraining from acronyms, or at least verifying what the
16 acronym is.
17 MR. WAEHLING: That's a very good idea. Please, any
18 time stop me.
19 MR. TORRENS: So like BCT is --
20 MR. WAEHLING: The Bonneville BCT is the base
21 cleanup team. The BCT have representatives from the Army,
22 myself, Barry Rogowski, Greg Johnson from the Department of
23 Ecology, Sean Sheldrake from the EPA. They were the decision
24 makers for cleanup actions that occur at Camp Bonneville.
25 The Department of Ecology is the lead regulatory

00006

1 agency for the site. Washington state has -- is the lead
2 regulator. EPA has a role providing additional technical
3 services and working with BCT. And the Army, we obviously own
4 the property and we are responsible for the cleanup activities
5 that occur here at Bonneville.
6 I will briefly explain what the site reconnaissance
7 work is. As part of -- as a result of past studies, and
8 archive search reports, and various other means we have
9 identified areas throughout Bonneville that are particularly
10 suspect that there may have been activities that occurred
11 there in the past that possibly could have the presence of
12 UXO.
13 What UXO are is an acronym for unexploded ordnance.
14 What unexploded ordnance is, it's the result of training
15 activities that have occurred here where ordnance either
16 failed to function properly or may have been lost or
17 improperly disposed of.
18 The perfect example would be the central impact
19 area, where they fired artillery in the past, and a certain
20 percentage of those may have failed to go off. In general
21 terms, a UXO is one of those items that has failed to
22 function. You can further slice it as to specifics, but
23 generally, conceptually, that's what a UXO is.
24 So what we were able to do, using all the data that
25 was available to us to date, we identified these areas that

00007

1 are most suspect for containing these items. So we wanted to
2 learn more information about these areas.
3 MR. FUNK: You talk about the blue dots. You didn't
4 say anything about the red dots. The blue dots, is that where
5 somebody has actually walked there?
6 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.
7 MR. FUNK: They have walked over the areas where
8 there are blue dots?
9 MR. WAEHLING: A person has stood every place there
10 is a blue dot.
11 MR. FUNK: That relates to what we have heard in the
12 past from you people, the Army.
13 MR. WAEHLING: Right.
14 MR. FUNK: Camp Bonneville is fairly clean compared
15 to other posts and that they handle any -- until recently, I
16 understand they have found one other one -- unexploded
17 ordnance, they have only found 14 and they know where they
18 have been. Has that number changed or is that 15 now?
19 MR. WAEHLING: It is 15 now. We did find one up by
20 the demolition site on the hill side, fairly close to there.
21 I agree with your statement, relative to many other
22 installations Camp Bonneville is relatively clean. That's not
23 to minimize the issue.
24 MR. FUNK: I understand.
25 MR. WAEHLING: Frank is correct.

00008

1 I will hurry this along.
2 So what we've done is we've asked trained crews to
3 go out to all these areas and they have a GPS units with them,
4 geographic positioning systems. It's an electronic device
5 that allows you to figure out exactly where you are on the
6 surface of the earth within 60 feet or so is what we're
7 averaging for accuracy here. They have a Shawnstat (ph) metal
8 detector, which is useful for detecting metal that may be on
9 the surface or subsurface. It's mostly just to guide them a
10 little bit.
11 We have asked them to go through each one of these
12 areas, and walk through and take a look for things that might
13 suggest there were activities there that could have produced
14 UXO. In other words, we are looking for targets. We are
15 looking for firing points. We are looking for actual UXO,
16 maybe scrap hanging around; anything that might suggest that
17 we had activities out there that could result with UXO.
18 So, for example, when we are walking through the
19 central impact area in phase one we identified a number of
20 cars that they used historically as targets. We found
21 refrigerators that they used as targets and things like that.
22 We did all that, but we wanted to make sure that we
23 knew -- obviously, for the areas that are going to be -- are
24 going to have a lot of people accessing these areas you want
25 to make sure you have a real good understanding of what's

00009

1 going on. So we decided to ask the crews, Parsons Engineering
2 Company, to go out and, even though we already looked at the
3 areas that were highly suspect west of Lacamas, we wanted to
4 make sure we had a good understanding. We said: West of
5 Lacamas we want you to cover 100 percent of this area.
6 They are walking these transects. What each one of
7 these dots is, we have directed the crews to stop
8 periodically, every couple hundred feet or so, stop and take a
9 GPS reading. That way we can document where they have been.
10 At each one of these dots they take information down.
11 They have a digital PDA. It's really a palm pilot
12 that's been programmed that walks them through a series of
13 questions. What does the ground look? What is the terrain?
14 Do you see a crater? They have been directed to stop on a
15 regular basis or if they find something and make a note of it.
16 MS. SUTHERLAND: Is it only visual?
17 MR. WAEHLING: It's visual, but aided with
18 reconnaissance. It's not a clearance activity. It's not
19 meant to be subsurface. It's only to gain information about
20 the area.
21 MS. SUTHERLAND: Just the terrain?
22 MR. WAEHLING: Terrain, craters, fragmentation.
23 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are they sweeping with a
24 magnetometer?
25 MR. WAEHLING: It's a metal detector. But I want to

00010

1 make perfectly clear this is not a clearance activity.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: When I see a concentration of dots

3 what does that tell me?

4 MR. WAEHLING: Well, depending on the size of the

5 area, they might be closer together as they were walking

6 through. So if you see a concentration of dots, let's say,

7 right here --

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: South ST 2.

9 MR. WAEHLING: South ST 2, that's where the 3.5-inch
10 rocket range was historically. We wanted them to walk through
11 that area so we would learn more about it.

12 Another example, in this area we might have found a
13 scar on an historic photograph. We don't have an explanation
14 for the scar so we asked them to walk through to see if we
15 could figure out why that scar might be there. Could be a
16 Jeep turn around or target.

17 MR. FUNK: Is there a distinction between a red dot
18 and the blue dots?

19 MR. WAEHLING: The red dots was collected last year.

20 The red dots is the ongoing effort they are doing now.

21 MR. JOHNSON: This answers Christine's question.

22 When you see a lot of those dots clumped together, in the
23 reconnaissance itself it's every 15 meters they stop and they
24 collect a point, or if they find something that's worth
25 reporting, like that could be a gas can. That could be any

00011

1 type of feature; a berm, a mound. So in some of those areas
2 where you see everything bunched up like that there was
3 probably a lot of stuff.

4 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are they flagging it or anything.

5 MR. JOHNSON: They are entering it into the palm
6 pilot. Once recon is done, they gather data every night.
7 Once reconnaissance is done they will put everything together
8 in a book. Every single one of these dots you will be able to
9 reference and you will find what was there or what wasn't
10 there.

11 MS. SUTHERLAND: You have 15 emergency situations
12 where you found something, is that what he's talking about?

13 MR. JOHNSON: UXO. I don't know where that number
14 came from, but I believe that the UXO they have found, keep in
15 mind, is only on the surface. So the stuff they have found,
16 this whole thing they are doing, this reconnaissance is only a
17 surface reconnaissance.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Visual is all they got. If they
20 collect something with their Shawnstat they don't know whether
21 it's a hot rod or ordnance item.

22 Keep in mind how far apart they are. We are ten
23 meters on their transects, basically.

24 MS. SUTHERLAND: If there are no dots in a whole
25 area, like in ST 2, what should I assume; the terrain was too

00012

1 difficult for someone to walk?

2 MR. WAEHLING: Or they haven't gotten there yet.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: Okay.

4 MR. WAEHLING: One thing, the 15 count is including
5 the UXB, all the studies in the past. It's the -- those 15
6 aren't from this effort. From all the years of the studies
7 that we've done, the subsurface geophysical.

8 MR. WAEHLING: Karen.

9 MS. KINGSTON: Can you tell me, for somebody that,
10 you know, didn't really have to learn metrics, give me an
11 idea -- these people are walking in a straight line. Give me
12 an idea in footage how far apart from there.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Thirty feet, probably from Ed to --

14 MS. KINGSTON: So, Greg, when they are walking
15 through there and this is, you know, covered forest floor, so
16 we are safe to say that they found those in the line they were
17 walking, but that the 30 feet in between, did they feel they
18 could actually see that far by sight.

19 MR. JOHNSON: That's a good question. Keeping in
20 mind that they aren't looking for ordnance. They are looking
21 for ordnance-related activities.

22 MS. KINGSTON: I see.

23 MR. JOHNSON: They are looking for firing points.
24 They are looking for materials that could have been possibly
25 been a target. If they found ordnance it's because they

00013

1 stumbled across it.

2 MS. KINGSTON: New people probably shouldn't think
3 those dots means something has been cleared.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Absolutely not.

5 MR. TORRENS: Kind of related to that, some of these
6 reconnaissance points are off property.

7 MR. WAEHLING: The reason that has happened is --
8 they didn't leave the fence line. What this is just raw data
9 and the accuracy of the GPS is plus or minus 60 feet. Then
10 the map that it's on top of is a little bit off, as well. So
11 that's why you will get a stray dot every once in a while.
12 Once we have had a chance to process it and go
13 through the QA-QC everything will be in. Basically they go up
14 to the fence.

15 MR. TORRENS: So then what you are saying, there is
16 a significant amount of dots on the western part of this map,
17 then what you are saying is particularly towards the top,
18 medial flap, so you are saying that's just GPS error in
19 mapping?

20 MR. WAEHLING: Yeah. They stay within the fence.

21 There is a fence around that section of the property.

22 MR. JOHNSON: I think they were saying the USGS maps
23 are up to -- when you put them together they can up to 70 feet
24 off. So like if you got a road on this map and you butted up
25 to this map here, the two roads might be -- on the map when

00014

1 you look at it they will look like they are close, but they
2 are a little bit off.

3 MR. WAEHLING: If the map shifts, say, 50 feet to
4 the south and your GPS error is off 30 feet to the north,
5 combined it's 70 feet of error. It will look like you are
6 outside the fence.

7 MS. SUTHERLAND: If you have a problem area, if the
8 dot is 70 feet off of an area because of the mapping, the
9 mapping is not that specific, how do you go back and find an
10 area of concern?

11 MR. WAEHLING: With the GPS unit.

12 MS. SUTHERLAND: If you are 70 feet off, and you map
13 the dot, and you put those numbers back in --

14 MR. JOHNSON: We are talking about repeatability.

15 MR. WAEHLING: We are no less accurate than 60 feet.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Most of the time with this GPS unit
17 they've been using it's been about 20 feet tops. When I was
18 recording some of these targets last summer I was anywhere
19 between ten to 20 feet off most of the time.

20 MR. WAEHLING: Again, I want to -- Greg put it very
21 well. We are looking for evidence of activities. We are not
22 looking for discreet individual items. Not to be confused
23 with clearance activities.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Not at this point.

25 MR. WAEHLING: It's to help us focus where we need

00015

1 to go into those areas.

2 MR. RAY: When there is evidence of activity, that
3 means that you are going to go back there sometime and see if
4 there really is something significant there?

5 MR. WAEHLING: Quite. Yeah. Quite probably.

6 MR. RAY: Does that figure in how you are going to
7 figure in the cost of the cleanup?

8 MR. WAEHLING: Absolutely.

9 MR. JOHNSON: That will probably be, like if they
10 find an area that they think is a firing point or something
11 like that, then what they'll do is they will go back and do
12 the geophysical investigation or mag and dig.

13 MR. WAEHLING: For folks that are new, when we say
14 "geophysical" investigation, we have instruments that are
15 designed to look subsurface. They were designed to detect
16 things that possibly would be buried. To do that we have to
17 clear brush and vegetation away and uncover it. It's an
18 involved process.

19 MS. SUTHERLAND: For a camp that's been used since
20 1911, I'm surprised that the only thing that would bring you
21 back to an area is visual, considering there is a dense
22 forest.

23 MR. WAEHLING: It's not the only thing.

24 MS. SUTHERLAND: Well, then what would bring you
25 back if, say, an RP-2 you didn't really find too much

00016

1 visually, no targets expected to be there?

2 MR. WAEHLING: UXO will bring us there, a known
3 impact area will bring us there, historical find of UXO will
4 bring us there.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Take, for instance, RP-15, if anybody
6 gets a chance -- you can't see this from here; I'm sorry --
7 RP-15, this is a 1940 photograph of the area; okay? We can
8 see berms, some other things over here. This is what we call
9 archival evidence. This is we have concerns. We may say:
10 Well, just because you didn't see anything on the
11 reconnaissance, we want to know what was here, because it
12 wasn't determined. And then we will negotiate to have that
13 looked at.

14 MR. WAEHLING: Right. What a good -- what might
15 drive a decision like that is if that's an area in the park
16 where we anticipate we are going to have an awful lot of
17 people.

18 So, for example, hypothetically speaking, let's say,
19 the berm, we had an area that was in the middle of the landing
20 strip right out here (indicating). Obviously there is going
21 to be an awful lot of people using this section of the park,
22 intensive reuse. We are going to pay a lot more attention to
23 that then, say, a ground scar or a berm that we've gone out,
24 we have conducted visual reconnaissance.
25 We don't see any evidence that would suggest that

00017

1 there is UXO activity. It's a long way away from the trails.
2 It's in the woods. Given that we are better off focusing our
3 energies where we are going to have the most benefit, the most
4 benefit is going to be where the most people are going to be.
5 MR. SHELDRAKE: That would then be the Army's
6 responsibility to propose that as the preferred alternative to
7 the community, to the RAB, for public comment, along with
8 other alternatives, which would be costing out complete
9 clearance, say, of those areas, costing out what that might
10 cost.
11 MR. WAEHLING: It's not just cost, but
12 effectiveness. It's not purely cost driven.
13 MR. SHELDRAKE: There will be nine criteria that the
14 Army will need to evaluate against that. One of them will be
15 community acceptance, number one being protectiveness and cost
16 effectiveness. At some point the Army will go over that.
17 There will be a number of options gone over.
18 Not every area, you're right, will get attention in
19 the end, perhaps. A lot of that is based on reuse,
20 potentially, what is the reuse plan for that area.
21 MR. TORRENS: That's a question I had in terms of
22 when you say where the people will be, then that -- is that
23 predicated on the existing County reuse plan?
24 MR. WAEHLING: It is predicated on the County reuse
25 plan.

00018

1 MR. TORRENS: With which, if I understand, it sounds
2 like that is still in some debate in terms of proposed reuse
3 activities.

4 MR. WAEHLING: It's the best that we have at this
5 time. Obviously for areas such as the containment areas and
6 things like that you can still make some pretty accurate
7 predictions.

8 You're right. It's still in draft stage.

9 MR. SHELDRAKE: What you might see based on that
10 plan is a proposed alternative that involves quite a bit of
11 clearance in areas where human activity will occur, depth
12 clearance on roads, park play areas. What might happen to
13 this area will depend on the County's reuse plan. Whether the
14 County plans on putting young children in these buildings will
15 dictate whether these areas will require depth clearance.
16 There are a lot of those things that come out of
17 what is the end use.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Frank, you've been very patient.

19 MR. FUNK: Yeah, I have. To address that a little
20 bit, whether it's Army or whether it's State, or whoever,
21 everybody in this room, I like to hear what everybody has to
22 say. But I also like for them to raise their hand so that
23 everybody else gets an equal chance.

24 To go on with my point, the 23 acres that they have
25 cleaned, I note you have a lot of blue dots down in that area

00019

1 where you have supposedly cleaned that sufficient except in
2 the creek.

3 MR. WAEHLING: Uh-huh.

4 MR. FUNK: What is the point of spending all that
5 time in there? Why isn't it spent somewhere else where they
6 haven't supposedly cleaned the unexploded ordnance site?

7 MR. WAEHLING: Well, that RP 13 is the area that
8 Frank is referring to. That was a former practice grenade
9 range, sub-caliber loft, where we conducted a time critical
10 removal action, oh, gosh, it's been three years ago, maybe
11 four. It was the consensus of the BCT and some folks that
12 they wanted us to walk through it, given it's an open area,
13 it's a field.

14 It went very quickly. We didn't really spend very
15 much time in that area. We covered it just to make sure we
16 covered all our bases. But the actual time that it took for
17 the crews to cover that was minimal. So the Army didn't
18 object to doing it.

19 MS. BROAD: You are talking about RP 13?

20 MR. WAEHLING: Right here.

21 MS. BROAD: It says that was done 2001, in the
22 reconnaissance.

23 MR. WAEHLING: Reconnaissance.

24 MS. BROAD: According to Frank, you already cleaned
25 it and then you did a reconnaissance.

00020

1 MR. WAEHLING: That's right. It sounds backwards,
2 because, frankly, it was. The MP 3 range was -- they used as
3 a practice 40 millimeter grenade range. What a practice 40
4 millimeter grenade is, they are a small item about this big
5 (indicating). They are shaped like an egg. The practice ones
6 have a blue cone on them. Many of them have a powder dye
7 marking pellet in it that goes poof when it lands. Some of
8 them have a pyrotechnic firework-like spotting device.
9 MS. BROAD: They actually pass out ammo?
10 MR. WAEHLING: They are not what you would use to go
11 to war, but you always have a concern maybe they did use the
12 same ones. Way back I remember Colonel Knight made a promise
13 to the community --
14 I'm sorry. The subcaliber are small rockets. They
15 look like a toy. They also have a spotting pyrotechnic
16 charge. Even though it's not designed to kill, it can still
17 hurt someone.
18 Colonel Knight was concerned about this, as well as
19 members of the community, because there was historic access by
20 children going to a swimming hole out here. We decided to
21 move out and just take care of it. We also did subsurface
22 clearance. We pulled out thousands.
23 How many thousands, roughly?
24 MR. JOHNSON: A lot of them.
25 MR. WAEHLING: Ten thousand. Many, many, many

00021

1 items. We didn't find any full go-to-war type of munitions,
2 but we did find the pyrotechnic ones. So we did do that
3 clearance in there.

4 The Army feels that the work is mostly done. We
5 probably still have some more to do.

6 So anyway, back to answering Frank's question, we
7 did do that work in there. It was an historic range. We
8 wanted to go look at all the known historic ranges.

9 MS. BROAD: So will there be additional cleanup?

10 MR. WAEHLING: Quite possibly. Maybe probably there
11 will be additional work in that area, because, to be honest,
12 the work that the contractor did, although they may have done
13 an excellent job in the field, frankly, there's holes in their
14 report. And when you have that it leaves questions. It's
15 quite possible we will need to go back.

16 MR. SHELDRAKE: That's what I wanted to point out
17 about the 203 range. The nature of a time-critical removal is
18 similar to an emergency response. It's something you want to
19 get done quickly.

20 And as such, it's going to need to be part of the
21 bigger package at some point that the public reviews in terms
22 of BCT is going to comment on that and help the Army figure
23 out whether some additional cleanup might be necessary after
24 that emergency response type removal. And then you guys will
25 be able to comment on that and whether you think it's a

00022

1 thorough cleanup there, as well.

2 MR. WAEHLING: It's not an island in the middle of a
3 property that's available. It's simply not. It was just as
4 Sean put it. We will probably have to come back and do more.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I think we can classify it as an
6 interim action. It's not a final solution. It's just
7 something that needed to be done at the time. What they did
8 was they did a geophysical or subsurface investigation at a
9 certain transect base through there. Forty mic on the EM61,
10 which is the geophysical instrument they used, will show up
11 about two feet.

12 Now, we don't know what the County is going to want
13 to put on that spot. When we decide what the County is going
14 to put on that spot, that's what is going to drive the depth
15 to which we clear it. It may be completely cleared to four
16 feet. It may be reclassified to four feet or whatever. But
17 until we have that information, then it's kind of where it is.
18 But as far as saying it's cleared, whether or not
19 there were mistakes or problems with the work being done
20 doesn't really -- isn't really relevant. It's the fact that
21 it's going to have to be probably redone, anyway, depending on
22 what goes in there.

23 I think there was some talk about an R.V. park,
24 which it may be, you know, if that happens then we are all
25 going to get together and we are going to, like Sean said,

00023

1 public comment and everything. But it's probably going to go
2 down deeper than two feet.

3 MR. WAEHLING: Right. It's going to be included in
4 the management package for the entire site.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I just want to let everybody know it
6 wasn't a final action.

7 MS. SUTHERLAND: Do we have a clearance depth matrix
8 yet for the site, a clearance depth over the entire site of
9 how deep you are planning to clean out?

10 MR. JOHNSON: No, we don't. Except for Federal
11 standards.

12 MS. SUTHERLAND: You don't have one site specific
13 for Camp Bonneville yet?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Don't need it yet.

15 MR. WAEHLING: We don't need it yet. We may just
16 clear to depth. The vast majority is found within the top 18
17 inches to date in Camp Bonneville.

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: You wouldn't need one of those
19 matrices before you try to early transfer everything?

20 MR. SHELDRAKE: There are areas that they get such
21 intensive use that there may need to be protective fabric put
22 down, or what have you, to give people a clear indication,
23 depending on the use, that it's been cleared to this depth.
24 Beyond this depth you shouldn't go unless you are going to be
25 doing clearance yourself. But we haven't developed those

00024

1 specifically at this time.

2 MR. WAEHLING: You know, you have heard us talk so
3 long about this thing about the ecology, the engineering
4 evaluation cost analysis. That's a document that's going to
5 compile all this information and layout: Here are
6 alternatives. Here is the anticipated effect in this. Here
7 is the anticipated cost.
8 It's a public process to decide which one of those
9 are going to be selected.

10 MR. WASTLER: I have a question. I think you
11 discussed this before at previous meetings.

12 I realize in years past our society probably wasn't
13 as pollution conscious as we are now. My question is, is
14 there any chance that there were propellants buried at the
15 stands, the places where the guns were being fired?

16 MR. WAEHLING: The firing points? There is a
17 possibility, which is one of the reasons that we were paying
18 particular attention to those.

19 MR. WASTLER: When I was in the Army we had to
20 account for all this stuff. I understand years previous they
21 really didn't have concern for it. If there is a chance they
22 did bury propellant, propellant, if you see these sugar and
23 flower bags at the store, imagine bags that size in cloth like
24 T-shirt, is basically what it is. If they bury that in the
25 ground it's just open for water to carry whatever is in there.

00025

1 Greg can probably tell us what chemicals are in
2 there, if there is any concern there.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Well, every one -- what you are
4 talking about are the firing points. Every firing point we
5 have here is an AOC.

6 MR. WASTLER: You know exactly where they were?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that's kind of what the recon is
8 doing now, is making sure we didn't miss any. But they've
9 compiled a list of areas of concern. A firing point is an
10 area of concern.

11 And if you remember -- it's been a while -- a few
12 months ago we were briefing the level one screen of all the
13 areas of concern. If you are looking under firing point, the
14 release mechanisms for a firing point are burial and
15 mishandling, so we take that into consideration. When we have
16 an area of concern that's a firing point, we are going to
17 design a remedy on how to deal with that.

18 MR. WASTLER: That propellant wouldn't show up with
19 the metal detector, would it?

20 MR. WAEHLING: We will also be taking chemical
21 sampling at those points.

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: Quick question, if you don't mind
23 calling on me. I understand that EECAs are no longer allowed
24 and that you have to do RIFS, Remedial Investigation
25 Feasibility Studies, because EECAs don't have a public comment

00026

1 period.

2 MR. WAEHLING: That's not true. EECAs do have a
3 public comment period. EECAs are allowed. There's Federal
4 and State regulatory authority, drivers, whatever you want to
5 them. Under Federal authorities there is something called
6 CERFLA, Comprehensive Environmental Response Facilitation Act.
7 That's Federal. Under Washington State it's MTCA, which is
8 Model Toxic Control Act.
9 Functionally they do very similar things. It's not
10 vanilla versus chocolate. It's much more subtle distinctions
11 between the two. Both are focused on cleanup. Under CERFLA
12 you can either write an EAC or RIF. Under Washington State
13 laws they have strictly called an RIF. They are not exactly
14 the same, but they perform the same function.
15 To the best of your knowledge, EECA is still allowed
16 under CERFLA. I've not been told otherwise. There is a
17 public comment period for an EECA, yes.

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: I was told that EECAs are not
19 allowed anymore.

20 MS. KINGSTON: We were told by an excellent EPA
21 Washington, D.C. source.

22 MR. WAEHLING: We have EPA right here.

23 MR. SHELDRAKE: What you might be referring to, we
24 typically, for our own application of EECAs, focus them on
25 smaller, less complex sites because, for us, when we are going

00027

1 through a cleanup process, you know, one or \$2 million type
2 cleanup, a smaller cleanup. They are rarely used for the
3 larger type clean up.
4 What Eric said is essentially correct. Whether you
5 do an EECA or RIF you need to follow the same process. You
6 can have a monstrously large EECA for a site or you can have a
7 smaller sized RIFS. Either way you have to figure out what
8 the release mechanisms are for the contaminants or UXO. Find
9 where those areas are, how severe that contamination is, and
10 flag one that's preferred based on analysis, and then get your
11 public comment on that.
12 They are just two different names for the same
13 document. It's just an EECA is usually a faster, one-year
14 type process. An RIFS can be a multi-year process. Some of
15 them I've worked on have taken upwards of five years.
16 How is that? Does that answer your question?
17 MS. SUTHERLAND: Yeah. I'll look into it. Because
18 I was assured that we should not be doing any more, so I'll
19 just check it out.
20 MR. SHELDRAKE: We will talk more about that after.
21 MR. WAEHLING: Frank.
22 MR. FUNK: Are we in the open discussion community
23 issues?
24 MR. WAEHLING: They did extend.
25 MR. FUNK: The reason I ask the question is, I get

00028

1 the impression that some of the people on the RAB committee
2 and the people attending here think that community is just the
3 people around Camp Bonneville. I get that impression. And
4 then when you see some of the other stuff, like the Army
5 talking about it, I think they mean the entire County.
6 I'm confused as to what the people on the RAB are
7 thinking, if they think that this is just for the community of
8 the people around Bonneville.
9 MR. WAEHLING: No.
10 MR. FUNK: I think they are thinking around the
11 base, because this is a County -- the park thing is a County
12 issue; not a local pinpointed area.
13 MR. WAEHLING: Frank, I think you touch on two
14 important things. One is, we did approach the agenda and we
15 jumped to the end on the UXO update.
16 Would people like to have the community discussion
17 now? Frank has raised a good question.
18 MS. LANE: Definitely.
19 MR. WAEHLING: I guess, question number one, this
20 UXO update ended up being a lot more involved. Frankly, I
21 didn't intend to see so many new faces, which is great. I'm
22 glad you are all here.
23 Do we want to delve right into community discussions
24 or not?
25 MS. SUTHERLAND: How about the election?

00029

1 MR. WAEHLING: We also have an election to do. We
2 have gotten a little bit out of order. I will leave it up to
3 you folks how you want to address it.
4 Frank, if it's okay with you, could we -- what I
5 would like to do, Frank, and what I propose is, let's conclude
6 the discussion on the UXO update. I would like -- I think we
7 need to take care of some RAB business as far as community
8 co-chairs. Then I would like to come back to this community
9 issues, community discussions.
10 Frank, I want you to restate your questions. I
11 think it's very valid. But it's important that we also get
12 that business taken care of, if that's okay.
13 MS. BROAD: Before you completely close, part of
14 this was Parsons was going to address us. Can you tell me
15 when they are going to be here?
16 MR. WAEHLING: The crew that is doing work is
17 Parsons Engineering. Unfortunately, they weren't able to
18 attend tonight, so I just took care of it.
19 My original intent, before we had so many new folks,
20 I was just going to give you an update on the areas that they
21 covered.
22 Parsons will be back once we have concluded the
23 reconnaissance effort and we are further down the road as far
24 as interpreting what that all means. When they have concluded
25 our phase two of reconnaissance and if the timing works out,

00030

1 we will have them present the findings. If not, I'll do it
2 myself.

3 MS. BROAD: Thank you.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Or Greg. Greg frequently joins them
5 out in the field to make sure they are doing a good job.

6 All right. Can we close the UXO update?

7 Okay. We have some RAB business to take care of.

8 Elect a new co-chair. First of all, I would like to thank Ian
9 Ray, who --

10 MR. RAY: You are welcome.

11 MR. WAEHLING: -- who was our co-chair. He did a
12 good job and has decided that it was so much fun that he would
13 like to provide an opportunity for somebody else.

14 MR. RAY: Correct.

15 MR. WAEHLING: And I suggest we conduct this by
16 having nominations of people who are interested in being
17 community co-chair, perhaps having an opportunity for a few
18 minutes if they want to say something, and then we will have a
19 vote using slips of paper.

20 And did we bring a hat?

21 MS. WALTERS: I brought my recycle bin.

22 MR. WAEHLING: We will have a vote of RAB members
23 present.

24 MR. FUNK: RAB members only, please.

25 MR. WAEHLING: Then at the conclusion of that we

00031

1 will have a new community co-chair.

2 MR. RAY: In that regard, I read the bylaws this
3 afternoon, anticipating this exercise. There are two kinds.
4 They are primary RAB members and community RAB members. Who
5 is going to vote?

6 The primary RAB members include Barry and Sean,
7 anyone on the BCT is a RAB member.

8 MR. WAEHLING: Oh, okay. I see your point.

9 My assumption was that the BCT members and
10 representative of government agencies would not vote.

11 MR. ROGOWSKI: I don't feel that I need to vote. I
12 don't feel it's appropriate, actually, to vote. I prefer the
13 community to elect their own co-chair.

14 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

15 MR. SHELDRAKE: I would echo that.

16 MR. WAEHLING: The Army concurs.

17 MR. RAY: Thank you. That defines it.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Dawn.

19 MR. WASTLER: I would like to nominate Karen
20 Kingston. So far she's brought more information to this
21 board, I think, than anyone has so far. She's definitely been
22 a credit to this operation.

23 MS. SUTHERLAND: I second it.

24 MS. BROAD: Are we seconding it?

25 MR. WAEHLING: We loosely follow Robert's rules.

00032

1 MS. SUTHERLAND: I second it.

2 MS. WALTERS: I would like to hand out the slip so
3 people can see the names of all RAB members that are going to
4 be voting.

5 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. While she is doing that, are
6 there any other nominations? Could be a quick and easy
7 election.

8 Is anybody interested?

9 Frank.

10 MR. FUNK: Hearing no other nomination, let the
11 record show that Karen is elected unanimously.

12 MR. WAEHLING: Thank you very much, Frank.

13 MR. FUNK: Incidentally, I expect her to keep
14 control and have them talk one at a time. That includes her
15 daughter.

16 MR. WAEHLING: Well done. Thank you very much.

17 Thank you, Karen. I hope you don't live to regret
18 it. That was a joke.

19 Okay. Thank you. Well, that was surprisingly easy,
20 given the history of this RAB.

21 Okay. Open discussion.

22 Frank posed a very good question. Frank, I will ask
23 you --

24 MR. FUNK: As I listen to the people here I get the
25 impression that someone thinks the community means just the

00033

1 people that live around Bonneville. And, actually, it's a
2 project involving the entire County. And as I read this young
3 lady's letter to the editor, it impressed me that I think
4 that's what it is, that people think that it's just a
5 community here, when, in fact, it's a County effort; not just
6 the people who live around Camp Bonneville.
7 I can understand their concerns in wanting things
8 cleaned up to protect their wells and everything else, but in
9 reality this is not just a neighborhood situation. This is a
10 County situation.

11 MR. WAEHLING: Don.

12 MR. WASTLER: Actually, it is truly a County
13 situation, but the neighbors who live around here in the
14 proximity, we are the ones who are going to have to suffer the
15 consequences. As you've heard me, my concerns with the
16 traffic and everything that this park, or proposed park, is
17 going to bring, property taxes.

18 I mean, there's practically no end to the problems
19 that are going to directly affect the people that live in
20 proximity of Camp Bonneville, where it's been so peaceful here
21 for so long and suddenly we are going to be in for a lot more
22 than we probably realize when this thing starts rolling.

23 MR. WAEHLING: Frank.

24 MR. FUNK: Can I respond to that?

25 I can recognize your concern, but you realize that

00034

1 when they took the transfer station close to me, about six
2 blocks, your garbage went by my place and fell off in my front
3 yard, along my road. The drunks throw the beer cans out.
4 They put a batching plant, asphalt, so they can pave your
5 roads and hauled it out up there. They put a cement plant in
6 there.
7 And so while I recognize your loss -- they also put
8 the recycling plant for brush, McFarland Bark and that other,
9 H & H, and they stink to high heaven when they are turning it.
10 So I recognize your concern. But -- and you should
11 be concerned. I don't fault you for that.
12 But by the same token, everybody in this County ends
13 up on the receiving end of something somewhere. And just to
14 add fuel to the fire, this article here talked about the
15 unexploded ordnance and reevaluating the camp, a neighbor,
16 okay. But many of us and most of us rode in an automobile out
17 here, gas powered engine. You are sitting on about two cases
18 of dynamite, sitting right alongside of it, the power of about
19 two cases of dynamite with the gasoline in your tank.
20 So when you go into all this, looking at this, I
21 think we have to look at it as a County investment, not
22 necessarily a community. I think you are concerned. You
23 should be concerned. I don't deny that.
24 MR. WASTLER: Can I respond back to that?
25 MR. WAEHLING: Of course, Don.

00035

1 MR. WASTLER: Frank, what you talked about happening
2 to your neighborhood is a very good example, that the County
3 hasn't been responsible for the stuff that they've done.
4 Every time you turn around you read in the newspaper where
5 something is happening and all the neighbors are up in arms
6 about it, and they just go ahead and do it, anyway.
7 This clear cutting that's going on just north of
8 here is a good example now. All the neighbors got up in arms
9 about that. It's clear cut. The amphitheater out here in
10 Ridgefield was the same thing.
11 And I think anybody that's lived in Clark County for
12 a while has just -- is afraid of what's going to happen once
13 they get in here and get a park in here. There is no end to
14 the problems. It's just going to be a game.
15 MR. WAEHLING: One thing we need to make sure we
16 remain focused on, though, this is a restoration advisory
17 board. Issues of reuse and decision making on behalf of
18 County and how the property is going to be reused is
19 significant, but not necessarily appropriate for this body.
20 MS. KINGSTON: Plus I would like to add something.
21 We are all passionate about these issues. That's why we're
22 all here, because we either want to be more informed or we
23 want to have what we feel is important looked at and
24 considered by the cleanup committees.
25 And so I don't -- Frank, I can tell you, I don't

00036

1 think that I've ever heard one person say that this is an
2 immediate resident issue. So I think if you were led -- led
3 somehow to believe that by maybe an article that you read or
4 something on that or that -- I think we are all here fighting
5 for the -- for whatever our causes are and that in hopes that
6 we'll benefit the County.
7 Actually, it's even a bigger issue than that, that
8 it benefits the state. Because we don't want the citizens in
9 the State of Washington paying for a remediation that's
10 supposed to be taken care of by the military. We are not here
11 to stand in and see that.
12 MR. WAEHLING: I would like to continue to press
13 that further. You raise a good point.
14 MS. KINGSTON: We have a lot of issues to go through
15 tonight.
16 MR. WAEHLING: It's local, State, County, Federal.
17 It's a nation. It's all -- this is governmental issues. You
18 can't separate the idea -- yes, this is a military
19 installation, but it's part of a greater community, as well.
20 I think we need to consider that.
21 We are all paying for Camp Bonneville's, as well as
22 paying for ours. It's important to consider that when we make
23 these decisions.
24 MS. KINGSTON: I would like to mention I had spoken
25 before about some reports that I'm gathering now with a few

00037

1 other people around the nation. We are looking at accidents,
2 UXO accidents. I'm particularly looking at the ones that
3 apply to children on closed bases.
4 And so -- but I just wanted -- I mentioned it
5 before, so I wanted to keep you all updated on this. I
6 obtained a government -- and this is an acronym; I'm sorry. I
7 forgot the paperwork for it -- it's the DDESB record that
8 provides documented cases of death and injury due to UXO at
9 former military sites.

10 This research that I just received identifies 65
11 fatalities and 131 injuries associated with civilian UXO
12 accidents in the U.S. And at the moment there is a \$56
13 million lawsuit in regards to the two U.S. closed bases in the
14 Philippines, Clark and I can't remember the name of the other
15 one.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Subic Bay.

17 MS. KINGSTON: That's right. This lawsuit is to
18 obtain money to defend the 300 plus killed and critically
19 maimed for their individual lawsuits. It's just to start the
20 other ones.

21 I didn't have any point to make other than I just
22 want to let you know that they have these reports. Once I get
23 them all together, anybody that would like a copy of this is
24 more than welcome to have a copy from me.

25 MR. WAEHLING: Just to help out, the DDESB is

00038

1 Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board.

2 MS. KINGSTON: Thank you.

3 MR. WAEHLING: Do you happen to know over what span,
4 what history? Is that 60 people ever, throughout the history
5 of --

6 MS. KINGSTON: No. Once they started actually
7 logging it.

8 MR. WAEHLING: How long has that been?

9 MS. KINGSTON: I don't have it with me. Once I get
10 it all compiled I'm happy to share it.

11 MR. WAEHLING: I'm sure. I was just curious.

12 MR. FUNK: I have a question for Karen. I didn't
13 hear anything in there about whether those bases were closed
14 that these injuries were on or whether they were bases that
15 were shut down and hadn't been cleaned up. There is no
16 specifics there that I heard.

17 MS. KINGSTON: All this was is -- I'm not -- I'm not
18 here to report on it tonight, but what I am here to do is to
19 tell you that I've gotten that far with it and I have those --
20 I have the U.S. records. So I'm happy to share them with you
21 once they are compiled, once I finish it up.

22 MR. FUNK: But it doesn't say whether it is a closed
23 base?

24 MS. KINGSTON: Yes, it does. Each one of them is
25 documented. Some of them have a little bit of a graphic

00039

1 autopsy report with them. Everything is documented. Police
2 reports. I mean, none of this is hearsay whatsoever.

3 MR. FUNK: You haven't answered my question.

4 MS. KINGSTON: Okay.

5 MR. FUNK: My question is, is this a base that was
6 closed, but not cleaned or was it a base that had supposedly
7 been cleaned and then occupied?

8 MS. KINGSTON: This is a tally of all the bases in
9 the U.S. that have UXO.

10 MR. FUNK: But you are not separating them to
11 whether it's an allegedly clean base or whether it's a
12 contaminated base?

13 MS. KINGSTON: That's my point, Frank. You are more
14 than welcome to read this. I am not discussing that this
15 evening. I'm just letting you know that I'm still working on
16 it for anybody that would like to get ahold of me and wants a
17 copy of it.

18 MR. FUNK: What I'm saying is --

19 MS. KINGSTON: Okay.

20 MR. FUNK: -- if that is a statistic, we are working
21 to clean this base so that it's suitable to use; okay? That's
22 what our project is. That's what our mission is.
23 You are giving of this -- and that's okay to give it
24 to us -- but I think it needs to clarify whether those are
25 places that have been cleaned up and turned over to the

00040

1 public.
2 MS. KINGSTON: Many of them, yeah.
3 MR. FUNK: They have been?
4 MS. KINGSTON: What I would like to refer you to is
5 the DDESB. They've got telephone numbers and websites. I'd
6 be more than happy to share that with you.
7 MR. FUNK: I don't have a computer.
8 MS. KINGSTON: Then you can ask me questions. I've
9 spent my time running over this stuff. So I'm more than happy
10 to start you off on a trail to answer what I know.
11 MS. BROAD: Would they give it like a per incident,
12 when you get it all compiled? So it will be at various
13 stages; some will be closed and not open to the public, some
14 will have gone through cleanup? That will give a per
15 instance. So there is no broad answer for Frank?
16 MS. KINGSTON: There is none.
17 MS. BROAD: Okay.
18 MR. WAEHLING: Look forward to seeing that.
19 MS. KINGSTON: I would really like to hear now,
20 Jerome is going to be giving us a report on the Clark County
21 Commissioners' early transfer that --
22 MR. KOK: I don't have an essay for you this
23 evening. I did request Bill Behren and Pete Capell to pass
24 along any information that I could share with RAB this
25 evening. They didn't provide anything new. As that

00041

1 information does become available I will be letting the RAB
2 know.

3 MS. KINGSTON: So would I be safe in saying,
4 assuming if the RAB is insistent that we want to know exactly
5 where the County stands on forcing an early transfer before
6 the characterization is through that we need to FOIA, Freedom
7 of Information Act, them?

8 MR. KOK: I think if you want to be insistent you
9 could either contact Pete Capell or Bill Behren directly. But
10 to my knowledge, with the expertise that the County has hired,
11 the site characterization would need to be complete or close
12 to complete in order to facilitate an early transfer, because,
13 obviously, one of the things -- one of the important things
14 that makes an early transfer work is the insurance policy.
15 And the insurance underwriters aren't going to write a policy
16 for an unknown quantity.
17 So if the site hasn't been adequately characterized
18 they can't legitimately underwrite an insurance policy that is
19 largely open ended.

20 MR. WAEHLING: I want to confirm what Jerome has
21 said. That's what I'm being told, as well, that the Army will
22 not consider transferring until this facility has been
23 characterized; frankly, until the EECA, RIFS, whatever the
24 document ends up being called, until that's completed.
25 It's in the self-interest of the Army to not

00042

1 transfer the property until that has been done so that an
2 appropriate cost can be assigned to the remedial actions that
3 need to occur out here.

4 MR. KOK: Yeah. Let me add that the Army, and the
5 County, and the insurance writers aren't the only parties
6 involved here that want that certainty. Because this is a
7 public benefit conveyance that goes through the National Park
8 Service, essentially they are on the hook in this chain of
9 transfer of property. So they are going to have to be
10 convinced, as well.

11 MR. WAEHLING: Let's not forget the Department of
12 Ecology, as well as the EPA. There are many people watching
13 this very closely, in addition to the community.

14 MS. SUTHERLAND: The last timetable we heard was
15 June 2003. Is that pushed back? Do you have a new time line?

16 MR. KOK: What is June 2003?

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: Early transfer of the property by
18 June 2003.

19 MR. KOK: I have not heard --

20 MR. WASTLER: It's in the minutes. Pete Capell came
21 to a meeting. Excuse me for saying not raising my hand.

22 MR. WAEHLING: To the best of my knowledge, a firm
23 schedule has not been developed yet.

24 MR. TORRENS: If I'm hearing you correctly, what you
25 are saying is there is no -- there will be no discussion of

00043

1 early conveyance or anything of that nature until cleanup has
2 been, or at least the characterization has been completed?

3 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

4 MR. TORRENS: So whether there is a County time line
5 or not, it's really driven by the process that you have in
6 place right now?

7 MR. WAEHLING: Right. And we are scheduled to try
8 to have a draft -- we are scheduled to have an internal Army
9 draft March, April time frame of the EECA-RIFS. Then there is
10 a process that we have to go through before we show it to
11 Ecology, work with EPA and all that, make sure that they are
12 happy with it. Then we have a public comment process
13 associated with it.

14 Now, the transfer may occur prior to the public
15 comment, but the County and everybody wants to see that so
16 everybody knows what they are going to get, and so that the
17 regulators have comfort that the range of options that are
18 available are reasonable in both directions. That's what I'm
19 being told.

20 MR. SHELDRAKE: One, I guess, issue that comes out
21 of that is whether that will go for public comment or if you
22 have an EECA, that goes out for public comment by statute.
23 But for the RIFS, that can go out for public comment, but
24 really what comes out of that is a proposed plan.

25 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

00044

1 MR. SHELDRAKE: So --

2 MR. WAEHLING: There is no question that it will go
3 out for public comment. It's a question of whether it goes
4 out for public comment under the Army or Clark County.

5 MR. TORRENS: If it goes out for comment as a Clark
6 County document is that prior to transfer or after?

7 MR. WAEHLING: After.

8 MR. TORRENS: What would be the point of a public
9 comment?

10 MR. WAEHLING: Well, there is still an opportunity,
11 a critical point where the community has an opportunity to
12 influence the remedy selection. There is a range of options
13 that are outlined in the County. So the County, just like the
14 Army, will need to be responsible for that.

15 MR. TORRENS: Are members of this RAB clear on that
16 process? Because I'm not. I've been with this for quite a
17 while. So I'm just wondering if it would be appropriate.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Sure.

19 MR. TORRENS: For this group to be brought up to
20 speed on.

21 MR. WAEHLING: The process of documents and when
22 this opportunity for public input --

23 MR. ROGOWSKI: Are you interested in the typical
24 cleanup process or the transfer process?

25 MR. TORRENS: I think, if I'm understanding this

00045

1 correctly, it seems to me as though we are finally coming to
2 some degree of fruition in terms of the cleanup process. So I
3 think it would be helpful to have some kind of education occur
4 just in terms of, okay, finally, what is this going to look
5 like, like the public input process you are talking about
6 right now?
7 I'm not aware of that. I don't know if others in
8 the room also share my ignorance in that. If so, maybe it
9 would be appropriate for us, as committee members, to have
10 some education.
11 MR. ROGOWSKI: Typically the cleanup process under
12 either the State cleanup law or under the federal cleanup law
13 would involve thorough study on site, collection of a lot of
14 data, information about the types of contamination, the extent
15 of contamination on the property. That information gets
16 rolled into a document called a Remedial Investigation
17 Feasibility Study. The remedial investigation report is a
18 report that basically is a finding of all the data
19 collections. The feasibility study looks at the different
20 cleanup options available and the cost benefits of each one of
21 those cleanup options.
22 Out of those options the preferred alternative is
23 selected, saying: For this amount of money this is the most
24 protective cleanup. It looks like the best alternative. That
25 is put out for public comment at that point in time so the

00046

1 community, all of you and anyone else, for that matter, can
2 say: Okay. We either agree or don't agree or would like to
3 have it modified in some way or another.

4 MR. SHELDRAKE: The RIFS has all the costs and
5 benefits, and the pros and cons of the different alternatives.
6 But from that point the Army then needs to take that data from
7 that public document at that point and say: This is our
8 preferred alternative. What do you, the public, think about
9 that?

10 MR. ROGOWSKI: That's in your proposed plan or draft
11 cleanup action plan?

12 MR. SHELDRAKE: So it's really two documents in that
13 process. That, I think, goes back to that EECA question you
14 had. That's why for these types of cleanups we prefer doing
15 an RIFS, because it separates those two processes. The public
16 gets to look at this complex document and then there is a
17 separate process where then the Army will come back and say:
18 This is the alternative we prefer. Here are some other ones
19 we compared it to.

20 MS. KINGSTON: My question for you would be that
21 how, at this point, when we have had somebody walk 30 foot
22 separating grids over this place, we don't know what's
23 underneath the ground 18 inches, who -- what psychic person
24 can tell us how much it's going to cost to clean up what you
25 don't know?

00047

1 I don't understand how we can say -- how the Army
2 can say characterization is just about done, when we sit here
3 and look at this, and somebody asks, you know, why is RP 2 not
4 very dotted? Well, we are going to go back in there, well,
5 before you get ready to release this place, or is that
6 something that we are going to discover that's just one of
7 those Jack-in-the-Box surprises?
8 I don't understand how we can consider this, you
9 know, ready to be looked at as a possible release when we
10 don't know this.
11 MR. WAEHLING: I think you are confusing two things.
12 Are you speaking of the RIFS or are you talking about the
13 early transfer? Are you talking about cost estimating?
14 MS. KINGSTON: I thought we were pulling in the
15 early transfer in here. Of the different products that need
16 to be finished, then it's up for -- can someone help me out?
17 MR. JOHNSON: Site characterization.
18 MS. KINGSTON: That supposedly is almost done, is
19 what you're leading us along with. I don't understand. I
20 don't understand this. Someone needs to have me understand
21 what you say.
22 MR. WASTLER: I think what she's saying, it doesn't
23 look like you are anywheres close to any kind of a transfer
24 with what you have done so far.
25 MR. WAEHLING: Remember, this is only one small

00048

1 piece of the puzzle. This is strictly an update on where we
2 are with our reconnaissance work.

3 MR. WASTLER: I have a question though. I think
4 it's an important one.

5 This whole cleanup process is based on Clark
6 County's reuse plan.

7 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.

8 MR. WASTLER: How do we know or what proof do we have
9 that after the property is transferred that Clark County is
10 not going to change their mind and say: We are going to do
11 this or that? Because once they have the property, once the
12 property is there they can do anything they want to with it,
13 can't they?

14 MR. WAEHLING: No. Actually, that is one of the
15 advantages of an early transfer.

16 MR. WASTLER: Right. What about all this other
17 property? The reuse plan only covers this portion. What
18 about all this other portion?

19 MR. WAEHLING: It covers all the portions, too, the
20 other portions is for habitat areas and hiking trails.

21 MR. WASTLER: Can they change their mind and sell
22 that?

23 MR. WAEHLING: No. The answer is no. As part of
24 this remedy selection process there are going to be what we
25 commonly refer to as institutional controls. An institutional

00049

1 control, an example might be you can only use this area for
2 habitat area or you can only use this for trails. If you are
3 going to change the use of the property you need to do X, Y
4 and Z.

5 MR. WASTLER: So if the property belongs to Clark
6 County then the County still has restrictions on what they can
7 do?

8 MR. WAEHLING: Very much. The pathway for enforcing
9 those restrictions is actually simpler when the property --
10 the future property owner is the same one that conducts the
11 cleanup. Right now it's a bit awkward.

12 I can't talk into great detail, because I'm not a
13 real estate expert or a lawyer, but my understanding is that
14 it's actually very difficult now. The Army is conducting the
15 cleanup on the promises that the County is going to do, let's
16 say, this current draft reuse plan. Ecology and EPA hold the
17 Army responsible for the implementation of the future reuse,
18 but the Army is not going to own the land. And the Army has
19 no legal authority to force Clark County to do anything.
20 Now, if Clark County owns the property, and Clark
21 County is conducting the cleanup, and Clark County commits to
22 institutional controls that they are going to keep fences
23 here, that they are going to -- if they dig here they are
24 going to have to do UXO clearance, ecology and the EPA have
25 mechanisms for legally enforcing that, do you not?

00050

1 MR. ROGOWSKI: Yes.

2 MR. WAEHLING: The Army does not.

3 MR. WASTLER: So there is no five years down the
4 road after Clark County owns the property that they can
5 suddenly say: Well, we are going to sell this off for a
6 subdivision. Or they completely change their plans?

7 MR. WAEHLING: I am not going to say there is no way
8 they can't sell it. I can say if they do that then they would
9 have to conduct clearance or that they would have to do
10 various other activities.

11 MS. KINGSTON: Deed restrictions.

12 MR. SHELDRAKE: One thing I would just add to that
13 in terms of property conveyance was, we usually add to part of
14 the cleanup package deed restrictions or deed notices. When
15 that person then buys that property, say a piece of
16 contaminated property were purchased, they adopt a parcel with
17 a deed notice on it that says there is a well contamination
18 under the foundation. If you decide to demolish that building
19 you need to take responsible steps to clean that up right
20 there on that property right now.

21 MR. WASTLER: I really don't have much faith in
22 Clark County's word. I have a fear that they are going to
23 start clear cutting there.

24 MR. WAEHLING: We are not taking them on their word.
25 It's a legal document. It's not a handshake and a wink.

00051

1 MR. WASTLER: That answers my question.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: I understand that if the reuse
3 changes even slightly in 20 years, that if there is an
4 accident that the Army will not be liable at all. Also, that
5 if there is an accident here that there are two court cases
6 that we learned about that -- one has already paid out; the
7 County, the local government had to pay half of the settlement
8 and the Army had to pay the other half. There is one
9 currently that we actually spoke to the lawyer and he talked
10 about how it looks like the local governments have to pay more
11 than half of that.

12 In my opinion that would bankrupt our County. I
13 don't think it's a good thing considering we just got an
14 e-mail about a picture of a rocket that wasn't in a firing fan
15 and it was armed, you know.

16 MS. KINGSTON: In an area considered clean and ready
17 for reuse.

18 MR. TORRENS: Here?

19 MS. KINGSTON: Yes.

20 MR. JOHNSON: It wasn't ready for reuse, but there
21 was no target in that area. There was no target in that area.

22 MS. KINGSTON: So it wasn't an area that was going
23 to be looked upon very much further; right? Because there was
24 no archives that would lead you to go back over there, but
25 yet --

00052

1 MR. WAEHLING: It's within the kick-out area that
2 would be around the demolition.

3 MS. KINGSTON: Would you state whether or not it was
4 a kick-out?

5 MR. JOHNSON: It was not kick-out. It was a fired
6 rocket. It was in an area where it shouldn't have been.
7 There was no target.

8 MR. WAEHLING: I would like to touch on the point
9 that you brought up. The point that Christine brings up is
10 that the County does have responsibility for institutional
11 controls, to maintain those institutional controls.
12 Let's use an example of a landfill. A landfill
13 frequently -- it's not ours, but let's say we had a landfill.
14 And they will frequently put a cap on top of it. They will
15 put a fabric membrane and some clay on top of it. They have
16 to maintain a fence around that.
17 Let's say Clark County or some future property owner
18 purchases that land, they then accept the responsibility for
19 maintaining that cap and for maintaining the fence around that
20 landfill. If the property owner who accepts that
21 responsibility fails to maintain that fence or to keep that
22 cap in good condition, they accept certain liabilities for
23 that.
24 Now, Clark County will also be required to purchase
25 liability insurance. So it doesn't necessarily come directly

00053

1 out of the coffers of Clark County government nor the
2 taxpayers.

3 MS. KINGSTON: There is no such thing as UXO
4 liability insurance to date.

5 MR. WAEHLING: That's not true.

6 MS. KINGSTON: Yes, there is. I am in daily contact
7 with Mare Island and the EPA that's covering Mare Island.
8 They do not have liability UXO insurance, because they don't
9 have UXO. That's to further state it.

10 MR. WAEHLING: Yes, we do.

11 MS. KINGSTON: We are in daily contact with Mare
12 Island, Westin, and all of them.

13 MR. WAEHLING: Well, then I'm sure the Clark County
14 and the Army would not transfer property unless Clark County
15 was able to acquire UXO liability insurance.

16 MS. KINGSTON: Okay.

17 MR. RAY: CO (ph) is also on record saying that you
18 will never get liability insurance with UXO on the property.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Lenny Seigel's. Okay. I know that
20 there are several insurance companies that are offering. It's
21 whether they are going to be offering it at a premium that's
22 affordable. That's a whole 'nother question. Loyd's of
23 London will insure most anything.

24 MS. SUTHERLAND: Also, with the minimum of a guard
25 walking around the impact area, because there is no liability

00054

1 insurance that can last 20 years, there is some complacency
2 about that. If someone cuts the fence and goes in, guess who
3 is responsible under this early transfer? It would be you and
4 I.

5 In the end point, if you look down the road, it's
6 not a win-win situation. It's something that should be looked
7 into. I really encourage this community, the entire Clark
8 County, to look at it.

9 MS. KINGSTON: I would like to tell you all about
10 the Western Governors Association. And the Air Force and the
11 Army sponsored a scholarship grant for two of our RAB members
12 to go to California to a UXO ITRC. ITRC stands for Interstate
13 Technology Regulatory County. I would like to give a report
14 on that.

15 Do you need a break?

16 MR. WAEHLING: We are well past our traditional
17 break time. I recommend let's take a ten-minute break. It's
18 8:30.

19 MR. FUNK: I think we should go on.

20 MS. SUTHERLAND: I think we need a break.

21 MR. WAEHLING: Let's take a ten-minute break.

22 (A short recess was taken.)

23 MR. WAEHLING: I want to be true to our word. We
24 have 15 minutes left.

25 MS. KINGSTON: First of all, Eric, I would like to

00055

1 counter what you just said, we have that many minutes left.
2 It's your duty to keep us as an informed body. If we can't
3 cover some issues it's been advised to me -- the worst thing
4 you probably did is send me to that ITRC -- it's been advised
5 me we need to have two meetings a month. I'm hoping that we
6 can rush through and get some of this covered.
7 MS. Lane: Not on Wednesday nights.
8 MS. KINGSTON: Not everybody has to stay.
9 MR. WAEHLING: Let's take first things first.
10 MS. KINGSTON: The ITRC.
11 MR. WAEHLING: No. Fifteen minutes. Do we agree
12 that we want to adjourn the meeting by 9:00 o'clock?
13 According to my clock, that's 15 minutes.
14 MR. RAY: Don't you have to vote before you say we
15 want to adjourn?
16 MR. WAEHLING: Do we want to abide by the agenda?
17 MR. FUNK: If we are in a discussion I don't
18 think -- somebody can't leave.
19 MR. WASTLER: I don't see any reason we can't go
20 into overtime if it's important, either.
21 MR. WAEHLING: All right. Anyways, Karen, I didn't
22 mean to cut you off.
23 MS. KINGSTON: Then I think what I do is I'll just
24 say that the ITRC training conference in California was a
25 three-day event. The ITRC was formed at the request of state

00056

1 regulators in the community.

2 I would be happy to give this report at another
3 time, because there's some issues that I really think --

4 MR. WAEHLING: I was going to say, to do it justice
5 would you like to have some time allotted on the agenda for
6 the RAB?

7 MS. KINGSTON: Either that, or if any of the
8 community members want to get together and want to hear about
9 what we learned, this place was filled with 200 EPA, state and
10 Washington, D.C. representatives, scientists, hydrologists,
11 geologists. The list went on. The only RABs that were there
12 besides ourselves, Camp Bonneville, Mare Island was there with
13 their EPA reps, Lowry was there with their EPA reps, Fort Ord
14 was there with their EPA reps and their attorneys, and us. So
15 we were the only grunts that were actually attending this
16 thing.

17 So if anybody in the community RAB would like to
18 hear more about it, we can always have a meeting ourselves. And
19 I'll be happy to share some of this wonderful information we
20 were able to glean.

21 MS. BROAD: Well, this is backtracking. I thought
22 we had said perhaps we would have a meeting in two weeks.
23 Would that be something we would share in two weeks?

24 Are you open to discussion as to if we don't take
25 care of our business are we going to meet more often? All I

00057

1 heard was -- nobody made a motion.

2 MS. KINGSTON: To clarify why I said, that was
3 because when we mentioned that we had meetings once a month
4 and we had several points that should be -- things that we
5 should be informed and know about. When we were talking with
6 some of the EPA, especially the Washington, D.C. folks, they
7 were surprised that at this point, where you're trying to move
8 with the characterization, that we're not having meetings
9 twice a month.

10 And we were surprised, twice a month, oh, my gosh.
11 We are going to hear grunts and groans by all kinds of people
12 about trying to get together twice a month. They said: No,
13 that would be responsible, because there's so much information
14 to cover.

15 I have some other things that really need to be
16 brought up tonight, but I can put this up and --
17 MR. TORRENS: I think, in fairness to following the
18 agenda, I certainly would like to hear what you have to
19 report. But you are not on the agenda. I think, in fairness
20 to the group, it would be appropriate to put those things -- I
21 would like to suggest, anyway, that those things be moved to
22 the next agenda.

23 MS. KINGSTON: I have two points that should not be
24 moved.

25 MR. TORRENS: But I guess --

00058

1 MS. KINGSTON: You are asking me where should we fit
2 them? What would we call them?
3 MR. RAY: Community issues. It's on the agenda.
4 MR. FUNK: Karen mentioned having a community
5 meeting. I am opposed to that.
6 MR. TORRENS: So I am.
7 MR. FUNK: I will tell you why. We are RAB people
8 and that's what we are supposed to do as a RAB group. And I
9 understand there was a community meeting, supposedly, of
10 interested people around Camp Bonneville and I know people who
11 weren't invited, didn't even know it took place. I'm opposed
12 to those type meetings.
13 MR. FUNK: Our business is supposed to be talking at
14 the RAB meeting.
15 MS. KINGSTON: I have no idea what you are talking
16 about. None.
17 MR. FUNK: Ian was one of them.
18 MS. KINGSTON: Were you?
19 MR. WAEHLING: Frank.
20 MR. FUNK: I think they met at Ian's house. I'm not
21 sure.
22 MR. RAY: I have guests at my house once in a while,
23 sure.
24 MR. FUNK: That's your business to have guests.
25 MR. RAY: Absolutely.

00059

1 MR. FUNK: If you are going to have RAB business
2 conducted there, it's out of place.

3 MS. KINGSTON: That's not true.

4 MR. RAY: I don't think so. We can talk about RAB
5 business if you want to.

6 MS. KINGSTON: We need to move on with this.

7 MR. WAEHLING: Also, please, if we could make an
8 effort to identify who is speaking for the sake of our
9 recorder, it would be much appreciated.

10 Christine.

11 MS. SUTHERLAND: At the last meeting I asked about
12 the ASR, Archive Search Report, about the FBI buried weapons
13 southwest of demo one that hadn't been talked about before.
14 Tom Piscal (ph) said he will guarantee he would confirm that
15 by January 8th. Do you have any information?

16 MR. WAEHLING: He was able to confirm that the FBI
17 did not bury any.

18 MR. MARSH: If anybody knows where the FBI has ever
19 buried some weapons, I would like to know. We don't bury our
20 weapons. All of our weapons for destruction are either old
21 weapons we own or things we receive in evidence. We are
22 actually prohibited from disposing those. They go back East
23 to the FBI in Quantico.

24 There is a bunch of urban legends going around the
25 country that, especially around Quantico, that 40 years ago we

00060

1 got rid of a bunch of old machine guns. People would like to
2 know where that is, dig them up. Worth tens of thousands of
3 dollars.

4 If anybody has any real information about supposedly
5 where there's some buried weapons, let me know. We will go
6 dig them up. But it doesn't happen. They all go back East.

7 MR. WAEHLING: Christine.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: Regarding the EA, the Environmental
9 Assessment, do we have a FONSI? A FONSI is a Finding of No
10 Significant Impact.

11 MR. WAEHLING: That hasn't been done yet.

12 Karen.

13 MS. KINGSTON: Okay. The Army, by law, is required
14 to keep an administrative record for Camp Bonneville. While
15 Christine and I were at the ITRC we were given a heads up by
16 the Washington, D.C. that there might be a violation here by a
17 missing AR by Camp Bonneville.

18 I came home and researched this and I found out the
19 Army has in, in fact, failed and is in violation of this
20 obligation and responsibility. An administrative record of
21 Camp Bonneville by the Army does not yet exist.

22 Sean, I am told, has stepped in.

23 MR. WAEHLING: Sean has brought it to my attention.

24 Just for clarification, are you speaking of the
25 public repository?

00061

1 MS. KINGSTON: Those are two different things.
2 MR. WAEHLING: I understand.
3 MS. KINGSTON: Okay.
4 MR. WAEHLING: What exactly are you looking for?
5 You haven't asked me for anything, administrative record. I
6 guess I'm not sure --
7 MS. KINGSTON: I fail to see what difference it
8 makes whether I ask for one, which I will. But my inference
9 here is that by law under CERCLA you are required to keep one.
10 MR. WAEHLING: Right.
11 MS. KINGSTON: From what I understand, Sean has
12 immediately stepped in and asked the Army to establish these
13 ARs, and they will be made available to us and published on
14 the EPA website. Sean can tell me whether I'm correct in what
15 I stated.
16 I was also informed by regulatory sources that it
17 was probable that Clark County knew that the Army did not have
18 this AR going.
19 MR. WAEHLING: Maybe for everyone's benefit you
20 could tell them what's in an AR and why it exists.
21 MS. KINGSTON: Why would I have to tell them that?
22 That would be for you or Sean to tell.
23 MR. WAEHLING: Okay.
24 MS. KINGSTON: Okay? So I grant that back to you if
25 you want to answer your own question.

00062

1 MR. SHELDRAKE: One thing I'll just explain briefly
2 in terms of what an administrative record is, it's the
3 collection of documents that serve as the basis for a
4 particular cleanup decision. You need to have that for even
5 the emergency time-critical cleanups, although you are allowed
6 to -- you are given a grace period in which to do that after
7 you start the cleanup, because it is time critical, all the
8 way through the more elaborate cleanup decisions, like the one
9 we've got coming up, where there will be public comment
10 periods established, et cetera.

11 So for each removal action at a site there is an
12 administrative record created that would be a discreet
13 collection of documents that you can go back and say: Okay,
14 this cleanup decision was based on this.

15 MR. WAEHLING: Have we conducted any removal actions
16 here? Yes, the time critical that was conducted at the time,
17 although UXO doesn't fall under, at that time doesn't -- it's
18 still up to debate whether it's even a CERCLA cleanup, so you
19 don't necessarily need an administrative record; is that
20 correct?

21 MR. SHELDRAKE: That's debatable.

22 MR. WAEHLING: Debatable?

23 MR. SHELDRAKE: But you mentioned you did have a
24 repository.

25 MR. WAEHLING: We do have public repositories of

00063

1 every document related to Bonneville. One's at the library in
2 Vancouver Mall. There is one at Clark County. Although it's
3 not a formal repository, every document is here at Camp
4 Bonneville. There is also one up at Fort Lewis. Plus for all
5 the final documents you've all been provided additional
6 copies, PDF copies of these documents.
7 MR. SHELDRAKE: The question --
8 MR. WASTLER: There is a bunch of people ahead of
9 me.
10 MR. SHELDRAKE: In terms of the non UXO activities,
11 as well, there are a number of discreet activities there;
12 right, that in place like the drum removal, those types of
13 activities that were a separate action? I'm not sure.
14 MR. WAEHLING: Let me look into it. They were
15 really, really small. But you're right. I will look into
16 that.
17 MS. KINGSTON: I do believe it was 120 days they had
18 to make sure that an AR was in place.
19 MR. SHELDRAKE: That's the CERCLA time frame.
20 MR. WAEHLING: That's possibly correct for that.
21 MR. SHELDRAKE: I'm not sure about the time frame.
22 MR. ROGOWSKI: You guys are talking about Federal.
23 MR. WAEHLING: We will look into it.
24 Frank.
25 MR. FUNK: Co-chairman Karen had suggested anyone

00064

1 that doesn't want to stay and listen to leave. And I would
2 like to leave, but I want to know when our next meeting is and
3 where it's at. I would like to go back to the fire station,
4 where you have running water, and toilets, and some drinking
5 water, and that sort of thing.

6 I would like to know so I can --

7 MS. KINGSTON: I don't have a calendar. Do you have
8 a calendar, Eric?

9 MR. WAEHLING: I do.

10 MR. FUNK: Will you have something for us to
11 discuss?

12 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. The second Wednesday in
13 February is February 12th. Then it just so happens the second
14 Wednesday in March is also Wednesday, March 12th.
15 Does anyone want to make a motion as to when our
16 next meeting should be held?

17 MR. FUNK: Will you have anything for the next
18 meeting over and above some of this?

19 MR. WAEHLING: As far as hard data from well
20 sampling, no. We won't have -- the wells, all the wells that
21 we talked about last time, they are going to be sampled,
22 hopefully, next week. Take some time to get that data back
23 and get -- for them to process the information. I don't think
24 I'll have anything by next meeting, February 12th.
25 We will have more information about the

00065

1 reconnaissance work for the areas that they've covered, but
2 they won't be done yet. That's the work. We won't have any
3 of the soil sampling data back yet from the led sampling.
4 MR. FUNK: Would March be a better date?
5 MR. WAEHLING: I would think March would be a better
6 date.
7 MR. KOK: I have a question for Karen.
8 Karen, can you give us an approximation of the time
9 it would take you to summarize your conference findings?
10 MS. KINGSTON: Well, it's not just me. It would be
11 Christine. I don't know. Fifteen minutes or so, in case
12 anybody has questions.
13 We have a couple other things to do tonight that are
14 on community issues.
15 MR. KOK: I would then propose adding that to the
16 next agenda and propose that meeting be in February.
17 MR. TORRENS: I would concur. I think if Frank has
18 to leave, and Frank is a RAB member, I think Frank should be
19 entitled to hear what you have to say. I think that's a great
20 suggestion.
21 Seconded.
22 MS. KINGSTON: For the ITRC --
23 MR. WAEHLING: All in favor of a February 12th
24 meeting? Any nays?
25 MR. FUNK: Nay. March is better.

00066

1 MR. WAEHLING: The ayes have it. The next meeting
2 will be February 12th.

3 Thank you very much, Frank.

4 MS. SUTHERLAND: Can we have at the next meeting
5 someone from the County come to go over some stuff with us? I
6 don't feel that I'm informed on how early transfer takes
7 place.

8 MR. KOK: I have a note to ask that to happen.

9 MS. SUTHERLAND: Also, can we get a hydrologist on
10 why you put all the wells over by the south?

11 MR. WAEHLING: The valley where Lacamas Creek exits
12 the property?

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

14 MR. WAEHLING: I can see if I can get a hydrologist.
15 I can't commit to it.

16 MR. WASTLER: I have one question. Once again, you
17 have mentioned Vancouver Mall Library.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.

19 MR. WASTLER: What seems to be the trouble with the
20 information being in any sort of category where you can look
21 it up? For example, you said documents, if someone wanted to
22 find those documents and your assistant here said she was
23 working on getting that stuff -- in other words, the
24 librarians didn't know anything. You go in there and there is
25 just a wall of stuff.

00067

1 You can spend all day in there just trying to find
2 any information unless you knew what you are looking for. So
3 if someone were looking for those documents you just mentioned
4 they might be in there for the entire afternoon covering every
5 single thing that's happened for Camp Bonneville before they
6 find it.
7 You know what I mean?
8 MR. WAEHLING: Right.
9 MR. WASTLER: There is no category or log they can
10 go to to say: I'm looking for these documents. Okay. They
11 are right here.
12 That was a problem. I brought that up at another
13 meeting. Nothing is in any category.
14 MS. KINGSTON: And you are required to have an
15 index.
16 MR. WASTLER: That's what we need, is an index.
17 MR. WAEHLING: We do have an index of documents.
18 That may not necessarily help.
19 MR. WASTLER: In other words, if you go in there and
20 ask the librarian: I want this specific document for the Camp
21 Bonneville issue, they will take you to an area that's a whole
22 wall of books that covers everything that's happened with the
23 Restoration Advisory Board. You are at a blank where anything
24 is at specifically.
25 MR. WAEHLING: You are thinking by subject,

00068

1 possibly, or a list of documents isn't going to necessarily
2 help you?

3 MR. WASTLER: Some sort of index, at least, that the
4 librarian would have so if a neighbor or someone who attends
5 these meetings or reads something in the paper that says
6 Vancouver Mall Library, they can go into the Vancouver Mall
7 Library and ask the librarian: I'm interested in this
8 document or I'm interested in this information, and the
9 librarian can say: Okay. It's here. Rather than take them
10 over to an area that's just a wall of books that's in no
11 category whatsoever. There is no index to any of it.
12 The reason I found what I was looking for is because
13 I'm a member of the board and I knew what I was looking for.
14 But for somebody who is waiting for their wife to do some
15 shopping in the mall or somebody that's not aware of the
16 process would spend all day in there and still not find what
17 they're looking for.
18 Is that clear?

19 MR. WAEHLING: I understand what you are saying.

20 MR. WASTLER: I was surprised the librarians were
21 blank. They didn't know anything about what was going on. I
22 had to take and show them what this was.

23 MS. SUTHERLAND: You already told him.

24 MR. WAEHLING: We are actually working on trying to
25 come up with a searchable way that would be better, as well.

00069

1 Jen and I are. Not done yet.

2 MR. WASTLER: I was embarrassed, because I told
3 several people about an environmental assessment. I knew what
4 it looked like.

5 Another time I went in for some other information
6 and they were blank. All they knew is that was Camp
7 Bonneville. I had to take and show them this is an
8 environmental assessment. If someone comes in, this is what
9 it looks like.

10 MR. WAEHLING: They have been provided lists of the
11 documents that should be contained. But we will work with
12 them to see if we can figure out a better system.

13 MR. WASTLER: Thank you.

14 MS. KINGSTON: Where exactly is your index? What is
15 the location of it?

16 MR. WAEHLING: They have been provided indexes.
17 Where it is I'm not exactly sure. We will have to talk to the
18 librarians.

19 MS. KINGSTON: Yeah. I'm talking about an index or
20 a public repository, which is a separate thing from the AR.
21 I'm talking about an index for the AR itself. So I need to
22 know what the physical location is of the index.

23 MR. WAEHLING: We don't have an index for the AR
24 right now.

25 MS. KINGSTON: You don't have?

00070

1 MR. WAEHLING: No.

2 MS. KINGSTON: Are you working on that, then?

3 MR. WAEHLING: Well, to date, as Sean pointed out,
4 we hadn't conducted any removal actions under CERCLA to date.
5 But that's debatable with the --

6 Karen, you know what? You bring up a very good
7 point and I need to get that straightened out. That is a
8 deficiency that I need to address.

9 MS. KINGSTON: Thank you.
10 Ian.

11 MR. RAY: I have 12 items of community interest. I
12 don't know. I'm not going to bring them up. But I could go
13 this far --

14 MR. TORRENS: It's 9:00 o'clock.

15 MR. RAY: -- and say that the basis and authority of
16 this charter for this RAB is covered under CERCLA.

17 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.

18 MR. RAY: Okay? We have a charter with some bylaws.
19 In paragraph E-7 it says, "The co-chairs will insure that a
20 process is in place so that advise and comments from
21 individual RAB members on cleanup issues are forwarded to the
22 proper officials."

23 Now, in my experience that doesn't happen. It
24 didn't happen when I was co-chair, either. But I would like
25 to see some effort to see that that's executed so that anyone,

00071

1 including myself, with 12 issues I can get some answers.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. WAEHLING: What process -- we need to talk about

4 the process another time. But -- okay.

5 MS. KINGSTON: Next meeting?

6 MR. WAEHLING: Okay.

7 MS. KINGSTON: At some point you are going to have

8 to cough up your hydrologist, because I don't want to ask Army

9 hydrology questions that were contracted by you to the EPA or

10 the Ecology, because I don't pay their salaries to talk on

11 your behalf.

12 So you at some point are going to have to tell me

13 when you are going to have the hydrologist that has walked

14 around here without knowing what's under the ground really and

15 told you which way the water flows; therefore, the Century

16 wells were placed. I need to know that. I think the

17 community needs to know that.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. I can do that.

19 I also would like to say, though, that the

20 hydrologists at the EPA Department of Ecology are very

21 competent, as well. They were involved with the location of

22 those wells.

23 MS. KINGSTON: Were they contracted by the Army to

24 do part of what you were required to do?

25 MR. WAEHLING: They approved.

00072

1 MS. KINGSTON: That what I'll talk to them about is
2 how they approved whatever it is that you told them. First I
3 need to hear what your findings were based on and what your
4 science was. I need to hear from the hydrologist, because you
5 can't answer that.

6 MR. WAEHLING: On how we derive where we are going
7 to locate the wells?

8 MS. KINGSTON: On how you derive where you are going
9 to locate the wells, how they conceptually determined the
10 water flow at Camp Bonneville, and I want to see the records.
11 USGS says they don't exist, so I need to find out which one of
12 you are telling me the truth.
13 I need to see all this, so I need the hydrologist
14 here.

15 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. I can answer two of those
16 questions. I think everybody is telling the truth. The
17 hydrologist, when they have a lack of information, make
18 educated guesses. Calculations for conducting the water flow
19 directions have not occurred yet, because they used the data
20 from the wells that were just installed. It may be that those
21 records don't exist, the USGS records don't exist.

22 MS. KINGSTON: So the Century wells that were
23 located, then?

24 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.

25 MS. KINGSTON: That's contrary to what you said last

00073

1 month, that the wells are located there for our protection.
2 Those Century wells were a guess or were, um, decided because
3 somebody walked the surface and said: Gee, it looks slopey
4 here, so water must be right there.
5 Which is real interesting, because I think more
6 people that buy property, and have a well digger come out, and
7 they will dig a dry hole and have to go test for water
8 someplace else and try to find water on their property. If it
9 was as easy as going along and saying: Oh, here is the flow,
10 here's the water, we can put our house here, that would be the
11 case. It's not.
12 MR. WAEHLING: But the next step, Karen, the next
13 step in the process is that you drill your hole in the ground
14 and you confirm -- you look at the information that comes up
15 out of the ground.
16 MS. KINGSTON: Eric, you are basing your
17 contamination theories on these Century wells.
18 MR. WAEHLING: The initial location of the wells is
19 based upon available information. You then confirm, you
20 basically form a hypothesis, is this correct. This is where
21 we put the well.
22 You will then confirm the hypothesis using the data
23 that's generated by those wells to see if you made the correct
24 assumption.
25 Now, it happens and it's not infrequent that you put

00074

1 it in the wrong place and you discover that you put it in the
2 wrong place once you've looked at the data, once you have been
3 able to triangulate off the wells what the ground water flow
4 directions are.

5 MS. KINGSTON: So then the 18 wells you just dug
6 are -- won't be considered to be representative of any
7 contamination flow; am I correct with understanding that?

8 MR. WAEHLING: No, that's not correct. I'm saying
9 that the wells were located by the hydrogeologist. Three of
10 them. It wasn't just one.

11 MS. KINGSTON: I know. I was here.

12 MR. WAEHLING: They were located on best available
13 information. When the data comes back from the water levels,
14 the geology from the log borings and all that, they will then
15 take a look at it to see if we made the correct assumption.
16 Does the data support what we believe is going on here or does
17 it not? If it does not, then we have to do something else.
18 It's not done yet.

19 MS. KINGSTON: It means absolutely nothing not
20 coming from the appropriate person.

21 MR. WAEHLING: I will see what I can do to see if I
22 can get the hydrogeologist here.

23 MS. KINGSTON: Thank you.

24 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. It's 9:10. Does anybody else
25 have anything else?

00075

1 MR. TORRENS: I would like two things. One, clarify
2 where the next meeting location will be. Frank asked for the
3 fire station. For obvious reasons, I'm extremely proud of the
4 facilities that our fire district has to offer. But I would
5 like to suggest that we continue having meetings here. I
6 think it's very convenient for most of the people at this
7 gathering and --
8 MR. WASTLER: Frank said something that, actually,
9 he needs some bathroom facilities better than what's here. He
10 is an elderly gentleman. I don't think any of us has crossed
11 that bridge yet, but I'm sure when we do we'll know what he's
12 talking about.
13 MS. LANE: The ramp going in and out was rather wet.
14 I hesitated walking up that thing. It could very well be very
15 slippery.
16 MR. WAEHLING: It was actually very icy when I
17 showed up.
18 MR. WASTLER: I don't mind having it here. He
19 mentioned something. I think he had difficulty. So I think
20 the fire station would probably be more appropriate.
21 MR. WAEHLING: I would be inclined to agree.
22 MR. TORRENS: Can't argue with that.
23 MR. WAEHLING: I recommend that we meet at the fire
24 station. We can take a vote on that.
25 Actually, I would much prefer that we use that. I

00076

1 control the facility for safety reasons. Let's go back to the
2 fire house.

3 Is there anything else?

4 We will have the next meeting at the fire station.

5 Hopefully there won't be scheduling conflicts and we may have
6 an "in" on working through that.

7 MR. TORRENS: I believe so.

8 MR. WAEHLING: Jen many call and make sure we can
9 get on the schedule.

10 MR. TORRENS: If there is nothing else, I would like
11 to make a motion to adjourn.

12 MR. WAEHLING: Thanks.

13 All in favor?

14 The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

15 (The hearing adjourned at 9:11 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00077

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)

) ss.

4 County of Clark)

5

6 I, Sarah C. Thomas, a Notary Public for Washington,
7 certify that the hearing here occurred at the time and place
8 set forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and place I
9 reported in Stenotype all oral proceedings had in the
10 foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to
11 typewriting under my direction; and the foregoing transcript,
12 pages 4 to 76 both inclusive, contains a full, true and
13 correct record of all such oral proceedings had and of the
14 whole thereof.

15 I further advise you that as a matter of firm
16 policy, the Stenographic notes of this transcript will be
17 destroyed two years from the date appearing on this
18 Certificate unless notice is received otherwise from any party
19 or counsel hereto on or before said date;
20 Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver,
21 Washington, this 15th day of January, 2003.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Sarah C. Thomas, RPR, CSR
CSR No. TH-OM-AS-C47307
My notary commission expires: 9-22-05