

00001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING

Court Reporter: Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

Date: February 12, 2003

Time: 7:00

Place: 8600 N.E. 117th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington

RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

P.O. Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98666

(360)693-4111

00002

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Shall we get started? Hello, this
2 is a good group. I think that's bravo to Christine for
3 having such a good turnout tonight. Thank you very much for
4 joining us tonight.
5 This is the February 12th Camp Bonneville RAB
6 meeting. We are at a new location instead of the fire house,
7 as I'm sure you noticed. We were beat out by the Boy Scouts
8 in scheduling the room, so this was arranged by Christine and
9 Karen. Thank you very much for making those arrangements.
10 We'll talk about at the end of the meeting, see how people
11 feel about continuing to meet here. Seems like a pretty good
12 facility.
13 I'd like to open up the meeting by having the RAB
14 members identify themselves so they can be recorded in the
15 minutes. Anybody else that is joining us that is not a RAB
16 member, you're more than welcome to identify yourselves.
17 There's no requirement to do so.
18 I'll start. Eric Waehling, Camp Bonneville BEC, US
19 Army.
20 JENNIFER WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Fort Lewis,
21 Camp Bonneville administrative coordinator.
22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Christine Sutherland, RAB,
23 neighbor.
24 CHRIS MAURER: Chris Maurer, Ecology.
25 SUE SVENDSEN: Sue Svendsen. I just applied to the

00003

1 RAB.
2 FRANK FUNK: Frank Funk, RAB.
3 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, neighbor and RAB.
4 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.
5 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver/Clark Parks and
6 Recreation, Clark County representative.
7 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, Restoration Advisory
8 Board, neighbor.
9 TIM NORD: Tim Nord, Ecology. I'm not a RAB member.
10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Barry Rogowski, Department of
11 Ecology.
12 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Sean Sheldrake, EPA.
13 DON STRICK: Don Strick, Clark County Public
14 Information and Outreach.
15 BRIAN VINCENT: Brian Vincent, Clark County Public
16 Works.
17 ED MARSH: Ed Marsh from the FBI.
18 GREG JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department of Ecology.
19 STU MARKLE: Stu Markle, observer.
20 SHIRLEY ZELLER-MARKLE: Shirley Zeller-Markle,
21 President Clark County Executive Horse (inaudible).
22 PETE CAPELL: Pete Capell, Clark County.
23 JUDIE STANTON: Judie Stanton, Clark County
24 Commissioner.
25 CHRIS PEREDNEY: Chris Peredney, Ecology.

00004

1 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast Hazel Dell
2 Association and RAB.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm Karen Kingston, community
4 co-chair.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to clarify, I'm the Army
6 co-chair on this RAB.

7 We have at least five empty seats up here at the
8 table if anybody wants to join us up here.

9 I'd like to take a few minutes and welcome some
10 folks from Ecology and welcome to our observers. Tim Nord is
11 joining us with the Department of Ecology. Tim is on the
12 agenda to discuss the order that was recently issued by
13 Ecology for the Army specific to Camp Bonneville. Tim is here
14 to discuss that.

15 As he talks about that, I think it's going to answer
16 an awful lot of the process questions that keep surfacing,
17 questions of what documents are going to be generated, what do
18 these documents do, when is the opportunity for public input.
19 Tim is going to be talking about that within the context of
20 the order.

21 Let's see, we have some folks, Judie Stanton is
22 here. We have Chris Peredney, also a risk assessor with the
23 Department of Ecology. So welcome all.

24 I'd like to turn it over to Karen for some opening
25 remarks.

00005

1 KAREN KINGSTON: I just wanted to tell you, since
2 I'm new as your co-chair, I just want to read a statement to
3 you.
4 I'm prepared to co-facilitate the meeting and I do
5 have things to learn. I really welcome feedback and I want to
6 improve the meeting. So please tell me if you have an idea
7 about style or content after the meeting. I'm available by
8 phone, e-mail or sometimes in person.
9 I expect under my term common courtesy as we all
10 follow the basic rules. If I see bad conduct or childish,
11 rude behavior, I'll stop the meeting and ask you to abide by
12 the rules. Being passionate about issues is important here,
13 however bad behavior will be checked at the door.
14 I am proud of everyone here. There are so many
15 different opinions, so please stay on task, say what you need
16 to say and please remember that others need time, too.
17 Also please do not interrupt. Let the person finish
18 their thought. We will take turns and try to get everyone in
19 while on a particular topic.
20 I would like us to speak English here, not using
21 acronyms, since it's difficult for the visitors and new
22 members to follow us. We get used to all our acronyms. I
23 thought we might try to speak a little more English.
24 Does everybody agree with what I've said so far?
25 FRANK FUNK: Are these the rules you're reading now?

00006

1 KAREN KINGSTON: No. I'm just kind of stating my
2 position.

3 FRANK FUNK: You referred to rules. What rules are
4 you referring to that we follow?

5 KAREN KINGSTON: You'll get a handout.

6 FRANK FUNK: Okay.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Give me a minute.

8 Let's see. As for the agenda, I hope you like what
9 Jennifer and I have done. I know you probably saw the
10 changes. You'll see that we have a second page. It's
11 dedicated to direct questions. After each meeting or within
12 10 days, 10 days of the closure of a meeting, please notify me
13 of any questions you wish to have in this area for the next
14 agenda. The question can be to the Army, to the Army
15 co-chair, a regulator, local government or even a person who
16 would be an authority on your subject. I'll make every effort
17 to have an authority here to speak and answer your question.
18 Please remember that the pending question period, at
19 the very beginning, is not designed for rhetoric or opinion,
20 although if the clarification that's given to the question
21 creates another question within that focus, please, please
22 feel free to ask at that time and continue asking questions.
23 It's more a question and answer period so we can all
24 feel more comfortable, feel like we don't have a question
25 that's been riding us for three years or something like that,

00007

1 we can get that over with.
2 That having been said, we'll go to the first order
3 of business, and I'll hand this back to Eric.
4 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, I'd like to thank Karen and
5 Jennifer again for putting together this agenda. They put an
6 awful lot of work into it. Hopefully this will work better,
7 making sure that we're able to effectively communicate, answer
8 your questions. By doing this, this is new, but I really
9 think this is going to work much better so that I'm able to
10 adequately prepare to be able to have an answer for you, which
11 is what I'm trying to do. Without carrying things on a little
12 longer, I'll dive right into the questions if everybody is
13 okay with that.
14 Second page of the agenda. One of the questions
15 was: Are there any BCT notes or meeting minutes after October
16 '02? If no, why have there been no meetings?
17 Firstly, up on the table you should see the last two
18 copies of the minutes that we had taken at the BCT meetings.
19 KAREN KINGSTON: BRAC cleanup.
20 ERIC WAEHLING: Excuse me, BRAC cleanup team
21 meetings. As most of you know, that is the EPA, Department of
22 Ecology and the Army.
23 When I first started contracting to have meeting
24 minutes taken at the BCT, the intention was to do that for the
25 benefit of the team members so that if they needed to, they

00008

1 could refer back to notes from previous meetings to jog their
2 memory, if you will, from discussions and other issues that
3 arose. Then I agreed to provide them to the RAB as a courtesy
4 or just additional information from the meetings.
5 It quickly became pretty obvious to me that the team
6 members weren't making use of the meeting minutes at all, that
7 they weren't really serving the purpose that I hoped they
8 would serve, so I stopped having minutes, professional
9 minute-taking service, at the meetings. That's why there
10 haven't been others.
11 I want to make sure you have those that exist. I
12 brought the last two copies. You should already have them.
13 I'm making them available again. They're available to you on
14 the table.
15 The second part of the question was, If no, why have
16 there been no meetings?
17 There have been ongoing meetings. Sometimes they're
18 meetings of the full BCT, sometimes just between the Army and
19 Ecology, sometimes subject matter experts, my contractor and
20 the subject matter expert with the various agency, for
21 example, Parsons Engineering might talk directly to Greg
22 Johnson at Ecology discussing some technical issues. We don't
23 always have meeting minutes available from those discussions.
24 That's my answer for number one.
25 Should I field responses?

00009

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. Anybody have any questions?

2 IAN RAY: The idea is to provide for an informed
3 board. It's not so much that the Base Closure Team get
4 minutes of what they have done, but that this board understand
5 what you are doing and what you have done.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Agreed. That's why the board and
7 representatives from the agencies are here to talk, to discuss
8 these questions one on one with you and everybody else.

9 IAN RAY: So you will have some kind of a disclosure
10 to the board after each meeting, after each Base Closure
11 meeting, about what you are doing?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sorry, I don't follow you.

13 IAN RAY: We don't know what you're doing unless you
14 tell us.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. I guess I'm not sure I
16 follow you, Ian.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think what Ian is saying, it
18 might be a good idea to start having the meeting summaries
19 again, if that's not too much trouble.

20 JEROEN KOK: I thought several months ago we had
21 agreed that there was going to be some form of discussion with
22 the RAB about the Base Cleanup Team meeting.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely.

24 JEROEN KOK: And what was accomplished, that kind of
25 thing. I think that's what Ian is getting at. I think the

00010

1 question is, is there anything to report, and can we continue
2 to expect that kind of communication?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sorry. I misunderstood.

4 Yes, we can make that an agenda item. After we're
5 done, I'll try to tack it on at the end. But absolutely.

6 Shall we add that onto the agenda, just update on BCT
7 activities and discussions, things like that? I'd be happy to
8 do that.

9 JEROEN KOK: Great.

10 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Quick point of clarification, Eric.

11 There was a hiatus of BCT meetings there, too, from July to
12 January, whatever, 14th, we didn't have any BCT meetings.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

14 SEAN SHELDRAKE: That's part of the reason that
15 there haven't been any minutes from that period of time.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a suggestion. It was
17 something I wasn't going to bring up until we got done. Since
18 I can form committees, one of the committees I've decided to
19 form is create a BCT committee. Ian indicated that he would
20 participate in this.

21 This committee would work directly with BCT staff
22 and make follow-up presentations to us from the community
23 aspect, and the BCT would, of course, you know, keep making
24 direct presentations, doing everything you still do.
25 But maybe this would be a time for us to actually

00011

1 form a BCT, to give you a contact, a direct contact person
2 that could ask you questions and stay involved in what's
3 happening at the BCT.
4 ERIC WAEHLING: What do you mean by BCT?
5 KAREN KINGSTON: The BRAC cleanup team.
6 ERIC WAEHLING: Have a person like myself or Barry?
7 KAREN KINGSTON: Well, say, for instance, we form a
8 committee, and Ian chairs it.
9 BUD VAN CLEVE: Liaison.
10 KAREN KINGSTON: Yeah. He would just act as a
11 liaison. Thank you, good word. He would act as a liaison on
12 behalf of the RAB. That would give you somebody to copy to if
13 you wanted to copy something.
14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sure.
15 ERIC WAEHLING: We can try it. If it works, let's
16 do it.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: I don't know. Frank, do I have to
18 make a motion? You're my source. I read specifically Roberts
19 rules of orders for three days.
20 FRANK FUNK: You'll never learn it that way.
21 KAREN KINGSTON: Let me know.
22 FRANK FUNK: The book is that thick (indicating).
23 KAREN KINGSTON: I know, believe me.
24 FRANK FUNK: You can do it by motion, if you want,
25 from the RAB, and the RAB can approve it.

00012

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

2 FRANK FUNK: Or as chair you can appoint a person to
3 be on the committee.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: That's what I thought I read in
5 there. I don't know if that still fell under Roberts rules.

6 FRANK FUNK: I don't know if you have to do it as
7 the two co-chairs or not, but you could appoint a person to be
8 a liaison to go to that committee.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: To be in direct contact.
10 Ian, are you still available for this?

11 IAN RAY: Yes.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Then I would like to appoint Ian.
13 If anybody would like to be part of that liaison committee for
14 the BCT, why don't you contact Ian, help him out, or call at a
15 meeting if you need some help.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Question two regards the transects.
17 At the January 2003 meeting the word "transect" was used to
18 describe a path used by a reconnaissance team. Does this mean
19 the previous described transects with the mowing machines will
20 not be done?

21 Yes, I used the term "transect" for both of those
22 activities. Whenever I've used the term "transects",
23 generally what that means I'm talking about somebody trying to
24 walk or travel, a piece of machinery traveling approximately a
25 straight line through a certain area.

00013

1 The reconnaissance teams that are presently working
2 out at Bonneville, they are taking transects through various
3 areas of concern and areas of potential concern or, in this
4 case, they're covering the entire western region of the park.
5 They're walking at a given spacing, that's a transect.
6 Regarding specifically about whether the transects
7 where we're using the mowing machines, one of the ideas that
8 we were considering in the past, that we shared with you, was
9 to consider taking a piece of heavy machinery that we called a
10 hydro-axe and have it mow through the brush and the trees and
11 everything, then conduct geophysical investigations at various
12 locations.
13 One of the things that came out of some of the UXO
14 work that was done earlier in the year was that that may not
15 necessarily be the best approach, so the interim step was to
16 use this UXO reconnaissance technique. Then what we're going
17 to do is we're going to pull all this information together,
18 and that's something I'd like to offer for an opportunity to
19 brief on this, I'll get to that in a second, we're going to
20 take a look at that. We've recognized we have a lot of
21 disparate information that's historical. We've been at this a
22 long time. It's difficult to sort of get a sense of where are
23 we, what do we know, what don't we know, how much information
24 do we need to present to make certain arguments and make
25 certain proposals, do we have enough information or don't we?

00014

1 The next step in the process is that the Army will
2 write a MOTCA RI/FS. This is very similar to the document
3 we've talked about in the past that we've referred to as the
4 EE/CA, which is the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis.
5 MOTCA Toxic Control Act, Remedial Investigation Feasibility
6 Study, is roughly a state equivalent of the two.
7 The intention of the document, Tim will get into it
8 I'm sure in more detail, but the document is designed so that
9 you can lay out what do we know about the site, do we have
10 enough information to make certain decisions that will then be
11 presented to the public so that a remedy can be chosen.
12 Have I done --
13 TIM NORD: Pretty good.
14 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, Frank.
15 FRANK FUNK: I have a question about the mowing
16 machine and the transect. We're all familiar with rotary lawn
17 mowers. When you went through with this mowing machine, it's
18 a form of a rotary mower. They have them on the railroads,
19 that sort of thing.
20 ERIC WAEHLING: It is.
21 FRANK FUNK: Were there any unexploded devices
22 struck by one of them?
23 ERIC WAEHLING: No.
24 FRANK FUNK: The reason I raise that question is, if
25 there were anything, apparently there wasn't or you'd have

00015

1 blowed the machine up probably, but there's been so much
2 discussion about Camp Bonneville being so dirty by various
3 people when, in fact, it's a fact they've only found 15 live
4 rounds in the last seven years, I think it is.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Uh-huh.

6 FRANK FUNK: It's also a fact that you have raised
7 the position that Camp Bonneville is cleaner than most other
8 bases concerning UXO. That's the reason I raise the question.
9 Then these people walking the transects and the paper you give
10 us last month showed where they'd been all over that heavy
11 impact area walking it. They apparently didn't find anything
12 to speak of.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. Yes, you're right, Frank.
14 The reconnaissance we did last year, they did go through the
15 central impact area and they found one item that was right
16 next to a target, a car target.
17 But to answer your question specifically, when we
18 tested the hydro-axe out at Camp Bonneville, we did not
19 encounter any UXO items. With that said, we went to an area
20 where we shouldn't have. We went out of our way to make sure
21 we weren't in an area that there should be UXO items.
22 But safety is a paramount concern. That's one of
23 the -- and also environmental degradation. The impacts that
24 your investigations potentially have on the environment is
25 also something to be concerned about.

00016

1 One thing we do do for safety, though, there's a UXO
2 technician walking in front of the machinery with a metal
3 detector trying to make sure that there isn't anything there
4 so that the operator of the machine is safe. So they'll walk
5 ahead a little bit, step out of the way, the machine would
6 pass. That's how they conducted it when we did it here a
7 couple, two years ago now.
8 With that said, we're going to pull all this stuff
9 together, tell our story, if you will, and make proposals as
10 to what our options are. Then part of the role of you all, of
11 the Department of Ecology, is to say, Do you have a basis for
12 this? Do you have adequate information to make these
13 decisions? If we don't have adequate information, then we
14 need to go back and get more information. One possibility
15 would be transects. There's numerous other options that are
16 available to us, but one might be transects.
17 Greg?
18 GREG JOHNSON: Let me try and answer this question a
19 little bit better, a little shorter version.
20 A transect is a transect, okay, meaning here is a
21 square, you're going from Point A to Point B. If you're doing
22 a surface reconnaissance, you won't have a hydro-axe or
23 anything like that. The guy will still be going from Point A
24 to Point B.
25 If you're doing a geophysical investigation, which

00017

1 is totally different, that's a subsurface investigation,
2 that's when you'll use the hydro-axe. The reason you use that
3 or some other form of grubbing is so when they use the M61,
4 the magnetometer, it has to be held a certain amount above the
5 ground so the vegetation has to be removed or it's totally
6 ineffective.

7 A transect is a transect. When we use it in terms
8 of the reconnaissance, we're talking about guys walking with a
9 GPS. When we're talking in terms of geophysical, they're
10 using a GPS also, but they're carrying this magnetometer to go
11 through after the hydro-axe has cut their transects.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: And, Greg, is the task when you're
14 doing this particular recon, is it looking for UXO,
15 cleaning --

16 GREG JOHNSON: What they're doing right now is a
17 reconnaissance. What they're trying to do, the whole mission
18 of this reconnaissance is to prove that the area that they're
19 in was used as a maneuver area only. That's the only reason
20 they're there. They aren't really looking for ordnance. If
21 they see the ordnance, they'll mark it, move on. That's the
22 whole purpose of reconnaissance.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: That's very important. It's not a
24 clearance.

25 GREG JOHNSON: Also, all these dots we're talking

00018

1 about, everybody is -- I've seen a lot of e-mails flying that
2 people actually think they've gone out, every dot is somewhere
3 they've looked. Every dot is a place they've stopped and took
4 a data point. There may have been nothing there, may not have
5 had their magnetometer on. That's just a spot where they
6 stopped and put a data point.
7 ERIC WAEHLING: A spot where somebody was standing.
8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: This work done right now is
9 just surface?
10 GREG JOHNSON: Strictly.
11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Strictly surface?
12 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.
13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If the base was used for 80
14 years, how could it give an estimate on how many UXOs possibly
15 can be under the surface? How could you get a dollar amount
16 by looking on the surface for a base that's been used 80
17 years? What's the percentage that you would consider would be
18 the surface you couldn't see? Do you understand my question?
19 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah. There's no way to determine
20 that without a subsurface investigation. You have the
21 Archives Search Report, which will determine certain ordnance
22 activity that may have taken place there. You have your
23 geophysical investigations. Other than that, that's it.
24 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, Greg, I'm not sure I a
25 hundred percent agree with that. One of the handouts that I

00019

1 had up on the table is a planning matrix that we use for
2 approximately what it costs per acre that the Corps of
3 Engineers used. You don't always necessarily need to know
4 what is subsurface to begin to identify your cost per acre.
5 GREG JOHNSON: I think what you're talking about is
6 the UXO calculator or the EE/CA, part of the EE/CA where they
7 determine the cost per acre. That's basically based on past
8 experiences.
9 ERIC WAEHLING: It's the second one that I'm talking
10 about.
11 GREG JOHNSON: Yes. They'll come out and give an
12 estimate. It could be a good estimate, could be a bad
13 estimate.
14 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a planning number.
15 GREG JOHNSON: It's a planning tool, right.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: That's actually touching on one of
17 the questions later down, which if I could I'll get to later.
18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: That's one of the handouts. Would
20 you hold that up? That's just approximately how we'll go
21 about calculating roughly what the cost per acre for clearance
22 is. Somebody asked that we provide that.
23 Next question? I'd like to link question 1.3 and
24 1.5 and answer them both at once.
25 Up at the table, there was that document here

00020

1 (indicating). As many of you may remember, some time ago the
2 Army conducted an Environmental Assessment, wrote an
3 Environmental Assessment document for the transfer of
4 Bonneville from Federal ownership to Clark County ownership.
5 It only covers that very narrow window of the activity. It
6 doesn't include our cleanup activities. It's strictly an
7 Environmental Assessment of transferring ownership from the
8 Army to Clark County.
9 As part of that process, although not required by
10 law, the Army decided to accept public comment on that EA
11 document. We received the comment. Sorry it took such a very
12 long time. Finally they generated responses to those
13 comments. These are the responses to those comments that I'm
14 making available to you all. So here they are.
15 I'm not an expert on EAs. It's a whole area of
16 expertise in and of itself. I'll do my best to answer any
17 questions, but I'd be more than happy to point you to people
18 that are a lot smarter when it comes to these sorts of things
19 than myself.
20 Question 1.5 requests that there's a member vote to
21 include these comments, as well as RAB minutes, as part of the
22 administrative record.
23 One of the things that happens when they do an EA,
24 an administrative record is established as part of developing
25 the EA document. So these comments, questions, are already

00021

1 part of that administrative record. The RAB minutes, of
2 course, are part of the public repository.
3 My question is, the RAB minutes are very general, we
4 discuss a whole bunch of issues and topics, not just
5 exclusively the comments about the EA. I'm wondering, is it
6 appropriate to include all the RAB minutes in the archive
7 administrative record for the EA or is it more appropriate to
8 have them as part of the public repository?
9 KAREN KINGSTON: I can answer that.
10 I did a foray to the Army about the administrative
11 record. All the minutes are in the administrative record,
12 according to Fort Lewis.
13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right, they are there. I'm a whole
14 lot smarter on administrative records than I was just a few
15 weeks ago.
16 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.
17 ERIC WAEHLING: It's not entirely cut and dry. I
18 still have a lot to learn.
19 But we are in the process of getting these
20 straightened out and making sure we get our Is dotted and Ts
21 crossed.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: They're there now.
23 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, yes. We're working on
24 approving them. I'm having a contractor help me do just that.
25 We'll get it right. But there is an administrative record

00022

1 that has been established exclusively for the EA. These
2 comments are in that already.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: Then are you suggesting possibly
4 that the minutes are in the administrative record as of today,
5 that you may remove them?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: No, no, no. They'll always be in
7 the public forum. They will always be out there.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: I'm not talking about the
9 information repository, I'm talking about the Army's
10 administrative record. Right now they're in there.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, they are.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Are you thinking of removing them?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: No, I'm not thinking of removing
14 them. Let me clarify.

15 One of the things that I'm becoming smarter about is
16 that the administrative record is site specific. The paint
17 disposal area, if you recall, was a pile of empty paint cans
18 that we ended up picking up and we did some confirmational
19 sampling, we cleaned it up. The old ammunition supply point
20 where we had a little bit of gunpowder in front of the door,
21 we removed a couple shovelfuls of dirt, confirmational
22 sampling, it's clean.

23 Each of those is required to have a specific
24 administrative record established for each individual site, is
25 my understanding. There's multiple administrative records.

00023

1 There's not just one for the entire site. We don't want to
2 have duplicate copies of these minutes for each one of these,
3 do we? Do you see the dilemma?
4 TIM NORD: May I offer something? We deal with
5 administrative records. They're a great thing to have because
6 you get to go back, look at what's transpired, the future is
7 going to have them.
8 How we have approached administrative records is, in
9 fact, on a site, but we have to define a site. To me, Camp
10 Bonneville is a site. But underneath that you have a
11 schematic that you use to organize where information is going
12 to go. Your point would be a file under that administrative
13 record for that action that took place, that documents why it
14 did it and what happened.
15 To me, there's one administrative record, but there
16 is detail to that that provides the organization of that in
17 such a way that it's easy to go and access and you understand
18 it.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. Which is the real intent.
20 TIM NORD: Right.
21 SEAN SHELDRAKE: The way CERCLA reads in terms of
22 administrative records is each decision document, each
23 discrete decision made, whether that is inclusive of several
24 areas, paint drum, whatever, if you have an action memo or
25 Cleanup Action Plan that encompasses however many areas, that

00024

1 particular Cleanup Action Plan would require its own
2 administrative record, Record of Decision, depending on which
3 nomenclature you use, MOTCA or CERCLA. You can package
4 things, as Tim is saying. Each package would then require its
5 own administrative record.
6 Certainly no one's expecting five copies of a
7 700-page document in one repository. You could say, "See this
8 administrative record." It's basically so each decision
9 document, each public comment process, has a nice little neat
10 package for the public to review and understand, be able to
11 comment on that decision.
12 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. We are already in the
13 process of writing a cleanup -- the PAP, which stands for -
14 help me out, Tim - Proposed Action Plan. It's similar to
15 what -- what we're getting confused and wrapped around here is
16 Federal terms versus State-specific terms. Basically we're
17 going to get it right. I'm going to make sure it's right by
18 everybody's standards as best I can.
19 The RAB minutes will be part of the big one.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: The big one?
21 ERIC WAEHLING: The big one. Sorry to get all
22 twisted around on that one.
23 Does anyone have specific questions regarding that?
24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do we need to vote or
25 anything?

00025

1 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know if there's anything to
2 vote on because they're already part of that. The questions
3 are already part of that administrative record. The others
4 will be also included in the administrative record.
5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Sounds good.
6 ERIC WAEHLING: Good to go, I hope.
7 What have been the latest private well test results
8 for ammonium perchlorates?
9 I thought I mentioned it at the last meeting. I
10 sampled one additional well. Those tests had come back
11 negative for all the explosives listed in EPA method 8330, as
12 well as a separate test for ammonium perchlorate was also
13 negative. This well was actually just outside the fence lines
14 of Camp Bonneville, but for privacy reasons I'd like not to
15 share the name or address of the specific well.
16 JEROEN KOK: Could you give us a direction? North,
17 south, east or west?
18 ERIC WAEHLING: Southerly.
19 BUD VAN CLEVE: Over here (indicating).
20 ERIC WAEHLING: Thanks, Bud.
21 KAREN KINGSTON: Close to the south gate.
22 JEROEN KOK: Thank you.
23 ERIC WAEHLING: Kind of near where the pipeline
24 exits the property to the south, that general area.
25 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question.

00026

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: About the ammonium perchlorate
3 tests, will you be doing an ongoing round, say every two
4 years, whatever would be appropriate, on the four residential
5 wells that you've tested? Is it four or three?

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Three.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Three residential wells that you've
8 tested? Was this a one-time shot? If there's none right now,
9 we're not looking at the future?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: What we are doing is we're going to
11 continue with quarterly monitoring of what's now 27 wells, I
12 believe it's 27, I may be off on that number, but it's close
13 to that, monitoring wells that we've installed around Camp
14 Bonneville, to include some wells that we installed -- eight
15 wells that we installed directly along the fence line where
16 Lacamas Creek leaves the installation. We're going to
17 continue to monitor those quarterly, to include ammonium
18 perchlorate as well as other things.
19 Specifically my intention at this time is not to
20 continue monitoring on a regular basis residential wells for
21 ammonium perchlorate because the intention of the design of
22 the web that we now have of wells is to tell us before
23 anything leaves the installation, before it could ever get to
24 these wells, our hope, intent, is to see it on Bonneville
25 before it ever gets there.

00027

1 Ian, then Christine.

2 IAN RAY: Ladies first.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What is the depth of one of
4 the deepest wells, the sentry wells, roughly?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Roughly I believe it's about 40
6 feet. We have shallows and deeps.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are you concerned, Ecology
8 maybe, that it could seep deeper higher up near Landfill 4 and
9 possibly go under, maybe not miss, but travel quicker under?
10 I don't know that much about hydrology. I know that there's
11 layers. Water runs differently in each layer. Each layer is
12 so diverse. 40 feet, my well alone is 150, I know people
13 around me have 250.

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think I want to take an
15 assessment of all the well logs and results and have our
16 hydrogeologist look at that before I give a real definitive
17 answer one way or the other. We don't even have all the data
18 back on all the wells installed yet, haven't had a chance to
19 review it. I'm a little uncomfortable saying one way or the
20 other until we can do that.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can we table this till the
22 next meetings?

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: When we get those results, I think
24 it would be a better discussion then - more informed.

25 IAN RAY: Regarding the latest private well that was

00028

1 tested, what is the lowest detection limit for that for
2 perchlorates?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: I believe, without having it right
4 in front of me, if it's consistent, it's around four or five
5 parts per billion.

6 IAN RAY: The lab is certified to make that
7 determination?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, Washington State Department of
9 Ecology certification.

10 FRANK FUNK: This 1.6, are you addressing it at the
11 same time as 1.4?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: As a matter of fact, yes. Well, no,
13 not directly.

14 1.6, water tests. I believe I have handed these out
15 before, but I'll hand them out again. This is all the well
16 data, preliminary raw data, that we have from Landfill 4.

17 FRANK FUNK: On Camp Bonneville?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: On Camp Bonneville. This is
19 specifically the wells at Landfill 4. It's also available to
20 you up at the table. This is a map that corresponds so you
21 can correlate the results to the corresponding well. The very
22 last page is the data from the newest well that was installed.
23 I want to caution you, this is preliminary data.

24 What I did, because I couldn't wait to find out -- get some
25 inkling of what the results were going to be, at the same time

00029

1 that the contractor who installed the well was out there
2 sampling the newest well, which is 250 to the south of the
3 landfill, I had them fill a couple bottles, shipped it off,
4 had a rush result specifically just for the explosives, 8330,
5 ammonium perchlorate. These are preliminary. I want to make
6 sure everybody understands that.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is the AP listed on here?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Dagnab it. It's a separate page. I
9 didn't get it copied. I apologize. Looks like the second
10 page for the AP didn't make it in here. That was the one --
11 we did have a detection of ammonium perchlorate at five parts
12 per billion with a detection limit of four parts per billion.
13 We had a little smidge of a hit. It's going to be up to the
14 hydrogeologists and people that are technically expert to tell
15 us what that means.

16 What I can tell you that in 250 feet, the well where
17 we had the highest hits of 199 parts per billion, 250 feet
18 away, we're at five.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Eric, we have 227 parts per
20 billion? I saw that in the paper. It's 227 parts per
21 billion.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: 227 parts per billion. Even though,
23 227 parts per billion, in 250 feet downhill we drop from that
24 number down to five. Again, the hydros are going to be the
25 ones that tell us when we get all the data from the well

00030

1 boring logs, put the pieces of the puzzle together to give us
2 a picture of what's going on underground, they'll be able to
3 tell us what's the significance of that number.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: Could you clarify that that is not
5 the only downhill area to Landfill 4? That's just one
6 downhill direction.
7 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sorry?
8 KAREN KINGSTON: Landfill 4 sits like this
9 (indicating). The well you're talking about sits to we'll
10 call it the south, might be the southeast.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
12 KAREN KINGSTON: There's downhill this direction
13 (indicating).
14 ERIC WAEHLING: Towards Lacamas Creek?
15 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes, as well.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: So we're only talking about this
18 one well right here to the south that is reading lower limits.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: Which is good news for plume
21 detection in that direction.
22 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, just as a point of further
23 interest, we hand augured, hand dug, two smaller wells.
24 They're identified as hand augured boring one and two. Both
25 times when we went to try to pull the sample from there, the

00031

1 hole was dry.

2 Again, we'll have to let the hydrogeologists, people
3 much smarter than myself, tell us what the significance of
4 that is. I can relate to you in both of our attempts, one
5 after a significant rainfall, they were unable to get a sample
6 from there because there wasn't any water in that well.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: That could be because it wasn't
8 deep enough, right?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: It could be. Karen, I'm not a
10 hydrogeologist. I'm not going to try to speculate. I'm
11 trying to relay what I know.

12 I anticipate a draft of that report very soon,
13 within the next week.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can you pass that on?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. It will be a draft report.

16 I'll make that available at the next RAB meeting.

17 Frank touched on it. All these wells also will be
18 monitored quarterly, continue to be monitored quarterly. What
19 we're interested in seeing is if there's trends, things like
20 that.

21 Fencing and signs. I'll try to pick it up. There
22 was a question regarding fencing and signs. Are plans
23 underway for repair, et cetera?

24 Basically there's two fences on Bonneville. We have
25 the perimeter fence which goes around the entire circumference

00032

1 of Bonneville. I think it's roughly 11 miles. Then we have a
2 fence that goes around the central impact area, which is about
3 four miles in length. My caretakers, Warren and Steve, I
4 think you have met them in the past, have been focusing their
5 efforts on maintaining and preparing the fence around the
6 central impact area. They periodically drive the fence line,
7 weather permitting, looking for any breaks. They repair any
8 breaks they find.
9 The fence is in good shape. It is three strands of
10 barbed wire on steel posts. There is signage. I have a
11 picture of the signage that was also in The Columbian from
12 Clark County. There are these signs about every 100 to 120
13 feet apart all the way around on the fence line. It notes:
14 Danger, artillery impact area, keep out.
15 Around the perimeter of Camp Bonneville, Warren and
16 Steve do their best to maintain that. There is one section
17 that is damaged in the upper northwest corner of the boundary
18 of the installation that we're unable to get access to that is
19 down. Along the areas that it's up, Steve and Warren try to
20 keep it going as a secondary effort, giving priority to the
21 central impact area.
22 Along that fence we have these signs installed
23 approximately every 50 to 80 feet. You can read it yourself.
24 The internationally recognized danger symbol, explosive
25 hazards, another keep out sign. Steve and Warren try to

00033

1 replace and repair these as best they can. There is some
2 vandalism that occurs up there.
3 At the two main gates and one of the areas where
4 we've had historic issues of trespassing, there is a
5 four-by-eight version of these signs right next to the gate.
6 You probably saw it when you came to the meeting at Camp
7 Killpack. Looks just like this, but it's four feet by eight
8 feet. We have three of those, one by each gate, where we had
9 historical trespassers in the past.
10 Frank?
11 FRANK FUNK: What is the restriction you can't get
12 to that area you say you can't get to?
13 ERIC WAEHLING: It's so overgrown the road doesn't
14 exist anymore. We don't have the means at the moment to be
15 able to build a new road, get work crews up there to install
16 it.
17 FRANK FUNK: You need to take your axe, that power
18 axe, go down there.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: It's incredibly steep. It would
20 have to be quite a road to allow a four-by-four pickup truck
21 or we'll have to find some other means. That's not planned at
22 the moment.
23 BUD VAN CLEVE: Talking about up here (indicating)?
24 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.
25 BUD VAN CLEVE: In this area here (indicating).

00034

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is he pointing to the right
2 area?
3 ERIC WAEHLING: I believe so. I've not actually
4 been there myself.
5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Go down to the next one down.
6 There is a path on the civilian side that runs right next to
7 it. There's actually a beaten path that goes into the camp
8 because there's no fencing. I walk there.
9 ERIC WAEHLING: Here?
10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Right there (indicating).
11 There's no signing there.
12 ERIC WAEHLING: The trespassing was from off of the
13 DNR property. I'll ask Warren and Steve to go up there and
14 see what they can do about it.
15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: They may not be aware. For obvious
17 reasons we're focusing on the central impact area fence. As
18 we can, we try to keep the installation boundary fence as
19 well.
20 DON WASTLER: My question is, what consequences does
21 a trespasser face?
22 ERIC WAEHLING: If they're caught?
23 DON WASTLER: If they're caught. How well is it
24 patrolled? What are the consequences? Are they actually
25 being charged with trespassing?

00035

1 ERIC WAEHLING: We haven't caught anybody, to be
2 honest.

3 DON WASTLER: Obviously, if Christine says there's a
4 beaten path that goes in there...

5 The thing I'm getting at, you're concentrating on
6 the central impact area when no one should be even be getting
7 that far. They shouldn't be getting inside the main
8 perimeter.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. We have arrangements with
10 Clark County sheriffs that they will respond if Steve and
11 Warren catch somebody. It's four thousand acres. I think Bob
12 Knight mentioned, he said you could have 300, 400 soldiers out
13 there and people could still sneak through.

14 DON WASTLER: If a person is caught trespassing,
15 maybe they've been trespassing out all the time. The one
16 little fine and trip to court they'll have to face for the one
17 little time they got caught is probably worth all the times
18 they've gone in there and doing whatever they're doing,
19 poaching deer, whatever reason they're going in there, even if
20 they're going in there looking for UXO for vandalism.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: We've actually met with Clark County
22 about this in the past. They've agreed to prosecute should we
23 catch anybody. The extent that they're able to prosecute is
24 up to 90 days and/or \$1,000. But we haven't caught anybody.

25 DON WASTLER: Thank you. That answers my question.

00036

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Army contacts. We have more
2 handouts for you. There were some questions as to who the
3 current commander was, the chain of command, which is a term
4 the Army likes to use. Think of it as management hierarchy
5 like you would see in a civilian company as to who's in
6 charge, whose boss is whose boss.
7 Jennifer has put together the chain of command, to
8 use military terms, of who owns Camp Bonneville. Although the
9 Army has undergone reorganization for cleanup activities, Camp
10 Bonneville is still owned by Fort Lewis.
11 The installation commander at Fort Lewis is
12 Lieutenant General Edward Soriano.
13 Underneath him is the garrison commander Colonel
14 Luke Green. Think of him as roughly equivalent to the mayor.
15 Fort Lewis is a mid-sized city. Colonel Green is like the
16 mayor of the city.
17 Working for Colonel Green as the Director of Public
18 Works is Richard Conte.
19 Working for Colonel Conte, in charge of the
20 environmental and natural resources, is Mr. Paul Steuke, who
21 used to be my direct supervisor, but under the new
22 organization he's no longer.
23 Going up from there, we have what was referred to as
24 the MACOM, which is Major Army Command. They are actually --
25 actually, the Atlanta field office, they wear two hats. The

00037

1 director of that is Don Bohannon. He is now my supervisor and
2 manages the BRAC cleanup aspects of things as far as the money
3 and the cleanup activities.
4 Actually I jumped ahead. This is for the chain of
5 command for RAB appeals.
6 In the TAPP, for public guidance, which is also here
7 for you, there is an appeals process. There's a straw man in
8 there. We were asked to fill in the names and addresses.
9 That's what this does here. It helps fill in those details.
10 Currently I don't have the mailing address for the
11 Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Ray Fatz or for the
12 assistant Secretary of the Army. By the time we meet next
13 time, I'll try to have a mailing address for them.
14 Between myself and the Assistant Secretary of the
15 Army, there's six layers of bureaucracy or management that I
16 do have the addresses for here.
17 There was a question about whether the Army can
18 provide copy machines for RAB business and for RAB community
19 members. I'm unable to provide a copy machine at Camp
20 Bonneville specifically to do RAB photocopying. It's just not
21 within my means to be able to do that. I am working with
22 Karen, the co-chair, to figure out some other way to do it.
23 In the meantime, Karen will provide us copies of
24 things that she wants, and we'll run copies until such time as
25 we work out something better. Unfortunately, I'm not able to

00038

1 provide a dedicated copier at Camp Bonneville. We're
2 continuing to work the issue. Hopefully we'll come up with
3 something satisfactory.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: If any of you community, anybody
5 would like copies of anything, and you probably need a lot of
6 catchup, you're more than welcome, if you know what the
7 document is, all you have to do is contact me and I'll get it
8 to you.

9 JEROEN KOK: Just as a thought off the top of my
10 head, is it feasible to set up an account at a photocopy
11 place?

12 ERIC WAEHLING: I haven't figured out a legal way to
13 do that. There's extreme limitations on how you can spend
14 public monies. I haven't figured my way around that way yet.

15 JEROEN KOK: We'll leave it to you.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Last but not least. Can the minutes
17 be provided digitally sooner? For people that have access to
18 e-mail, I believe Jen is already working on trying to do that,
19 where we provide electronic digital copies prior to the hard
20 copies that arrive in the mail.

21 JENNIFER WALTERS: I send them out a week after I
22 get them electronically, in case they come back and say we
23 needed to correct this or whatnot. I think it's been about a
24 week usually we get them electronically. I'll try to get that
25 down to maybe two, three days.

00039

1 ERIC WAEHLING: We're continuing to try to turn up
2 our turnaround on the minutes from the meetings.
3 I managed to take twice as long as was allotted on
4 the agenda. How do people feel? Do we need a break even
5 though we're behind?

6 BUD VAN CLEVE: Keep going.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I can cover the reconnaissance work
8 update really fast.

9 As you've seen the maps in the past, we're
10 conducting ongoing reconnaissance work, primarily focusing in
11 the areas west of Lacamas Creek which we've identified, the
12 vernacular, we're calling it the regional park area versus the
13 habitat areas. The good weather has helped us keep up our
14 productivity. Things are going well.

15 Frank.

16 FRANK FUNK: In order to let the new members know
17 where we're at in your agenda, are you on the 8:10 topic?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm on Army updates, reconnaissance
19 work. I apologize that I don't have an updated map with me.
20 The maps with all the dots that everybody has been seeing so
21 many of in the past, that work is continuing, it's going
22 smoothly. The next area that they're looking at, they're
23 performing reconnaissance along all the trails. It's on
24 schedule to be completed at the end of February, first week in
25 March.

00040

1 I'd like to move on to the administrative order.
2 Tim, as I mentioned earlier, is here to talk to us about that.
3 I'm tired of talking, and I'd like to hand it over to Tim.
4 TIM NORD: I'll bet you are. How long do I have?
5 KAREN KINGSTON: How long do you need? Do you want
6 to do it after the break?
7 TIM NORD: I can fit your schedule.
8 KAREN KINGSTON: We want you to tell us everything
9 you're here to tell us.
10 ERIC WAEHLING: This is significant, important. I
11 think you should take the time needed.
12 TIM NORD: Maybe a five-minute break.
13 (Pause in proceedings.)
14 ERIC WAEHLING: If we could reconvene, please.
15 Tim, the floor is yours.
16 TIM NORD: My turn.
17 Well, first, thank you very much for allowing me
18 time to come and explain in non-acronym terms a very
19 complicated document and what it means.
20 What I'd like to do is just kind of go over the
21 concept of what this order does on a conceptual level, but
22 also give you some understanding of the real big picture in
23 the state of Washington, narrow that down to Camp Bonneville,
24 and then talk a little bit about the future, about what this
25 means and how we are going to collaborate with the County.

00041

1 The State has over the past 14 years identified over
2 9,000 contaminated sites. Those are the general sites you
3 read about in the paper, absent Camp Bonneville. Solvents,
4 petroleum, heavy metals. Of that amount, we have cleaned up
5 in that same time period over 5,000. 3,000 we're working on.
6 We still have a little bit over a thousand that are left.
7 They're just waiting for us to deal with.
8 So the universe that we look at is very, very large.
9 We've been doing this for quite a long time, and we're quite
10 good at it. We have various types of programs under our
11 cleanup umbrella that people can come and clean up sites
12 under, one of which I will be talking about with this order.
13 The basis for cleanups in Washington comes from a
14 citizens initiative, that's Initiative 97. That was passed by
15 the citizens of this state overwhelmingly I believe in 1989.
16 It's the highest pass vote of any initiative, even Tim
17 Eyeman's initiatives, on record. There is a great support for
18 a healthful environment in the state of Washington.
19 There are two basic elements behind this cleanup
20 law. One is a right that is expressed in the very first
21 paragraph of this law that says everyone has an inalienable
22 right to a healthful and safe environment. Very important.
23 The other element is that the public is engaged in
24 the cleanup of sites in the state of Washington. They have a
25 right to be aware of what is going on. This RAB is actually

00042

1 part of that. Although it's not necessarily sponsored by the
2 State, it is a very important part of that.
3 I'm going to speak to that, as well, about where the
4 RAB and the citizens of Clark County can become involved in
5 this process.
6 The order that we issued is based on those
7 principles. I'm really going to generalize here to stay away
8 from legal details, but there's two very important parts in
9 the order.
10 One is standard terms and conditions that are given
11 to anybody that these orders go to. The other are those
12 activities that we're actually requiring underneath this
13 order. So there's two parts.
14 Do we have copies of the order here?
15 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. They were made available on
16 the table.
17 TIM NORD: The two important parts for you to pay
18 attention to, the first begins on page 14. Those are the
19 actual tasks that are going to be undertaken by the Army. Let
20 me just pass out a summary of that so you can kind of see what
21 I'm talking about. This is important in that it sets forth
22 those activities that the Army is going to do. These are
23 fairly significant activities that are going to take place.
24 Eric mentioned RI/FS, Remedial Investigation Feasibility
25 Study. It's one of those activities, a real big thing that

00043

1 occurs.
2 What we have done is we have broken those out and
3 provided schedules. You will notice that those schedules talk
4 in terms of 30 days, 60 days after this or that. They're
5 really a function of the start date of the order and they are
6 all linked by chronology of when something happens and
7 something else is going to happen. This provides you with a
8 general overview from a process standpoint, not a substantive
9 standpoint, but from a process standpoint what is going to be
10 happening.
11 We have worked very hard with Eric and his team to
12 conceptualize the site. In other words, how are we going to
13 organize our thinking in a way such that we can make
14 decisions, that it's not too complicated, that they're
15 discrete, that we can make a decision here, that that is going
16 to support a decision here? So we have conceptualized the
17 site into three basic components.
18 Those components are by what we are calling Remedial
19 Investigation and Feasibility Study action unit one. It's
20 based on hazardous substances, the type of material there.
21 That's one. You can see that the remedial action unit is
22 actually the third yellow row here. We have a schedule for
23 things that are going to occur under that remedial action
24 unit.
25 We have another unit that is based on the small arms

00044

1 site, the demolition area and the landfill. We believe that
2 we can organize our thoughts and investigation around that and
3 make a decision. We have a schedule for that, as well.
4 The third area is really a site-wide model that
5 deals with the unexploded ordnance itself. So we have
6 organized a schedule along those lines, as well.
7 There are different time frames when those decisions
8 are going to occur. We also have the site-wide groundwater
9 investigation built into this, too.
10 What this order does is it organizes thinking, it
11 organizes a process for decision making to get to an end
12 point. That end point is based on those principles in our
13 state cleanup law, and that is protection of human health and
14 the environment.
15 When we make decisions, and there are numerous
16 points in this decision-making process, we are going to be
17 coming out to the public and we will explain what's going on,
18 we will ask for comment. One of those is the order itself.
19 FRANK FUNK: Pardon?
20 TIM NORD: This document itself, our order.
21 FRANK FUNK: Okay.
22 TIM NORD: There is going to be a public comment
23 period on this order. We will go through it in much more
24 detail for everyone and explain what this is about, then we
25 will get feedback to that. This is built into our law. Based

00045

1 on that feedback, we might amend it. We might not, as well.
2 But that's just an example of the steps that we take to engage
3 the public.
4 Another opportunity is when we do a remedial
5 investigation or site investigation where you gather all the
6 data, and then when we look at alternatives: What are we
7 going to do with all of that data? How will we solve that
8 problem? We will again go out and explain, This is what we
9 saw, this is a range of alternatives that are available. This
10 is pre making a decision. We're not making a decision on
11 this. It's just to get people engaged in this.
12 Another part when we go out is we have taken those
13 comments based on those alternatives, and we develop a Cleanup
14 Action Plan. We will select the approach based on what you
15 have seen before, or a combination of those approaches, and
16 this is how we are going to solve -- how we plan on solving
17 this environmental problem. We would go out for public
18 comment again on that.
19 There is a series of steps that we are going to be
20 taking that is going to draw the RAB, as well as other people
21 that are at -- that have a stake in Camp Bonneville, into the
22 process. It's a burdensome thing that we do, but it really
23 pays dividends to make sure -- it ensures we make thoughtful
24 decisions.
25 I'm just talking process here, but that's kind of

00046

1 how this thing is going to roll out.
2 That doesn't happen overnight. It takes a long time
3 to do that. Some people get a little frustrated that it does
4 take so long, but this is not easy stuff to do. The
5 investigations aren't easy, looking at the data, coming up and
6 wrestling with how we're going to solve an environmental
7 problem.
8 By the way, if you have any questions, feel free.
9 Look at that, I should have said that right up front.
10 IAN RAY: I notice on remedial action unit number
11 three, is a site-wide UXO hazard, the entire 3840 acres. I
12 just had a quick look at this. I don't see anything about
13 groundwater site-wide.
14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: At the bottom.
15 TIM NORD: There is.
16 IAN RAY: Got it. It's at the bottom. All right.
17 TIM NORD: You might be looking at it for the first
18 time. It's kind of hard in 15 minutes to capture everything.
19 I might not be doing a very good job articulating everything.
20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How are you going to call for
21 feedback when you call for public participation? I know you
22 have a forum here.
23 TIM NORD: Right.
24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If we don't have this, how do
25 you call, how do we find out when there are calls?

00047

1 TIM NORD: We will have a mailing list. We will
2 send the flyers out to people notifying them of the public
3 comment period. We will identify location where we will hold
4 a meeting. We'll put advertisements in the paper. That is
5 how we typically announce we will have a meeting.
6 I think we have a pretty good sense of what the
7 issues are. We will cater that meeting to both explain what
8 this is and to draw out, have a discussion with people, and
9 then we will get their feedback on this. We will record. We
10 have public meetings all the time, so we have ways on how to
11 do that. Then we have to make sense of those comments, try to
12 determine what to do with respect to this.
13 Yes, Frank.
14 FRANK FUNK: I did a little calculation on the
15 second yellow line from the bottom. If my calculation is
16 right, that's going to take a period of three years and two
17 months, is that right?
18 TIM NORD: Very well could, Frank.
19 FRANK FUNK: I see a couple others that might take
20 longer.
21 TIM NORD: Yes, this isn't easy stuff. I didn't do
22 the math like that. We have to make sure that we do things
23 right.
24 FRANK FUNK: Yeah.
25 TIM NORD: This is actually an aggressive schedule.

00048

1 When you look at these turnaround times, for the amount of
2 information, it's aggressive. Yeah, by its nature it takes
3 time.

4 FRANK FUNK: Let me point out how I arrived at this.

5 TIM NORD: Okay.

6 FRANK FUNK: It says 60 days within completion of
7 the fieldwork. Then it says five months for the draft. Does
8 each one of those go individually or do they coincide with one
9 another as they go?

10 TIM NORD: They're sequenced.

11 FRANK FUNK: One follows the other?

12 TIM NORD: That is correct.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Uh-huh.

14 FRANK FUNK: It would be three years and two months,
15 or maybe a little longer?

16 TIM NORD: Uh-huh, yeah.

17 DON WASTLER: My question is when Eric was talking
18 about their cleanup, they were saying that they weren't going
19 to cut down any trees that were larger than six inches in
20 diameter. In other words, they were going to try and preserve
21 the habitat that's there as much as they could throughout the
22 cleanup process.

23 Are you guys basically having the same plan in mind?

24 TIM NORD: There is no decision made yet, okay?

25 DON WASTLER: What I'm asking is --

00049

1 TIM NORD: I'm going to try to get to that.

2 DON WASTLER: Okay.

3 TIM NORD: As we go and look at what is there at a
4 site, I'm going to kind of talk in generic terms here, we
5 first have to understand what is there, and then we look at
6 what is possible to solve this problem to make sure it's
7 protected. Remember, everything that we do in the end is
8 going to be protected. It's a fundamental requirement. We
9 can't do anything else.

10 If in this instance we get to a point that starts
11 bringing in these land use issues, and we can say that
12 cleaning up this way is protective, and we might have some
13 other mechanisms in place to make sure it's protected, we
14 would agree with that. If, however, based on our analysis
15 it's not a good fit, we wouldn't agree with that.

16 Now, let me just take a step back now a little bit
17 and talk about who we're working with here.

18 This is a collaborative effort. We need the
19 technical expertise of the Army and the talent that they can
20 bring to the table. We will need the technical expertise of
21 the County's consultants and what they bring to the table,
22 too. We will need your input as well. It is through that
23 process that you can get to the answer of your question. I'm
24 not there yet.

25 DON WASTLER: My concern is, for example, the impact

00050

1 area for the UXO, they may come to the conclusion to just
2 clear-cut the whole thing and bulldoze it to find all the UXO
3 that's in there.

4 TIM NORD: Sure, that's right.

5 DON WASTLER: That's what my memory is. In the
6 process of this cleanup, Camp Bonneville, that area up in
7 there is a watershed, and I've already witnessed how sensitive
8 that is to timber harvest, not there, but what happens below,
9 downstream. That's my concern, when they go in there and
10 start cutting that down, what the results are going to be, the
11 impact it's going to be to the environment below.

12 TIM NORD: Those factors are considered. In any
13 type of cleanup that we do, you have to look at the
14 consequence both from an economic standpoint as well as the
15 consequence to the infrastructure of the community - and we
16 did that up in Everett where we're doing a massive cleanup in
17 a residential area - the consequence to the environment as
18 well.

19 Now, there's lots of ways of how to skin a cat.
20 That's why you look at all these different alternatives. It
21 is making choices. You look at the consequences of those
22 choices and you try to get a best fit. You balance all of
23 these factors. That's not easy. You have to make sure that
24 you're balancing based on the right information. That's in
25 part, Frank, is why things take so long, because it is a

00051

1 balancing act. You have to make sure you have the right
2 information.

3 Yes, Karen.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: In talking about the collaboration
5 with the community, might I suggest before you send out your
6 notification to the public that you possibly run that by some
7 of the community RAB members here? In the past, there's been
8 some problems with the way a regulating agency, we'll pick on
9 the Corps of Engineers right now, about how they knocked on
10 doors asking for any input from the local residents as to what
11 they'd seen at Camp Bonneville or what they've discovered,
12 maybe what they had in their basement or on their mantle. The
13 way they approached the community was done so poorly because
14 people just did this and they were afraid.

15 Could you just get some input from us?

16 TIM NORD: We can do that. It's a very challenging
17 thing, to try to get as many people involved in this. It's
18 like voting. How come people don't vote? It's extremely
19 important. Some of the same characteristics apply to these
20 type of things, too.

21 Yes, we will do that. You know, we will be
22 developing a public participation plan, as well. It's one of
23 the things that has to be done. It will be looking at those
24 things. What are the best tools to use to involve the public?
25 When do we communicate? How do we communicate?

00052

1 Yes, Frank.

2 FRANK FUNK: Taking your chart here, do these work
3 in a sequence? Like the first one is a draft public
4 participation plan, then you go to item actions, then do that,
5 or can you do more than one at once?

6 TIM NORD: These things are going all at the same
7 time.

8 FRANK FUNK: The reason why I asked was because if
9 you figure them up, it would be over 14 years.

10 TIM NORD: I'm going to remember this about you,
11 Frank. I'm going to do the math myself next time I come here.
12 I will start out with how long it takes.

13 FRANK FUNK: All right. That will shortcut things,
14 won't it?

15 TIM NORD: I don't know if it will be as much fun,
16 though.

17 IAN RAY: Even so, running parallel, it looks like
18 there are four or five reports due in 30 days?

19 TIM NORD: Yes.

20 IAN RAY: A lot of work.

21 TIM NORD: Yes, it is. We have marshaled a
22 significant number of staff. This is the largest site, from a
23 staffing standpoint, that Ecology is running right now. This
24 is a very important thing for us as well as the community
25 here.

00053

1 Yes, Christine.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm happy to hear that,
3 first, that it's looked upon as such an importance, because
4 obviously the people in this room feel the same.

5 I have a question. It says February 4th is the
6 effective date. We can look at that as the three months?

7 TIM NORD: Excuse me. I thought you were going
8 someplace else. That's a habit of mine. I need to let people
9 finish before I speak. Pardon me. You go ahead.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The February 4th date on page
11 39, let's take the top, draft public participation plan, that
12 is May 4th that that would be due?

13 TIM NORD: Yes. What I was going to say is I
14 thought you were talking about the comment period, that one
15 could view us issuing this last week saying that the comment
16 period started then. We're going to expand that. We just
17 needed to get that out. We will have a new comment period
18 that will make sure that we get everyone's thoughts on this.
19 Let me also talk a little bit about how we are
20 coordinating with the County, as well.

21 Ecology's role is cleanup. That's what we do. When
22 you look at us, you look at the cleanup people. As you know,
23 the County has expressed interest in the transfer of this
24 property. I think most of you know that at some point in
25 time, the Governor makes the decision if this is a good thing

00054

1 to do.
2 Ecology is in the role of providing a recommendation
3 to the Governor. When that recommendation is made, it's going
4 to be based on: Are we convinced that this cleanup is going
5 to occur by means of are there going to be resources applied
6 or provided to the County? And do we have assurance that when
7 that cleanup occurs, it will be protected? That's what the
8 decision is. It's as simple as that.
9 Now, of course, as Frank has pointed out, cleanup
10 hasn't necessarily occurred yet. Studies have not occurred
11 yet. But what we will do, we are basically convinced right
12 now that by following this document, that the end point will
13 result in a safe and healthy environment for the community-run
14 Camp Bonneville. This document, the essence of it, if the
15 County gets this property, will be applied to the County as
16 well. This is the backbone.
17 When you look at this, if there is a transfer, it is
18 these same conditions - although it will be a different type
19 of document - that will be provided to the County as well.
20 What the Army gets, the County's going to get. Nothing's
21 changed. It's neutral to who gets it.
22 One of the things that we are just starting to do,
23 there was an initial conversation today, is what type of legal
24 document would that be? We are starting to develop what I'll
25 just call a prepurchaser consent decree. I could have used

00055

1 the acronym on that, but I didn't do that out of deference to
2 you, Karen. It's a legal document that we would enter into
3 with the County that would describe those things that have to
4 occur. When we have that agreement, we will be convinced,
5 just like we are convinced now, that this would govern any
6 decision, that that would occur. So the County will be having
7 that, as well.
8 That takes us a while to do, but we will have to
9 have that before we make a recommendation. We won't enter
10 into court yet. That's this type of document that we're
11 talking with the County would actually be entered into court.
12 But before we would make a recommendation, we would have that
13 thing done.
14 There's another document that the County is
15 negotiating with the Army on right now, and I don't know what
16 stage it's at, but they're going to have to start doing that.
17 This is called the environmental services contract agreement.
18 ERIC WAEHLING: Cooperative agreement.
19 TIM NORD: Cooperative agreement.
20 Basically what this is, this is a cooperative
21 agreement that describes the conditions of the sale - excuse
22 me - the transfer of the property and how much money would go
23 along with that transfer. Now, that's important to us.
24 That's one of the conditions, because that's the means for the
25 County to be able to execute this other document that we have.

00056

1 So we have a vested interest in making sure that that marries
2 up to the work that we are expecting to happen. So that is
3 another fairly significant thing that the County and the Army
4 are working on and that we would become involved in when it is
5 time to do that.

6 Yes, Frank.

7 FRANK FUNK: I listen to you. You talk about --
8 what I'm hearing is that you have kind of delved into what is
9 here at Bonneville to a degree, not a whole lot maybe, but to
10 a degree. Do you have a feel for, at Bonneville, how
11 contaminated it is with water quality and UXOs?

12 TIM NORD: Yeah, I think we have a -- well, of
13 course, it's all based on one's understanding of the world. I
14 think we have a general understanding of the types of
15 contaminants, not necessarily their location, their frequency,
16 their distribution, but we know in general what's there.
17 There is a lot more work that needs to be done. We
18 talked about the transects, what a transect is, what recon
19 work is. All that says is that this is the area, then we go
20 in there and try to figure out what is actually there in order
21 to determine what solution we are going to try to apply to
22 that environmental problem.

23 You know, I'm not the technical guy here, Frank.

24 There are other people that can speak to this a little bit
25 better. The people that we have placed on here are really

00057

1 good. They're going to be working with really good people
2 that are hired by the County, that the Army has, too, to make
3 sure that, in fact, we do know what's there, we do know what
4 it means to have groundwater contamination at the landfill,
5 what is the preferential pathway, under what geologic
6 formation, to ensure that the travel time is such that if it
7 does get to the sentry wells, we're going to catch it and it's
8 not going to be a problem. We will understand how come it's
9 227 feet away, something like that, and it's five parts per
10 billion or something like that. We will know those things.
11 You have to know those things in order to make a thoughtful
12 decision.

13 I can't tell you right now. Do we know it all? I
14 don't think we do. But I believe we will get pretty close.

15 FRANK FUNK: One other question. Will you use
16 transect systems the same as the Army?

17 TIM NORD: I can't answer that. I'm not the guy on
18 that. I can say that there's lots -- people have lots of
19 ideas on how to do things. The Army has some great ideas that
20 we agree with, and some of them we don't. We have lots of
21 ideas on how to do things. The ideas aren't Eric's ideas that
22 we don't agree with. But those that we come up with don't
23 always make sense either. That's part of the process, that
24 you start grabbing all of this talent and this thinking, come
25 up with the way.

00058

1 I can't really answer the question on the transect.
2 But, you know, probably Greg can or something like that. But
3 it's my time right now.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: One question. Are we safe in
5 understanding that you will determine a solution before you
6 consider a transfer? You'll consider a solution for each and
7 every one of the concerns? Will you transfer it before you've
8 determined solutions?
9 TIM NORD: No, no. If the transfer occurs, it's
10 going to be before all of these solutions, these remedies, how
11 we're going to solve the environmental problems are made. It
12 is important that you understand as long as we have assurance
13 that these processes are going to take place, that is good.
14 It is a good thing. If you don't have that -- because,
15 remember, this says -- this is based on a regulation that we
16 have that is very complicated, very thorough.
17 If you look at a specific regulatory site here, and
18 if you look at that place where it says, Put together a
19 Cleanup Action Plan according to this portion of the
20 regulation, you go there, you are going to see what is
21 required, part of that plan.
22 There is a great deal of depth behind this, and that
23 provides us with the ability to say, If this is followed, this
24 will be okay. In the end, the result has to be protective.
25 Cleanup decisions will not be made if this transfer

00059

1 is going to take place. But the process on how those are
2 going to be made and the conditions of how those are going to
3 be made, and the threshold requirements that need to be met,
4 will be in place.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Two questions. One, I think
6 I'm having a hard time understanding. I understand when the
7 County takes over, they will follow the process. I guess I
8 just don't understand how they can put a dollar amount to
9 something, to a cleanup, that will follow this procedure and
10 go out on the field and actually see the site-specific
11 problems that you didn't see before, how that wouldn't
12 fluctuate that cost so dramatically that you would have to go
13 to cost overrun insurance or other things like that, which
14 actually I think is quite complex.

15 TIM NORD: Yeah. That's not easy stuff to do.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I guess, how does the state
17 find confidence in the site?

18 TIM NORD: I think Eric mentioned it, there will be
19 what you call an EE/CA.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Engineering Evaluation Cost
21 Analysis.

22 TIM NORD: In essence what that is is an analysis of
23 what one thinks there is at this time, plus a range of
24 alternatives. It's more like bookends, from scraping
25 everything to do nothing, the most expensive to the least

00060

1 expensive. You will have the bookends there.
2 Then people are going to look at that and say, Best
3 guess, educated guess - I don't want to use a term like that -
4 how much do we think it's going to cost? What is the risks
5 that are associated with that decision? Let's say it's 10
6 bucks. How certain are we of that? If you're real certain,
7 you feel pretty good. If you're less certain, then you start
8 looking at, Do we want to go to 12 bucks? Do we want to go to
9 11 bucks and buy two bucks worth of insurance in case we do go
10 over that? There will be very difficult and challenging
11 discussions around how much money we think this is going to
12 cost.
13 There will be insurance that will be bought by the
14 County as part of this deal that would say that if we spent 10
15 bucks, we have three more bucks of insurance that we will be
16 able to access to do for these overruns. I'm going to go
17 places that I'm not sure, I might need some help from other
18 people here. Undoubtedly there are reopeners, as well, where
19 even with the insurance, because we found some things that we
20 didn't anticipate, some problems, some more extensive
21 contamination, now those discussions will go again.
22 Ultimately remember that the Army's always
23 responsible.
24 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
25 TIM NORD: They are always here. The beauty, and I

00061

1 want you to understand this, I'm distinguishing between
2 cleanup --
3 Before we get to there, we've talked about length of
4 time. This stuff is really expensive. We have cleanups that
5 take a decade. We have schedules for funding with the Federal
6 Government that are 10 years out. It's important that you
7 know the longer material stays there in the environment, the
8 more expensive it is going to be to clean it up. It keeps on
9 spreading. The longer it's there, the greater risk we have as
10 a society that people are going to come in contact with that
11 and be harmed. That's not a good thing.
12 What the early transfer does is it brings money up
13 front. That is really important for this community because
14 now we can spend a lot of it real quick, which gets to our
15 goal quicker.
16 Yes, Frank.
17 FRANK FUNK: Talking about transfer of money. About
18 two or three years ago a question was asked to Eric, I think
19 you've been here about three years, hasn't it?
20 ERIC WAEHLING: Just about that.
21 FRANK FUNK: They had a system where money is
22 allotted to Camp Bonneville. They could transfer some of that
23 money to another cleanup area, and another cleanup area could
24 transfer into Camp Bonneville.
25 If you have this system you're talking about for the

00062

1 money now, will that cleanup money be transferrable in the
2 same means?

3 TIM NORD: No.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: No.

5 TIM NORD: It is locked in a vault and can only be
6 applied to this.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: That's right.

8 TIM NORD: If you take a step away from Camp
9 Bonneville, when you start looking at all Federal facilities,
10 we are in that dilemma all the time because part of our job is
11 to actually try to get money. It's not just the cleanup, it
12 is trying to make sure and talk to people that we can get
13 money to sites.

14 That is not going to happen here if the early
15 transfer takes place. That's part of the deal.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Second part.

17 TIM NORD: Yes.

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Considering this is a
19 military site, I just didn't know if the state has a default
20 threshold or a matrix for hazardous discoveries outside the
21 CERCLA parameters. Say, for instance, the rocket that was
22 found, it wasn't found in a firing fan or anything. Is there
23 a threshold that the State holds that if they find, say, a
24 certain amount, say 15 of these items outside their expected
25 areas, will you recommend to the County not to go forward with

00063

1 the Reuse Plan? I didn't know if there was anything cut and
2 dry.

3 TIM NORD: I don't understand the linkage to the
4 Reuse Plan.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The park. Is there a cut and
6 dry matrix or number?

7 TIM NORD: No, there isn't.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm concerned about the
9 rocket that was found not in an area that you would expect it.

10 TIM NORD: Let me answer your question this way. It
11 is not just Army land. There is 800 acres that is State land,
12 owned by the Department of Natural Resources. There are two
13 portions that we're dealing with.

14 Your question really is, I think, how do we go about
15 tracking sources of contamination? I'll just call a rocket a
16 source of contamination.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Unknown rocket, surprises.

18 TIM NORD: Surprises, yeah. That's not any
19 different than what we do at any other site when we are trying
20 to follow and document the aerial extent, for example, of
21 pesticide contamination or metals contamination or how we go
22 and try to ascertain the extent of groundwater contamination
23 both vertically and horizontally.

24 There are a series -- that's judgment based on one's
25 technical expertise, based on what one has learned in their

00064

1 profession. There's no magic formula for that. It is each
2 specific instance one has to apply best professional judgment
3 based on the amount of information that they have to say, We
4 have gone far enough, we understand this problem enough that
5 we feel we've captured it. This is what we should do about
6 it.
7 Now, that's not to say that once in a while a
8 groundwater problem isn't what we thought it was. You can't
9 see it. It's tough. Sometimes we find things and we go back
10 and try to understand it better. So you just keep on.
11 There's a dogged pursuit of trying to make sure that you have
12 an understanding of what's there.
13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I feel like when you look at
14 groundwater, that's maybe a good look at it. But when you
15 look at UXO, it's not homogeneous, you don't have any rhyme or
16 reason why some are clustered, some aren't, some are scattered
17 around. When you find so much unknown on a site, because you
18 are finding so many pieces outside of it's expected area, I --
19 CHRIS MAURER: Jim.
20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I guess I was done.
21 CHRIS MAURER: May I address this, please?
22 Your question, Christine, is what will happen if
23 ordnance is found that we didn't know about in an unexpected
24 place, right?
25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Uh-huh.

00065

1 CHRIS MAURER: There is a section in the order that
2 says that -- that specifically says what to do if new areas of
3 contamination, including new areas of unexploded ordnance, are
4 found.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay. I'll check it out.

6 TIM NORD: That's in there. But I'm not sure that
7 that's really your question.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just didn't know if the
9 state has tackled an issue where they have a threshold. Say,
10 you know, Greg blew up that rocket, you tally it, tally it.
11 When you look at the tallies that were surprises or
12 discoveries, I didn't know if you had a matrix that you kind
13 of look at. Is there any guidance?

14 TIM NORD: What you have, if your tallies are too
15 many, you didn't do a very good job in the first place, or you
16 need to do a better job in the second place, to get a better
17 understanding of what's out there. It's not a matter of
18 stopping; it's a matter of doing more.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you think, let's say, the
20 50 million transfer, do you feel confident? I guess the
21 reason why I feel that should be put off is to find if there
22 are any more tally marks that you would have to consider.

23 TIM NORD: Our job is cleanup, like I said. We
24 focus in on the cleanup. At some point in time we're going to
25 be making a decision, through a lot of hard work by a lot of

00066

1 people.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The reuse is so sensitive.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Could I take a stab?

4 TIM NORD: Yes.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I can state with confidence that as
6 part of this plan, not only will we identify what needs to be
7 done, for lack of a better word, say today, to make sure it is
8 safe for both public health and the environment, but there
9 will be backup plans, if you will, that if in the future
10 things are discovered: What do you do next? When do you come
11 back? When do you think you have an indication that perhaps
12 you don't have as good an understanding of what the past use
13 of that property has been, so therefore there may be a threat,
14 what are you going to do about it? That is built into the
15 plan.

16 Part of the formal aspect, we call that a five-year
17 review, but it may happen more frequently depending on the
18 need. If evidence comes to light in the future that your
19 remedy that you have chosen isn't working sufficiently, it's
20 not working as well as you want it to, performing up to
21 standard, then you figure out that you have to come back and
22 do something. So that is built into the plan.
23 Tying it back into your specific question about
24 whether a certain reuse is feasible, cleanup especially when
25 it comes to UXO is directly driven by how that property is

00067

1 being used. What you're really concerned about are people
2 coming in contact. That is constantly revisited. I don't
3 know if this is tying into it, but that's formally part of the
4 process, required by law, that you continually come back and
5 revisit: Is it working? Is it working? If it's not working,
6 do something about it.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is there anything that took
8 place with the finding of the rocket, any adjustments made?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Not as far as reuse. I can tell you
10 what we did. This group doing the reconnaissance, I had them
11 walk that entire area, those of you that visited the site,
12 where the road crosses Lacamas, you head up towards
13 Landfill 4, the area this rocket was discovered, I had them
14 walk through the whole area trying to see if there's any
15 indication, with the geophysics, reconnaissance, not a
16 clearance, but just what that triggered is: Do we have a good
17 understanding of what this area was used for? Why is that
18 rocket there? Is it a singular, random event or do we have a
19 firing point we didn't know about? Let's go see if we can
20 find a target. These folks walked through it.
21 Yeah, there's a response to that.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just haven't heard much
23 about that.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: I haven't talked about it.

25 FRANK FUNK: I think the young lady referred to a

00068

1 money transfer. If you had a money transfer, say \$50 million
2 as a hypothetical, you found that that wasn't going to cover
3 it, is the government willing -- I thought Eric was hitting on
4 it, but I wasn't sure, but will they add more money to it as
5 needed?

6 TIM NORD: It's my expectation that will happen. If
7 you run out of the insurance money, as well. Remember,
8 there's going to be two types of money.
9 Let me back up just a bit. We are making decisions
10 on what we know today, and then you have a sum of money, and
11 then you have insurance that would be accessed should you need
12 that money. If those conditions change, and it is those
13 conditions that -- those conditions would require you to
14 revisit the amount of money that is available for this, it's
15 my understanding that the County and the Army get together
16 again.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: If we -- as you pit it, if the
18 insurance company goes bankrupt, the Federal Government, the
19 Army, is ultimately still there.

20 TIM NORD: There is always a safety net here.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, there is one point of
22 clarification. We keep using the term "when we transfer the
23 money." Just as a point of interest, the money actually
24 doesn't get given to Clark County in a lump sum. It's
25 essentially placed in what is the government equivalent of an

00069

1 escrow. As the money is expended, it's doled out. The money,
2 as it's being spent, it's doled out. It's not a lump sum
3 payment.
4 The grant, it's technically a grant, the grant of
5 money that's sitting in the escrow is locked up. It can't be
6 given to another site, like Frank talked about. What Frank is
7 talking about is that we're forever competing with other BRAC
8 sites for monies. This is an opportunity to lock up all the
9 monies that we should need, plus insurance, plus all this
10 other stuff, to make sure that we don't lose it to another
11 site.
12 BUD VAN CLEVE: You're not going to write us a check
13 then?
14 ERIC WAEHLING: It goes into an escrow. Actually,
15 I've heard concerns from other people about how the money
16 would be disbursed. I wanted to clarify that.
17 TIM NORD: Ian.
18 IAN RAY: Hurrah for safety nets and escrows.
19 On this chart, range UXO detection techniques, the
20 variables are clearance depth, the estimated number of UXO per
21 acre, and the size of the plaster ranging from 10 to 1,000
22 acres. Way over on the right-hand column, the total cost per
23 acre ranges from \$1,000 an acre to \$22,000 an acre. It seems
24 like the whole thing is based upon the number of estimated UXO
25 per acre.

00070

1 I don't know, but have I heard yet, when do we get
2 the data for the number of UXO per acre?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, the multiplier of site
4 conditions has a far greater influence on the ultimate cost
5 than necessarily the density of UXO per acre.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Will we get that number? That's an
7 important number to know.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: The expected density?

9 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: It will possibly be part of the
11 RI/FS. Whether it's from a cost-driver point of view, and
12 we're getting off subject here, but from a cost-driver point
13 of view, it's the Army's belief that site conditions actually
14 play a more significant role in the costing than necessarily
15 the density or the depth of the UXO.

16 IAN RAY: That's true. It shows in the modifier,
17 the multiplier can be as much as two for like a vegetation
18 modifier. You have to have at the front the number of
19 estimated UXO per acre. My question was, when do we get that
20 data? When do we find that out?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: That actually is a component of the
22 RI/FS process. The costing is but one of the many pieces that
23 are knitted together when you determine your range, your
24 bookends, as Tim put it so well, what your range of options
25 are, and the costs associated with that. That is one of the

00071

1 data elements.

2 GREG JOHNSON: Actually, I think that number is
3 available right now if you look in the EE/CA that was prepared
4 by the Corps, you go to the back three or four chapters in
5 both those volumes, it has the information.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: In the '99 document.

7 GREG JOHNSON: I don't know if you've ever seen it
8 before.

9 IAN RAY: Are you referring to the 203 100-by-100
10 grids?

11 GREG JOHNSON: No. This was the EE/CA. It's a
12 two-volume EE/CA. The UXB grids were part of that estimate.
13 If you'll look in the back chapters of those two volumes,
14 they're about this thick (indicating), it actually says EE/CA
15 on them. If you look in those, go in the back, it gives
16 numbers.

17 IAN RAY: One more little point about that.
18 As I recall, the data was considered invalid, so the
19 EE/CA wasn't any good. Is that so?

20 GREG JOHNSON: I don't remember that. That must
21 have been before my time.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I think some people felt that the
23 conclusions drawn from that data might not have been valid.
24 The data within the constraints of it is still useful.

25 GREG JOHNSON: Excuse me. Were you referring to the

00072

1 203, the cleanup of the 203 range?

2 IAN RAY: No. There were 203 separate 100-by-100
3 sites where they found some UXO, they extrapolated that to the
4 whole site.

5 GREG JOHNSON: Yes, that's pretty much probably what
6 they based the EE/CA on.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. The conclusions were drawn
8 into question, but the data, what you found in each grid,
9 within limitations, as you always have with data, is still
10 useful.

11 DON WASTLER: Actually, I had something I wanted to
12 say. Listening to all this, I was kind of waiting for the
13 conclusion. But this is an awful lot of money. I'm a
14 neighbor. Yes, I am concerned about the cleanup. I want it
15 cleaned up. The Army has definitely taken responsibility. I
16 had no idea that there was such a mess up there. This is
17 going to be an awful lot of money and an awful big project for
18 this entire cleanup to be complete to where the standards are
19 for public access.

20 My concerns are the pollution that is going to
21 result after the public has access. I know it has nothing to
22 do with you now because you're in the process of cleaning this
23 up and restoring it now. If you read my letter, my response
24 to the Environmental Assessment, I witnessed a situation in
25 the stream I live along where some irresponsible contractors

00073

1 overfertilized the soil. It killed 90% of the aquatic life in
2 the stream, which is yet to return.
3 The idea of this place, a beautiful place like this,
4 with access to the public, really concerns me because when I
5 see the south shore of Lacamas Lake, remember what it used to
6 look like, I remember what Prune Hill used to look like, I
7 remember what Summer Hills used to look like, I'm concerned, I
8 really am.
9 How much of Clark County is going to be left? I
10 think about streams like Burnt Bridge Creek, Salmon Creek,
11 some of these other creeks where they were once clean and
12 there was no UXO or there wasn't any military pollution there
13 at all, but because the public had access to it...
14 My mom has this saying, "There's nothing like
15 closing the door after the horse got out."
16 I keep hearing this, "We're sorry that that
17 happened, it won't happen again." I go to the community
18 development center. I see this huge sign that talks about
19 erosion. Evidently they're not doing anything about it. I'm
20 just scared to death that it's going to happen.
21 I wonder if we're even thinking about the animals
22 and the environment that's there, that's just not on Camp
23 Bonneville, but those that are depending on the environment
24 downstream. That one little incident, 90% of the aquatic life
25 in that stream affected all the wildlife, the raccoons,

00074

1 cranes. To have to witness them going through the stress that
2 they've had to just from one irresponsible contractor that the
3 County couldn't catch. By the time the water from that stream
4 reaches the testing station, it's already diluted by three
5 different streams, so they weren't able to actually catch it.
6 I know it has nothing to do with the reuse now, but
7 Commissioner Stanton, people are here now, I want to stress
8 this, I'm really concerned about the Reuse Plan and how well
9 they're going to stick to it and what's going to happen.
10 KAREN KINGSTON: Don, I don't mean to interrupt you.
11 But I think Judie Stanton and Pete were thinking of being able
12 to come back to another one of our meetings. We'll be able to
13 get into these topics. We've got half an hour left and we
14 have to leave.
15 DON WASTLER: No problem. Thank you very much.
16 KAREN KINGSTON: Your points are important.
17 DON WASTLER: As I sit and hear all the money this
18 is going to cost to restore this place, I'm going to say, what
19 happens after the public has access?
20 KAREN KINGSTON: Is that the question? Give
21 Mr. Nord a question, just one question, and then these are
22 good topics to bring back up.
23 DON WASTLER: I have every bit of confidence the
24 place is going to be cleaned up, if not sooner later.
25 KAREN KINGSTON: Did you want to give him a

00075

1 question?

2 DON WASTLER: No. I wanted to make that comment. I
3 hear about all the money that's going to be spent, the
4 trouble, and I wonder if anybody is thinking about what's
5 going to happen afterwards.

6 GREG JOHNSON: Can I bring something up quick?

7 Earlier it had been brought up that approximately 15
8 live rounds in the last seven years have been found. Those
9 numbers, I don't know exactly where they came from, but they
10 don't exactly jibe with the numbers I have.

11 For the record, I want it to be known the Department
12 of Ecology, I'm sure the County, any of the other regulators,
13 that is not an acceptable amount of UXO. To say "only 15
14 items have been found" is not okay.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: We'll assume the member that said
16 it was stating his own opinion.

17 GREG JOHNSON: That's fine. That's not our opinion.
18 That's not an acceptable amount for us.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank.

20 FRANK FUNK: Give us a figure. You say it doesn't
21 jibe with you. Give us a big figure, how many you found?

22 GREG JOHNSON: I haven't found personally any.

23 FRANK FUNK: So how can you quarrel with what the
24 Army has told us?

25 GREG JOHNSON: I'm going by the records.

00076

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank, the point that Greg was
2 making wasn't so much whether 15 was a correct number, but
3 that any found isn't --
4 GREG JOHNSON: Any, period. To make a statement to
5 say "only 15 are found in seven years," that's two a year and
6 no one is even there, no training going on.
7 ERIC WAEHLING: Greg, don't let me put words in your
8 mouth. I think what you're trying to express is that that is
9 a significant number.
10 GREG JOHNSON: Very significant number.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: Ecology is very concerned about
12 that.
13 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah. I'm sure as is the County and
14 everybody else involved.
15 ERIC WAEHLING: As is the Army.
16 GREG JOHNSON: As is the Army.
17 TIM NORD: Any other questions on my little part of
18 this meeting?
19 KAREN KINGSTON: Yeah, you can always count on me.
20 TIM NORD: Is this the last one? I'm helping you
21 with the clock here.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: I want you to have plenty of time
23 to cover everything.
24 TIM NORD: Brain cramp?
25 KAREN KINGSTON: Forgot.

00077

1 TIM NORD: I'll be around.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: Are you setting anything up in the
3 EA in particular that covers a citizen advisory group or
4 continuation so that citizens do not have to work through the
5 CERCLA process in order to have input after it transfers?
6 Have you worked through anything like that?

7 TIM NORD: No. That will be part of the public
8 participation plan that we put together, that will be based on
9 state requirements. We will try to match up, to the degree we
10 can, with the CERCLA requirements. There is common ground
11 there.

12 I think in general the states are a little bit more
13 expansive in the public involvement, how we go about doing
14 things. But it's a site-specific set of decisions that are
15 made. I mean, there are some EPA activities that are really
16 extensive, trying to reach out. There are some in the state
17 that are relatively small because the interest isn't there.
18 It's really a site-specific thing.

19 You will be involved in the development of the
20 public participation plan, so you can have your say in that,
21 kind of chart the course on how we all want to interact.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: The EPA set up something, it's a
23 multi-use type of RAB, it's not a RAB anymore, down at Mare
24 Island. Would you be setting up something like that? They
25 did an excellent job on that.

00078

1 TIM NORD: I don't know. I don't know the
2 specifics. I can't answer your question now. I know you'd
3 like me to agree to it, but I'm not quite sure what I'd be
4 agreeing to.
5 Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.
6 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you, Tim.
7 Karen, we're halfway through our agenda. It's 9:10.
8 What are your thoughts?
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Some of these things we can
10 probably push over to the next one.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: I think we should ask the RAB, as
12 well, what their thoughts are.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: Looking at the agenda, I probably
14 could go through the discussion of the TAPP and discussion of
15 the RAB guidance real fast if I just read my little thing
16 here, give you an overview quickly.
17 Is there any one of these questions you want us to
18 bring up? Do you have questions?
19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: What?
21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: This handout, the Landfill 4
22 groundwater sampling, you said they're going to do four times
23 a year?
24 ERIC WAEHLING: We will continue to monitor four
25 times a year.

00079

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The last one is 4/02.
2 Anything more recent? I would expect four other samplings.
3 ERIC WAEHLING: The last sampling -- we haven't got
4 the data results from the most recent one that occurred in I
5 believe January.
6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: There is 4/23/02. That is
7 April of '02. There should be three in between there.
8 KAREN KINGSTON: 7/24/01, then 4/24/02.
9 ERIC WAEHLING: The answer is, it has been done
10 quarterly. Let me take a look at this. Either there's been a
11 photocopy error or I didn't give it all to you. Let me look
12 into that. I can promise you and assure you it has been done
13 every quarter. The most recent sampling was in the
14 December/January time frame. We haven't got the data back
15 from that yet.
16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: In between now and April 23rd
17 of 2002 we will get a whole other book of these?
18 ERIC WAEHLING: The most recent sampling occurred on
19 January 8, 2003.
20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.
21 ERIC WAEHLING: We haven't gotten those results.
22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So July and October?
23 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. In that draft report that
24 you'll be getting, all the quarterly data will be in there.
25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.

00080

1 ERIC WAEHLING: To include the most recent.
2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: One more question. I think
3 Greg can maybe help with this. The sites that are not an area
4 of concern or area of potential concern, is there any
5 reconnaissance effort that is going to go on those or are they
6 closed and done?
7 GREG JOHNSON: Are you talking inside the area where
8 they're doing reconnaissance right now, the future reuse area?
9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: You mean west of the creek?
10 GREG JOHNSON: West of the creek.
11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are there any areas that are
12 not of concern, no further action?
13 GREG JOHNSON: There's a bunch of areas of concern
14 and areas of potential concern within what they're doing right
15 now, the reuse area.
16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is there any no further
17 actions? Is that the equivalent?
18 GREG JOHNSON: We have no no further actions yet.
19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: On the whole site?
20 GREG JOHNSON: Every site is going to be looked at.
21 We haven't come --
22 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, I can say with a high
23 degree of confidence that there will be no area within
24 Bonneville that has no further action.
25 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, there will be some action.

00081

1 ERIC WAEHLING: There will be something.
2 GREG JOHNSON: We haven't come up with a no further
3 action.
4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are there any sites that
5 started as a no further action?
6 GREG JOHNSON: You know, the Level 1 screening.
7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's what I'm recalling.
8 GREG JOHNSON: We worked on that last year. But
9 that is a guidance document. That's not exactly what's going
10 to be done. If an area falls out as no further action, what,
11 was it east of Lacamas Creek?
12 ERIC WAEHLING: High-use area, even if it's not,
13 there's still going to be dig restrictions.
14 GREG JOHNSON: Fences, signs.
15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So the no further actions are
16 pending the land use controls? If there are no further
17 actions at the site, there will be land use controls?
18 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.
20 GREG JOHNSON: There will be land use controls. No
21 further action, the term would be no one's going to go in
22 there and dig it up. They aren't going to do any further work
23 there, but it's going to be fenced off or signed off or
24 whatever. There will be some type of institutional control.
25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I'm sorry to have to repeat.

00082

1 There's not a site, an area, on Camp Bonneville, on the site
2 of Camp Bonneville, that has a no further action stamp?
3 GREG JOHNSON: As of right now?
4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.
5 GREG JOHNSON: No.
6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I thought there were three or
7 four I read about in the matrix.
8 GREG JOHNSON: The Level 1 screening, the way it was
9 written, there are -- it could come out as no further action.
10 That Level 1 screening, we haven't done it yet.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: I think maybe what the little bit of
12 confusion is, within the context of a legal regulatory point
13 of view, when you say no further action, that means it's good
14 to go, no worries whatsoever.
15 GREG JOHNSON: That's different.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: You could put a child day-care
17 there.
18 When we said that in that screening matrix, no
19 further action, again it's just a guidance. We may not
20 necessarily need to go back and do intrusive geophysical
21 investigations, but that area is still going to be identified
22 as a potential concern, you're still going to try to limit
23 public access to that area. If it's in a really high-use
24 area, the middle of a tent camping area, we're still going to
25 do investigation there.

00083

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: There's going to be a surface
2 on all of the whole Camp Bonneville site?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Everything within the fence line
4 that is now Bonneville will have some sort of management tool
5 applied to it.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Will every area in Camp
7 Bonneville have a surface reconnaissance or look?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: That decision hasn't been made yet.

9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Oh, okay.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: That's within the bookends that Tim
11 Nord mentioned, from one to the other. That will fall
12 somewhere in there.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Any other issues on this?

14 Otherwise, I'll take a couple minutes here and run through the
15 Restoration Advisory Board Technical Assistance Program. I
16 need to go over that with you real quick.

17 Anything we didn't cover tonight we'll just carry on
18 for next week, next month, is that right?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: That's up to the RAB.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Sounds like it, okay.

21 One thing I want you to look at is the US Army
22 Restoration Advisory Board Technical Assistance for Public
23 Participation guidance. This was established in 1998. It
24 clearly defines our roles and responsibilities. I'm really
25 hoping that all of you will take the chance to go through

00084

1 this, if you haven't read it before. It sounded to me like a
2 lot of people hadn't.
3 If you want to just make a note, I would want you to
4 pay attention to page four, number 1.0, the introduction. I
5 would also want you to pay attention to 3.1, on page four
6 again. That includes the role and responsibility of the
7 installation commander. I'll just put this in here and you
8 can read it. You can take notes when you get the minutes.
9 3.2, which is page five, RAB members provide
10 individual advice, address important issues, review documents,
11 provides advice on priorities among sites or projects, attends
12 regular meetings, documents decisions, makes information
13 available to the general public, and interacts with the LRA,
14 the local redevelopment authority, and other planning bodies -
15 which would be the County - to discuss future land use issues
16 relevant to environmental decision making.
17 Some of these are areas that I'm hoping here in the
18 near future we're going to jump in on and start actually
19 fulfilling our role here.
20 The next one would be 5.1, page eight, an Army
21 representative and a member of the local community, how we
22 share our leadership responsibilities.
23 Then 6.0, page 11, I'd like you to read the
24 operating procedures.
25 9.0, page 14, technical support.

00085

1 9.2, page 14, is something that a lot of us probably
2 don't know about. It's preventive medicine activity and
3 promotion that's done by the Army. That's an interesting
4 thing that we can receive health advice as far as the
5 contamination out there.
6 Then 10.0, page 19, funding. It gives you an idea
7 on what the Army is required to meet as far as getting
8 materials and documentation. Eric and I are working together
9 now to make sure everybody's getting all the documents that
10 they want to review and discuss. This also is a place that
11 says if we ever need to come up with some kind of a hearing
12 type aid thing, microphone, a translator, we can access
13 something like that.
14 Anyway, these are all things that have been in this.
15 I'm just encouraging everybody to read that. At the next
16 meeting, if you have questions, we can go over that.
17 Anything? We'll just move on.
18 TAPP is a Technical Assistance for Public
19 Participation, is what it stands for. This is a program that
20 provides community members of RABs to access independent
21 technical support and training through the use of government
22 purchase orders.
23 The principal criteria for obtaining TAPP is that
24 the technical assistance is likely to contribute to the
25 efficiency, effectiveness or environmental restoration or help

00086

1 the community with acceptance of environmental restoration
2 activities at the camp.
3 I will be creating a TAPP committee to make these
4 applications. Eric said he'll help with this. The eligible
5 TAPP projects flow roughly in these categories:
6 To help us review, interpret access technologies;
7 explain function and implications; participate in relative
8 risk site evaluations for Camp Bonneville; interpret health
9 implications potentials; exposure scenarios to humans and
10 animals; training and education on restoration projects.
11 Sometimes a lot of this can be provided by Federal
12 and State agencies. They're really outfitted to be able to
13 come in and do this for us. If as a community we're concerned
14 about something, we are allowed through the TAPP Program to
15 obtain a second opinion.
16 I need a raise of hands for anybody interested in
17 working on this committee.
18 ERIC WAEHLING: What I want to say is if some of
19 those that have been with us for a long time, about two years
20 ago I had a woman named Susan Wilson come out from the Army
21 Environmental Center to talk about the TAPP program. She's no
22 longer with AEC, but I'd be happy to find somebody else that
23 might want to come talk about it. I'm just making it
24 available.
25 KAREN KINGSTON: I think we'll have them talk to the

00087

1 committee.
2 ERIC WAEHLING: Either way.
3 KAREN KINGSTON: I think Colleen said she would be
4 involved in it. She's been involved in something like this
5 before. I'm willing to be involved in it. I've got access to
6 people that do professional grant writing. Anybody else?
7 It's part of your participation here.
8 DON WASTLER: If you need some help, I'll gladly
9 help if you need a hand. No problem.
10 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.
11 So, anyway, Tim Nord, is there another access for
12 funding options available to us that you have thought of?
13 TIM NORD: We have a public participation grant
14 program that runs on an annual basis that we distribute money
15 to eligible parties. It's on a competitive basis. We can
16 provide -- I can send a package of that down.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay. We look like we've done it.
18 ERIC WAEHLING: Shall we talk about the next
19 meeting?
20 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes. Go ahead.
21 ERIC WAEHLING: At the previous meeting, the last
22 RAB meeting, some folks asked for the engineer and the
23 hydrogeologist that helped design the location of the wells to
24 come and brief the RAB. That person is available March 12th,
25 but there might be a date conflict.

00088

1 Also the contractor that's doing this UXO
2 investigation, the one who will eventually be writing the
3 RI/FS report that knits all this story together, the fellow's
4 name is Gerry Moore, he is also available on March 12th for
5 the next RAB meeting if you decide that you want him to come
6 out to brief you, begin to talk to you about how all this fits
7 together. Just as importantly, he's going to be looking for
8 initial feedback from you all so he can write a better
9 document. This is just the very beginning of this process.
10 Also the County, if there's interest in early
11 transfer, we potentially could have some folks come and talk
12 about that. That's three possibilities for discussions at the
13 next RAB meeting.
14 We may potentially have a problem with meeting
15 locations and dates. As I mentioned, the fire house, the Boy
16 Scouts have locked it up at the same time that we
17 traditionally meet. They have it locked up for I think the
18 next six months. This space, I think it works quite well,
19 it's generally available to us when we need it except in
20 March. It's not available March 12th. It is actually
21 available on the 19th.
22 In discussions before the meeting with Bud and
23 Karen, apparently there's another location that might be
24 available to us on March 12th, which is our normal meeting
25 time, but it is not quite as convenient a location. I'm

00089

1 asking you to provide us feedback. The three options I've
2 laid out, I've checked with those folks to see if they're
3 available on March 12th. I have no idea if they're available
4 on the 19th.

5 Do you want to stay in this location and try to
6 shift things a couple days to March 19th? Do we want to meet
7 in another location that might not be as convenient?

8 KAREN KINGSTON: There's two places. One is the
9 other PUD building down by the freeway, by the large library.
10 The other one is out on St. John's, 78th and St. John's.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: Public Works conference center.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: He didn't know for sure if the
13 person would not be able to speak to us on the 19th. I guess
14 we could, since we're going to have a large presentation from
15 the County, we may have more community, we could bump the
16 hydrologist to the next month.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Up to you folks.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: How is everybody with the 19th,
19 having it here?

20 FRANK FUNK: That's a Wednesday?

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Third Wednesday.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: Here the 19th is good.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Anybody disagree with that? Shall
24 we go with that?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Do we want to see if Parsons can

00090

1 also brief that same night? That's going to be a lot to bite
2 off.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: Judie, are you going to be able to
4 be here and give us at least maybe a talk of some sort on the
5 transfer process of where you are and what the County is
6 hoping for, what you're actually hoping for?

7 JUDIE STANTON: If you're interested in hearing
8 more, Tim did a good job tonight of covering a lot of it, but
9 if you still have questions, yeah, I'd be happy to be here.
10 We can have our consultant here. It's whatever you wish.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: It's what the RAB wants.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What kind of time frame do
13 you feel would be appropriate? Should Eric stack up the two
14 contacts and yourselves?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: That would be way too much for one
16 meeting. I wouldn't recommend that.

17 Is there interest in having a briefing of that
18 nature or do we want to have the hydrogeologist and Parsons
19 here?

20 KAREN KINGSTON: There's another option here, too,
21 and that's that we allow you enough time so that we would --
22 another member has given me his input there. We would be able
23 to discuss pros and cons. You'd be able to hear the cons and
24 give your input of why you feel secure with the transfer, and
25 maybe that would change minds, something like that.

00091

1 VALERIE LANE: I think you better donate a whole
2 meeting to her. With the RAB here with their questions, we're
3 going to take all night. I think you're putting too much on
4 your agenda for the next month. I really do.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I think before we start throwing
6 back the pros and cons, as Tim alluded to, did a great job
7 explaining it, there's a process to it. It's a little bit
8 complicated, but not so complicated that you can't brief it
9 and understand it pretty quickly once it's laid out in front
10 of you and you understand the pieces.

11 I think it's within that context that then we can
12 really begin to have serious discussions as to the pros and
13 the cons.

14 TIM NORD: May I make a suggestion?

15 From my understanding, where we're at in trying to
16 grapple with this early transfer, March might be a little bit
17 too early. Maybe April or May I think people will have a
18 better sense of things and there might be a little bit more
19 certainty on various things.

20 I think it would be better for you to wait just a
21 bit. I know we're chomping. I think you can bite more if you
22 wait a month or two.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: If we wait a month or two and maybe
24 there is some community people that are interested in having
25 some input prior to when things are said and done, you know,

00092

1 can someone say that in three months -- say if we set you up
2 for the May meeting, would things be so said and done that you
3 would just be here to report that you're in escrow? What is
4 your timeline?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I can tell you, I don't want to
6 speak for Judie.

7 JUDIE STANTON: I think the Army is hoping we'll
8 have a fairly firm understanding that we're going to achieve
9 this this fiscal year by July. I think any time before July
10 is still a good comment time. But it's up to you.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I would like to see the
12 process actually. Maybe half an hour, 45-minute chunk, we can
13 do some minor question and answer. Maybe someone can come on
14 a regular basis and keep us very posted. I like to -- maybe a
15 monthly update, since it's going to happen very soon, we're
16 not going to have this forum to discuss it. Hopefully we
17 will.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: For my own personal clarification,
19 when you say "understand the process," specifically the
20 process of the documents that will be generated, what is the
21 role of those documents? There is a public input component to
22 this. That wasn't mentioned actually. There is a 30-day
23 public comment period on the whole process, is my
24 understanding. There's multiple documents that are part of
25 this process. Is that what you're looking for?

00093

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: As a taxpayer, I would --
2 because it's a significant project I feel in this County, I
3 would like to hear next month kind of where you are.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Don.

5 DON WASTLER: Are we at a point where we might
6 possibly need to double up on a couple of meetings for one
7 month, have two meetings? It sounds like we have a lot of
8 information to cover in a short period of time. That sounds
9 like a load. I'm not excited about it, but it might be
10 necessary.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: If the RAB wants to do that, we can
12 try to accommodate that.

13 DON WASTLER: Karen brought it up at one of the
14 meetings. That doesn't mean we have to have two meetings
15 every month. We might be at a point with information where we
16 might need to double up.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: I was citing about 90% of the RABs
18 that have gone through early transfer went to double meetings
19 a month there for a while to keep the community updated. I
20 would suggest -- I was suggesting that was an option for us
21 because it set precedence everywhere else. If people don't
22 want to do it, they don't want to do it here, doesn't mean
23 Washington State is like anyplace else.

24 FRANK FUNK: I don't know about anybody else. I'm
25 kind of a busy fellow. I don't really want to go to two

00094

1 meetings of RAB a month.
2 DON WASTLER: Attendance isn't actually required.
3 KAREN KINGSTON: I would say if it was two meetings,
4 it wouldn't fall under the statutes of attending two.
5 FRANK FUNK: To come here for two meetings, I try to
6 set aside the area for this one, make sure it's available.
7 DON WASTLER: The minutes would still be available,
8 wouldn't they?
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.
10 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't think we need to make the
11 decision right now. It is 9:30, let's pull it back to what we
12 want to talk about next time we get together.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.
14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How about the County and
15 Parsons or is it Fleming?
16 ERIC WAEHLING: Which one? Groundwater or UXO?
17 Keep it subject area.
18 KAREN KINGSTON: Which one is --
19 ERIC WAEHLING: Groundwater would be Project
20 Performance, Dawson. UXO, Parsons Engineering. His name is
21 Gerry Moore.
22 KAREN KINGSTON: Greg, do you have any input?
23 You're usually our double man when it comes to UXO.
24 GREG JOHNSON: Personally, we have a meeting set up
25 on the 27th. From what I've seen of the agenda for this

00095

1 meeting we're going to have, it's very, very aggressive. I
2 think it's going to require a lot of thought on Ecology's
3 part. I don't personally think we'd be ready to brief that in
4 March. Groundwater I think would be better. As far as
5 Ecology goes, we need to digest for a couple months after this
6 March meeting.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: A somewhat focused presentation
8 from the County, an introduction to, won't get into specifics,
9 keep everybody's rhetoric down to questions, then a Parsons
10 groundwater.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Groundwater talk.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: A groundwater talk. Is that good
13 with everybody?

14 I want to remind you that if you have questions, you
15 need to call me, you need to e-mail me or get ahold of me
16 somehow so that I can make sure I give them to Ecology or
17 whoever, so they're prepared. I think we're better off the
18 way we did it this evening.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: How do people feel about the new
20 format? Better? Not better?

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I like it.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: I like it.

23 FRANK FUNK: Are we set for March 19th?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: It will be March 19th.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Same place?

00096

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Here.
2 FRANK FUNK: Right here, right. Move we adjourn.
3 ERIC WAEHLING: There was a motion. Second?
4 FRANK FUNK: Move we adjourn. Somebody has to
5 second or it dies.
6 VALERIE LANE: I'll second.
7 KAREN KINGSTON: Just a minute. Does anybody need
8 my phone number? Otherwise the raising of hands, now that
9 you've -- this time nobody knew for sure what was being
10 presented, how we were doing this. Next time, I need the
11 questions a little bit ahead of time.
12 FRANK FUNK: What questions? What are you talking
13 about?
14 KAREN KINGSTON: Any questions you would have
15 regarding groundwater.
16 FRANK FUNK: Any question for what?
17 KAREN KINGSTON: Groundwater.
18 FRANK FUNK: Okay.
19 KAREN KINGSTON: Any particular things that maybe
20 you want to ask the hydrologist, any particular questions you
21 want to ask Judie so that she has a focus and she's prepared
22 with kind of an idea of where we're going with her. That way
23 we won't have quite so many hands raised, going off. We'll
24 probably be able to fall on track closer to the agenda time.
25 VALERIE LANE: You have to realize, there are things

00097

1 that people aren't going to realize to sit down and think
2 about beforehand. When it's talked about as a topic, it comes
3 through your head. You're still going to get a lot of hand
4 raising questions.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: I agree with that. I just thought
6 if anybody can get a little bit of that.

7 VALERIE LANE: They can try.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: I'd be happy to get my phone
9 number, but not on the minutes. If you want to give me a
10 jingle and let me know, I can give it to Jennifer. Anybody
11 else that has my e-mail, you're welcome to do that.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you. Frank, you had a motion.

13 FRANK FUNK: Yes.

14 VALERIE LANE: I seconded it.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Good night, everybody. A marathon
16 one.

17 (Meeting adjourned.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

