

00001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING

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

11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Date: June 11, 2003

Time: 7:00

Place: 6701 N.E. 147th Avenue

Vancouver, Washington

18 RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P.O. Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98666

(360) 693-4111

00002

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Good evening, everybody.
Thank you

2 for coming here on such a beautiful
summer's evening. I know

3 it's an indication of your dedication.
It's much

4 appreciated. Thank you very much.

5 I'd like to start the meeting. My name
is Eric

6 Waehling. I'm the Base Environmental
Coordinator working for

7 the Army at Camp Bonneville. I'd like
to start with our

8 traditional roll call introduction.
Again, this is

9 completely voluntary; don't feel that
you have to identify

10 yourself. It's an opportunity to do so,
have your name

11 entered into the minutes if you so
choose.

12 Again, my name is Eric Waehling. I work
for the

13 Army.

14 JENNIFER WALTERS: Jennifer Walters,
Camp Bonneville

15 administrative coordinator.

16 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok with
Vancouver/Clark Parks

17 and Recreation Department, Clark County
representative.

18 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, RAB.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen Kingston,
community co-chair

20 and neighbor.

21 COLEEN BROAD: Coleen Broad, RAB.

22 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, Restoration
Advisory

23 Board, neighbor.

24 CHUCK MASON: Chuck Mason, Veterans of
Foreign Wars,

25 neighbor.

00003

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Christine
Sutherland, RAB.

2 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast
Hazel Dell

3 Neighborhood Association and RAB.

4 TOM EATON: Tom Eaton, EPA, Region 10.

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Barry Rogowski,
Department of

6 Ecology.

7 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB.

8 FRANK FUNK: Frank Funk, RAB.

9 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Sean Sheldrake, EPA,
Region 10.

10 ERIN MIDDLEWOOD: Erin Middlewood, The
Columbian.

11 RUSTY WARREN: Rusty Warren, Clark
County sheriff's

12 office.

13 JAMIE DAMON: Jamie Damon with Dawson &
Associates.

14 LOREN CARLSON: Loren Carlson, neighbor.

15 GREG JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department
of Ecology.

16 DON STRICK: Don Strick, Clark County.

17 ED MARSHMAN: Ed Marshman, FBI.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much.
We'll get

19 started. I have one very quick announcement that
I'd like to

20 say just before we get started. Because I want you
all to

21 know, keep everything as out in the open as we can,
there has

22 been a potential development with Bonneville as far
as

23 property transfer and things like that goes.

24 The Army has received a letter of inquiry from the

25 FBI saying they potentially might have a need for
Camp

00004

1 Bonneville for training. The FBI headquarters is
in the
2 process of evaluating the need and the financial
implications
3 of that. The impacts of that are being evaluated
from a
4 transfer legal point of view. The implications of
that as far
5 as a Federal need versus LRA transfer, transfer for
6 recreational redevelopment, are being
figured out.

7 I have been told, and I continue to
work under the
8 assumption and direction that we're proceeding
with the
9 transfer to Clark County, but that's out there.
So all of my
10 actions, all of my work that I do is in that
direction.

11 I wanted everybody to know that potential is
12 floating out there. The implications of that are
unclear at
13 the moment, but I wanted you to know about that.
14 The letter was sent to me. I forwarded it along
to
15 my higher headquarters, Colonel Baker, DA BRAC
office back in
16 the Pentagon. My headquarters is talking to FBI
headquarters
17 back in Washington, DC.
18 To that extent, that's my knowledge right now of
19 that. But I wanted everybody to know that that's
happened.

20 I'm not really sure how that's going to play out.
We're a
21 long way down the road, but a Federal need may or
may not take
22 precedence over a transfer outside the Federal
Government.

23 BUD VAN CLEVE: Has Clark County officially been
24 notified of this?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: They have been verbally notified
in

00005

1 discussions with Colonel Baker. That's all I
know about. I

2 can't comment any further than that.

3 Frank.

4 FRANK FUNK: I have an inquiry about our agenda.
Of

5 all the years I've been on the board, we have
always had the

6 opportunity to ask questions of the people
speaking that are

7 listed on the agenda, until last month. My inquiry
is, are we

8 restricted in any way from asking questions of
people who are

9 listed on the agenda, in the items we have listed?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: I would say no. Actually, that's

11 the whole intent of our RAB meetings. With that
said, I'd

12 like to ask that we all extend courtesy to one
another.

13 FRANK FUNK: I agree with that.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Allow each other to express
thoughts

15 and also to, as much as we can, stay on focus with
the topics

16 that are on the agenda, or at least within the
scope of the

17 RAB focus.

18 FRANK FUNK: Are there going to be any guidelines

19 that say we have to wait till a person gets done?

It's just a

20 question, just a question.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Eric, you and I discussed that.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I want to respond, then

Karen can

23 respond.

24 I ask that we all extend common
courtesy.

25 FRANK FUNK: I agree with that.

00006

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Karen.
2 KAREN KINGSTON: You and I discussed
this at great
3 length and decided one of the problems
with getting
4 presentations done, unless it's a teaching
presentation, if
5 it's a speaking presentation, we were getting off
track. The
6 presenter wasn't able to get their points across,
do their
7 full presentation within any kind of a time limit.
8 You and I discussed that and said that on a
speaking
9 presentation, we would ask people to hold their
questions
10 until after the presenter was finished.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: I think that's consistent with
what
12 Frank is asking.
13 KAREN KINGSTON: As long as Frank understands
that.
14 FRANK FUNK: You have to speak louder.
15 KAREN KINGSTON: Maybe you can convey that to him.
16 ERIC WAEHLING: Out of courtesy, it would be best
if
17 on a presentation or something we could wait till a
presenter
18 is through to start the question and answer, if
that's how the
19 presentation is set up.
20 FRANK FUNK: Are there presentations designated
here
21 today?
22 ERIC WAEHLING: Tonight, no, I don't think we have
a
23 presentation.
24 KAREN KINGSTON: We do.
25 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, that's not true. Ian is

00007

1 going to talk about BCT updates. We've started
communications

2 there to try to get better communication between
the RAB and

3 the BCT.

4 FRANK FUNK: Could those be designated as such on
5 the future agendas so we know what are
presentations so we

6 won't interrupt the person or persons?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay, if need be. Although, I
think

8 within the confines of courtesy, we
should be fine.

9 FRANK FUNK: Okay.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Jeroen.

11 JEROEN KOK: I have a question on the
FBI inquiry.

12 A couple years ago the Washington
National Guard

13 expressed an interest in having Camp
Bonneville property

14 transferred to them instead of the County. I
think we

15 concluded in the course of discussing that
that some

16 Congressional action would be needed in order to
successfully

17 transfer the property to somebody other than the
County.

18 Based on your knowledge, would a similar

19 Congressional action have to happen in order for
the property

20 to be transferred to the FBI?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: On my limited knowledge of what
I've

22 been told, the answer is no. The issue with the
National

23 Guard was they were -- they fall under the
Department of

24 Defense. The intention of BRAC law is to transfer
properties

25 outside of the Department of Defense. That was
my

00008

1 understanding of the issue.
2 I'm not a real estate expert when it comes to
these
3 things. They're very complicated. I can only
relate what's
4 been told to me.
5 JEROEN KOK: Thanks.
6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Have you heard any more, Eric,
as
7 to how much of the property the FBI wants to get,
what they
8 want to use it for?
9 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't have any details as to
10 redevelopment. They want to use it for training,
some small
11 arms training, potentially more, potentially
consistent or
12 similar in nature to what's been done out there
in the past
13 when the Army had it. But we don't have things
as far as a
14 redevelopment plan, things like that. That's as
much detail
15 as I know.
16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Okay.
17 ERIC WAEHLING: Anybody else have any questions?
18 VALERIE LANE: I do. When will you find
out more?
19 ERIC WAEHLING: Hopefully really soon
because it
20 puts me in an awkward position of not
knowing.
21 VALERIE LANE: They were doing law enforcement
22 before out there, they were talking about driving
courses, you
23 know, screaming cars.
24 ERIC WAEHLING: I haven't heard anything like that.
25 ED MARSHMAN: There would be no driving
courses.

00009

1 VALERIE LANE: No driving courses?

2 ED MARSHMAN: No.

3 VALERIE LANE: Kind of like what's out there?

4 ED MARSHMAN: If it went to the FBI, you basically

5 would see the ranges that used to be open reopened.

6 VALERIE LANE: Just for FBI, not public, though,

7 right?

8 ED MARSHMAN: Probably not public.

Normally we

9 don't open public ranges.

10 VALERIE LANE: Wouldn't shoot more than what you're

11 shooting now?

12 ED MARSHMAN: Right.

13 VALERIE LANE: The rounds wouldn't be louder, per

14 se?

15 ED MARSHMAN: Shouldn't be. Basically what you used

16 to have here, used to be a whole lot of law enforcement

17 agencies shooting on Camp Bonneville.

18 VALERIE LANE: Right.

19 ED MARSHMAN: We have accommodated as much law enforcement needs as we can on our one range.

Unfortunately,

21 a large part of what's happened in law enforcement, a lot of

22 law enforcement agencies used to shoot at Camp Whitcom

23 (phonetic). That closed.

24 There is a drastic need for law enforcement ranges

25 in the area. If we could reopen the range that used to be

00010

1 used by law enforcement agencies, we'd do that,
too.

2 FRANK FUNK: Would the FBI be taking the entire
3 acreage of Camp Bonneville or just a portion?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: My understanding is they're
5 interested in the entire acreage to gain the
noise buffers

6 necessary.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Would the groundwater
still

8 be tracked?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you. I didn't mean to
10 interrupt.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Go ahead.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Under any scenario, the
groundwater

13 cleanup, Landfill 4, OB/OD sites, that work will
continue no

14 matter what. Whether it's County transfer, no
transfer, FBI

15 transfer, those things need to continue and will
continue.

16 FRANK FUNK: UXO, too?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: The UXO, as we've talked about
for

18 all these years, what needs to happen with UXO is
very much

19 dependent upon how the property will be used in
the future.

20 Under an FBI scenario, we have to evaluate what
would need to

21 happen.

22 The answer is a big question mark. But the HTW

23 stuff, the groundwater work, will all continue.

24 I just wanted to make sure everybody was aware of
25 that.

00011

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: One more thing. I think
it's

2 a fantastic idea. I don't think that there should
be such an

3 intensive use on a UXO site. I think the FBI
should have a

4 good shot at it. I just want that on the record.

5 DON WASTLER: Same response. I think law
6 enforcement training is far more important than
recreation.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: I have the same response, as
well.

8 In fact, I would say the majority of the residents
in and

9 around the one-mile perimeter of Camp Bonneville
are already

10 pretty much conditioned to the type of military
use that was

11 going on prior to the closure, accepted it, and
were pleased

12 that in the case of the Army there was a
coordinating body

13 that the residents could go to if, in fact, they
did have a

14 question or a complaint.

15 I would imagine the FBI would probably set up a PR
16 system pretty much the same as the Army, wouldn't
it, Ed, and

17 be able to deal with the neighbors under the same
scenario?

18 ED MARSHMAN: Right. Just like now, if anybody
has

19 any questions at all, you know.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: In the past, if there was a
problem

21 with aircraft coming in, a noise somebody didn't
understand,

22 they had a contact person with the Army they could
call.

23 ED MARSHMAN: Right.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: And it was dealt with in that

25 scenario. I think the residents out there are

00012

1 well-conditioned to accept that kind of a
scenario, as well.

2 I just wanted to state that.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian.

4 IAN RAY: We have a reporter from The Columbian
5 present. I hope this gets into the paper soon.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I want to make sure everybody
7 understands that the decision hasn't been made,
that it's just

8 an inquiry, it's being evaluated at FBI
headquarters. The

9 County has done an awful lot of work, been down
this path for

10 a long time, and it's not a decision that is
going to be made

11 lightly. We've all, particularly this group,
done a lot of

12 work, been here a long time.

13 LOREN CARLSON: Is it set in stone it has to go
FBI

14 or County? It's probably too early to ask that
question.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know. I'm not part of
that

16 discussion, to be very honest. It's all back in
Washington,

17 DC. Until told otherwise, I'm continuing down
this path.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: This is twice the same thing has
19 happened when they came to us before, wrote us a
letter, said

20 they're not putting any more money into it, the
Army and the

21 National Guard want it. All of a sudden, why, we
were being

22 pushed out the door. Now it seems like the same
thing going

23 around again. What's next? Is there nothing we
can trust as

24 far as turning it over to Clark County? Do we
have a voice in

25 it?

00013

1 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not quite sure how to respond
to

2 that. I'm just responding to what has happened.

3 Certainly you have a voice. A way to exercise
that

4 I would advise is through the political process.
You can

5 certainly write, and I can give you names of the
folks back in

6 Washington, DC.

7 BUD VAN CLEVE: I know the buttons to push.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: I know you're very savvy with
these

9 things. That's the best answer I can offer. Of
course, you

10 have a voice, but the decision is not being made
locally.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: The last time this came up with
the

12 National Guard and the Army, I requested a
meeting with Brian

13 Baird. It turned into a public meeting with
Brian Baird and a

14 group downtown. You were there at the meeting.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, I was.

16 BUD VAN CLEVE: We got some pretty quick action
from

17 Brian at that time. He, along with a few other
people, will

18 be contacted immediately.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: I do know that the congressman
has

20 been contacted by the Army, as well as the County.
Certainly

21 hearing from his constituents I'm sure means a
lot.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: Okay.

23 ED MARSHMAN: If I could add one thing, too.
Almost

24 sounds like this is coming from left field.
You've got to

25 remember, ever since 1995 when this went on the
BRAC list, the

00014

1 number one condition has been the FBI, as a
Federal agency,

2 has a need for continuous training.

3 As a matter of fact, when the official document
was

4 signed by the Undersecretary of the Army back in
1996, that

5 document states that the FBI's law enforcement
needs have to

6 be compatible with any other use. If they are not
compatible,

7 then the Undersecretary of the Army reserves the
right to pull

8 that property out of surplus. That's been sitting
in the

9 public record since 1996.

10 Obviously, I don't know where this is going. At
the

11 same time, I mean, with Clark County, as a matter of
fact, I

12 just had a meeting with Clark County a while ago,
so, you

13 know, even Clark County, the Reuse Plan, shows there
has to be

14 some law enforcement training ranges out there.

15 BUD VAN CLEVE: I don't have a problem with
sharing,

16 but this don't sound like sharing.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a long way down the road. As
I

18 said, as things develop... We don't know a whole
lot. As we

19 learn more, I'm looking forward to sharing with you
because it

20 is also my future.

21 DON WASTLER: I make a motion we move on with the
22 agenda.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Seconded?

24 KAREN KINGSTON: I'll second it.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: All in favor? Let's move on.

00015

1 First agenda item. EPA also has an announcement of
2 sorts they'd like to make. They've asked for a few
minutes on

3 the agenda. I'm happy to extend it to them. Tom,
Sean.

4 TOM EATON: I'd kick it off. Thanks for putting us
5 on the agenda today. My name is Tom Eaton. I am
the deputy

6 director of the environmental cleanup program in
Region 10.

7 Karen tells me that it's not a secret that we are
proposing to

8 take a very much reduced role in future work at
Camp

9 Bonneville. I thought I'd come down here and
explain our

10 reasons why and then answer any questions you might
have. My

11 presentation should take about five minutes, and
then I'll

12 answer any questions that any of you have.

13 Just in terms of our rationale. First, we have had
14 an interagency agreement with the state Department
of Ecology

15 for several years now. It's several pages long.
In essence

16 what it says is that we are agreeing to split up
the work, the

17 environmental cleanup work in the State. Some
sites EPA will

18 take the lead on and clean up under Superfund,
other sites the

19 State will take the lead on and clean up under the
Model

20 Toxics Control Act.

21 This site, for many years, kind of fell into a gray
22 area. Recently Ecology has staffed up more and has
taken more

23 of an active role in the future cleanup of the
site. They've

24 issued an order to the Army to get the cleanup on a
particular

25 schedule, and this site more clearly fits into the
agreement

00016

1 where Ecology is the lead and we would take a
reduced or
2 support role.
3 A second reason is this is not an NPL listed site.
4 The real formal decision point on transfer really
goes to the
5 Governor of the State of Washington, in
consultation with
6 Ecology and other State agencies.
7 Because it's not an NPL site, we don't really have
a
8 formal role in the transfer. We can have an
opinion, we can
9 have advice, we can provide technical assistance,
but we don't
10 have that formal role.
11 Third, and important to me, is Sean's work load.
12 He's working on some very important other sites in
the State
13 where we are taking more of a lead role on. In
fact, in some
14 respects he's our project manager on our most
important site
15 this year because it's one of our -- we put a high
priority on
16 what we call construction completions, where we
actually
17 complete a cleanup. We have one in this whole
region, the
18 region being Washington, Oregon, Idaho and
Alaska. We have
19 one site, it's a little bit north of --
20 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Southwest.
21 TOM EATON: Frontier Hard Chrome. Sean is the
22 project manager on that. It's very important that
we complete
23 that project by the end of our fiscal year. The
last schedule
24 I saw he has for that takes us right to the end of
the fiscal
25 year to get it done. So that's really the third
reason, is

00017

1 Sean's work load.
2 What we're proposing to do is really step back and
3 take a support role to Ecology on an as-requested,
as-needed
4 basis. If they need some help, we're here to give
it.

5 I don't anticipate we would be involved in future
6 RAB meetings or in future BCT meetings, but more
if there's a
7 specific item of work that Ecology needs some help
on, within
8 our resource limits, et cetera, we'd be prepared
to help out
9 on that.

10 FRANK FUNK: It's been my understanding in
listening
11 to the Ecology people, regardless of what happens
at Camp
12 Bonneville, that the UXO would be cleaned up. I
would assume
13 the water cleanup would be there, too.

14 If this were to go to the FBI or somebody else, it
15 would be an injustice to the citizens of Clark
County to leave
16 these UXO in place. They should be cleaned up
because there
17 have been trespassers on this property from day
one, always

18 will be, and they should not be left there for
somebody to
19 stumble onto.

20 The record of Camp Bonneville is that of all of
the
21 history of it, there has never been an individual
or an animal

22 blown up by UXO. The UXO should be cleaned up, as
well as the
23 water problems. That should not die because the
FBI or

24 anybody else takes it. That should be the
foremost objective

25 of whatever happens to it. We've been informed
that's what

00018

1 would happen.
2 Likewise, if you build a fence around it, then the
3 wildlife cannot use it. If you put a chain link
fence around
4 it, the wildlife can't use it. Deer, elk, bear,
raccoon,
5 everything uses it. That would fence them out or
fence them
6 in, whatever. People do cut chain link fences,
too.
7 End of my statement.
8 TOM EATON: Barry, do you want to comment to that?
9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes. I think, Frank, there's
going
10 to be some issues regarding the FBI and the amount
of active
11 range, shooting ranges, that they have, and the
type of
12 training that's going on.
13 What we've always said in the past is that cleanup
14 of UXO would occur based on the proposed land use
in the
15 future. A recreational park with a high intensity
camping,
16 RV, hiking area, in my mind is going to require a
lot more
17 cleanup of UXO based on that land use than an area
that the
18 FBI is using for active training and ranges.
19 There's also an issue, a legal issue, of what our
20 authority is to actually require cleanup within an
active
21 range, depending on the type of range it is. For
example, we
22 don't go into Fort Lewis, where they're actively
using ranges,
23 we do not require active cleanup of those ranges
while they're
24 being used for UXO.
25 There's an additional legal issue that will need
to

00019

1 be sorted out as to what the range use is by the
FBI and what

2 our legal authority would be for UXO cleanup.
That would be

3 the same for Ecology, as I believe also for EPA.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: One additional thing. Both for
5 transfer to the County or the FBI or transfer to
anybody, one

6 of the requirements on behalf of the Army is that
the receiver

7 of the property have a safety plan to address the
very issues

8 that you brought up. They have to get that
approved by our

9 Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board.

10 This issue is one that still is paramount, the
issue

11 of safety, and will continue to be. It's just that
the

12 response and how you handle that might be different
under

13 another scenario. But, again, we don't know what
that looks

14 like just yet.

15 I think Don was first.

16 DON WASTLER: Two things to say. One to Frank.

17 Regardless of what happened, the Army has
acknowledged the

18 contamination there. They're going to continue
the

19 responsibility to clean it up, even if nothing is
done with

20 it, regardless. I'll back Eric up on that. I've
asked him

21 that over and over, and he's come back with the
same answer.

22 The Army has taken responsibility for the
contamination there.

23 It's going to be cleaned up regardless of who.

24 The next thing I want to say is I'm sorry to see

25 Sean go. He's made a contribution to this project.

I'll be

00020

1 sorry to see you guys back out of this.

2 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Thank you.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: You know, I think of two

4 issues. I think the response that the community
would have

5 towards a sign that says "park" and a sign that
says "FBI

6 shooting active range" would be perceived totally
different by

7 this community.

8 A level of cleanup would, you know, in my judgment

9 be understandable. Just the response by someone
seeing a sign

10 from an active FBI range, it being fenced, because
you need to

11 control people getting into an FBI range, that
would be

12 different from a sign that says "park," which you
would bring

13 your children to, come tenting. I just want to
make that

14 point. There's a perception in there of what you
would see

15 when you see that sign.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: It's as much a question of the

17 certainty that you need for assurances that the use
of that

18 property is safe. The difference between tent
camping and a

19 small arms impact area where bullets are laying is
very

20 different. Both require safety measures. I'm not
trying to

21 minimize that. It will need to be looked at. We
just don't

22 have any details at this time.

23 FRANK FUNK: Chris, I remember him saying, even if

24 they put a fence around, put a lock on it, done
nothing with

25 it, no activity, the State would still require they
clean up

00021

1 UXO and the water. The water is still going to
flow in the
2 creek.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely. The water is going to
4 continue to be addressed. The groundwater plumes
at

5 Landfill 4, surface water contamination, if there
is any, will

6 have to be addressed. The Army can't, even if we
wanted to,

7 walk away from that. Ecology wouldn't let us.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah, I would second that also.

9 The second part of that question is dealing with
the soil

10 contamination, chemical contamination of soil,
and chemical

11 contamination of groundwater. Ecology would
still pursue

12 having those issues addressed.

13 FRANK FUNK: You people say UXO as they
deteriorate

14 contribute to that deterioration of the water. I
understand

15 what you're saying as we listen. You ought to
clean up the

16 UXO along with it.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Or ongoing monitoring to see if
18 there is an issue. Frank, you're right.

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's a good point, Frank.
That

20 is a good point. UXO that's been fired and has
partially

21 exploded or partially burned is still going to
have chemical

22 constituents that are going to need to be
addressed.

23 The real issue comes into the areas that would be
24 active ranges, active training, the FBI would be
using, how

25 much of that would be, what would be the extent of
UXO cleanup

00022

1 in those areas?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: I want to make sure I'm not
missing

3 anybody here.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Were you finished with your
5 presentation, Tom?

6 TOM EATON: Yes.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: I did have a question myself.

8 Memorandum of Agreement, MOA, I'll use the
acronym,

9 when was an MOA enacted or signed or decided upon
between

10 Ecology and EPA, say what year was that,
approximately?

11 TOM EATON: Around 1994.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay, 1994. The end of 2001 or

13 2002, I stepped in and asked Chris Maurer, just
before you

14 started coming, Barry, to investigate whether or
not there was

15 any MOAs existing that pertained to Camp
Bonneville, either

16 with the Army and the State, the County and the
State, or

17 within the State. It's on record. I have an e-
mail, as well,

18 that says there was none. So this MOA did exist
then?

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah, there has been one between

20 EPA and Washington State, both for NPL sites,
upland NPL

21 sites, and also for aquatic sediment sites that
EPA and the

22 State both work on.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Is it correct to explain to

24 everybody then an MOA is an order that is agreed
upon -- well,

25 an agreement between two agencies that decide what
their role

00023

1 will be so that even if one agency finds cause to
be alarmed

2 about something, they still act within the
agreement on the

3 MOA and follow the guidelines according to what
each person is

4 supposed to be doing? Can you explain it easier?

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's not a legal agreement. It's
6 not and order. It's a management agreement between
the State

7 and EPA. It's a written agreement.

8 COLEEN BROAD: Is it just to keep from doing

9 duplicates of work?

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Exactly.

11 TOM EATON: That's quite a bit of it. We were
12 finding we were spending a lot of time critiquing
each other's

13 work rather than cleaning up sites. We decided
back then that

14 we would be better off, the public would be better
off, if we

15 split the work up more, we worked on some sites,
Ecology

16 worked on some other sites.

17 We have not totally gotten out of each other's

18 business because we have legal responsibilities, as
does

19 Ecology. We split up as much as we can. We
think that

20 results, State wide, in more effective cleanup.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Coleen, are you next?

22 COLEEN BROAD: I've gone already.

23 SEAN SHELDRAKE: I wanted to add, it's been a

24 pleasure working with all of you. I'm going to
miss working

25 on Camp Bonneville in a lot of ways.

00024

1 One of the technical aspects I wanted to add,
Chris

2 was right, this site is a part of that MOA/MOU.
It changes

3 over time. But typically BRAC sites are not
part of this

4 MOA/MOU because the way the law was written, the
BRAC law,

5 it's a consensus-building process amongst all the
regulators,

6 the service that uses the property, and a local
reuse

7 authority.

8 When this early transfer takes place, it's no
longer

9 going to be a "BRAC site" per se. Technically
speaking,

10 logistically speaking, our funding goes away at
that point in

11 terms of my time being here versus being at
another cleanup

12 site. It's just another way those resources are
put in place

13 for different types of cleanups.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: You've been a phenomenal asset,

15 absolutely phenomenal to all of us. You educated
us. You've

16 been so quick to respond to any e-mails or phone
calls or

17 anything. I cannot tell you how much, I think I
can probably

18 say on behalf of the community, we appreciate your
presence.

19 We are sorely going to miss you.

20 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Thank you.

21 GREG JOHNSON: I'd like to say on behalf of
Ecology,

22 you've been a great asset to all of us, especially
myself.

23 We're going to miss you, too.

24 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Thanks, Greg.

25 TOM EATON: I don't know if the RAB issues letters

00025

1 or resolutions. If you do, I'd be glad to put a
resolution

2 like that in Sean's personnel file, if you care
to write one

3 up. He's been a great value to the community.

4 DON WASTLER: I'll sign it.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: I'll draft one up and bring it
to

6 the RAB for issue to look at and sign.

7 IAN RAY: You can pass his performance review
around

8 and we'll all check in.

9 I have a question. I thought Sean was involved
in

10 the request for the Inspector General's
investigation of time

11 critical removal actions. Are you involved in that
exercise?

12 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Involved at this point, I guess
no.

13 I did ask for an investigation into certain issues
at Camp

14 Bonneville, that's correct.

15 IAN RAY: Is that going to die as you leave or will
16 it continue?

17 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Whether I'm here or not, that

18 wouldn't have any bearing on an investigation of
that sort.

19 It either merits investigation or it doesn't.
That's

20 something that others objectively decide, not
myself, not EPA.

21 IAN RAY: Thank you.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: I do have one other question about
23 the MOA. Do you feel from the EPA's standpoint that
an MOA

24 ever bound your hands in any way, enacting pressure
on you, on

25 your agency standpoint, regarding cleanup, that it
bounds you

00026

1 in any way?

2 TOM EATON: No, it really doesn't have any legal
3 standing. It's really an interagency agreement.

Our lawyers

4 are careful when they look at things to make sure
we're not

5 legally bound by it. It's really just a management
agreement.

6 So, no, it doesn't provide any additional legal
7 constraints on us or Ecology. It's just an
agreement on how

8 we're going to try to manage work.

9 JEROEN KOK: Tom, quick question. How do you see
10 your role from this point forward? You mentioned
that you

11 would participate on an as-needed basis. I'm
wondering, what

12 would trigger EPA's participation from this point
forward?

13 TOM EATON: Well, a lot of it would be up to

14 Ecology. One thing that will take place is Harry
Craig, who

15 has worked on this site in the past, has been on
military

16 duty, will be coming back later in July. He's a
resource that

17 we could make available to Ecology if they needed
that.

18 One item we talked about earlier, I don't know if

19 it's still appropriate or relevant, where the
process is to

20 date, but we offered to do kind of an independent
check of the

21 cost estimates that had been developed for cleanup.

We

22 thought that maybe since we are stepping back
to take a

23 support role, we might be in a better
position to do an

24 independent assessment review of the cost
estimates and

25 provide those to the County, the Army and Ecology,
rather than

00027

1 having Ecology do it, since they won't be directing
cleanup in

2 the future.

3 Again, whether that's still useful or relevant, I

4 don't know, but that's one thing we offered. It
really

5 depends on: Do they have any technical gaps? Do
they need

6 help on something? Then, do we have the ability to
fill those

7 gaps?

8 JEROEN KOK: Quick follow-up question.

9 Will you be tracking, and if so how, the progress
on

10 the cleanup efforts in order to make a
determination whether

11 you independently want to participate in a
particular subject?

12 TOM EATON: I don't envision we will, no. I

13 envision we will rely on Ecology. If we get
complaints or

14 anything, of course we'll look into those.

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'm going to add, though, Tom,
that

16 we do report regularly to EPA on progress made.
Part of the

17 agreement, the milestone, the major milestones for
cleanup, we

18 have briefings where we sit down and brief an EPA
team, just

19 as a sounding board. Are we headed in the right
direction?

20 Does this make sense? Would you in general agree
with this

21 type of cleanup effort of this site? Not
necessarily all the

22 technical details, but the bigger picture
perspective.

23 TOM EATON: Yeah, that's correct. The agreement

24 doesn't totally separate work. We do have legal

25 responsibilities. We carry those out. We also
keep Ecology

00028

1 apprised of sites we're in the lead on because we
have to

2 meet, as part of ARARs, part of that term, State
standards.

3 It's important we keep them abreast. It's a
little higher

4 level, not down into the details.

5 JEROEN KOK: Thank you.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Shall we move on to the next
agenda

7 item? Ian.

8 IAN RAY: I have 20 minutes to tell what I can do
in

9 about five minutes.

10 I'm going to read from prepared notes in the
11 interest of a few words. Jaime will nod if I go
too fast.

12 You may interrupt.

13 If there's time, I've provided some handouts for
14 some other interesting issues.

15 Regarding the BCT to the RAB connection, a brief
16 history of the project:

17 In February 2003, at a regular RAB meeting, a
18 committee was established to set up a regular
functioning

19 connection to the BCT. In correspondence to the
Army, the

20 assumption was made that the primary contact with
the BCT

21 would be Eric Waehling, the Base Environmental
Coordinator.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Would you identify the acronym
BCT?

23 IAN RAY: Base Environmental Coordinator.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Team.

25 IAN RAY: I will try to read what they mean
instead

00029

1 of using the acronyms.
2 KAREN KINGSTON: The BCT, just --
3 IAN RAY: The Base Cleanup Team is the BCT.
4 KAREN KINGSTON: Thank you.
5 IAN RAY: The committee asked for regulations
6 governing the project, and none have been
indicated. So we
7 make our own within our bylaws and DoD guidance,
and that is
8 the Restoration Advisory Board is a forum to
facilitate open
9 and effective communication.
10 The first questions to the BCT were: How will
the
11 Army inform the Restoration Advisory Board Base
Cleanup Team
12 liaison person of:
13 One, planned Base Cleanup Team activities.
14 And, two, actual BCT activities since the last
RAB
15 meeting.
16 At the April 2003 RAB meeting, the hesitation of
the
17 Army to move on the project was discovered, and
further
18 correspondence from the liaison offered a simple
approach and
19 justification for the project; that is the
Assistant Secretary
20 of the Army has directed the installation to provide
all
21 relevant information. At the May 2003 RAB meeting,
the Army
22 committed to report the means of communication.
23 On June 10, which was yesterday, 2003, a conference
24 call with Eric Waehling, Barry Rogowski and Ian Ray
25 established that the BCT reports would be made by
telephone

00030

1 conference monthly on the fourth Wednesday at 10
a.m. There's

2 a contractor's meeting on the 20th of the month to
be covered

3 in the same conference call.

4 The first conference call report yesterday
contained

5 the following:

6 One, the Department of Ecology groundwater
7 investigation for Landfill 4, the Department of
Ecology will

8 present the work at this meeting. They have found
- refund -

9 maps of the Troutdale aquifer. They've obtained
those maps.

10 I think they will be explaining how they will be
used.

11 The second item was that cost estimating for

12 obtaining cleanup funds continues. There was no
discussion of

13 the source of data for cleanup.

14 The third item, the FBI's expressing interest in
15 using CB for training in the interest of homeland
security.

16 We just covered that. Federal need apparently
takes priority

17 for the property, groundwater and cleanup would
continue, and

18 there are no decisions today.

19 The fourth item was the EPA is considering limiting
20 involvement in the CB project. We've heard about
that.

21 The fifth and last item, the contract for Landfill
4

22 removal continues, and there's a scheduling
conflict.

23 Discussions were mainly topical, just as I've
described them.

24 That is our first effort. We will try to improve
in

25 detail as we learn. The RAB members should
provide the

00031

1 community chair or me with their ideas and
assessment of the

2 value of the Base Cleanup contact with the RAB.

3 The RAB members are expressing a proactive
attitude

4 to be involved early in project work. And the
Base Cleanup

5 Team was asked: Can you provide dates of Base
Cleanup Team

6 activities, issues discussed, proposals,
conclusions and

7 decisions? The answers were all yes.

8 That was the end of the conference. Questions?

9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That sounds like there was
10 some headway made.

11 IAN RAY: Yes. It's a beginning. I think we'll
get

12 into more detail. As the RAB uses the liaison, we
should do a

13 lot better.

14 COLEEN BROAD: Will the liaison be able to attend
15 the BCT meetings?

16 IAN RAY: Haven't covered that. I'm sure we will.

17 COLEEN BROAD: You're sure we will
attend or cover

18 it?

19 IAN RAY: The issue will be reopened.

20 Don?

21 DON WASTLER: I'm wondering why these
BCT

22 meetings -- all the minutes to the
Restoration Advisory Board

23 meetings are in the repository, the
Vancouver Mall library,

24 but where are the minutes to the BCT
meetings? They've been

25 going on all along, haven't they?

00032

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. To be honest, we generally

2 don't take minutes.

3 DON WASTLER: There should be some kind of record.

4 Ian just mentioned something about some kind of records.

5 There should be something in the information repository in the

6 Vancouver Mall library about what the BCT's been doing.

7 They've been working since this whole project started, haven't

8 they?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah.

10 DON WASTLER: There should be some sort of progress

11 report, minutes or something.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: We're sitting here.

We're here. We

13 took minutes for a short while, and the intention of the

14 minutes is to provide a reference for the BCT participants,

15 the participants to the meeting to review, refer to as

16 necessary.

17 To be honest, nobody was using them. It was taking

18 up time reviewing them. It was just decided that it wasn't

19 needed or warranted.

20 DON WASTLER: I'm just saying it would be nice for

21 reference to go to the library and see just what progress was

22 being done at what time and when.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, we certainly don't take court

24 minutes like we do here. This is something that's unique to

25 this RAB.

00033

1 DON WASTLER: There isn't any record or
anything of

2 progress?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: The documents
themselves, the

4 comments on the documents, things like that.

5 DON WASTLER: Can't they be put in the information
6 repository?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: The documents are in the
information

8 repository.

9 DON WASTLER: Are they there already?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: All the documents that are
presently

11 there, and future ones as they are generated are
there.

12 DON WASTLER: From the BCT?

13 JEROEN KOK: I think what Eric is referring to is
14 the technical reports that are generated as a result
of the

15 BCT work, not so much the BCT discussions.

16 DON WASTLER: The reason I'm asking this is because
17 of that RDX and HDX. I was concerned about that.
The

18 Department of Ecology had that class that we had.
Actually my

19 letter says that they talked about it. They really
didn't

20 talk about it.

21 Just by looking at Clark County's Reuse Plan, in
the

22 back it was talking about different types of grants
for

23 funding for what they were going to do. Out of
curiosity, I

24 managed to talk to not Pete Capell, but the
gentleman that's

25 just under him.

00034

1 JEROEN KOK: Brian Vincent.

2 DON WASTLER: He called me back, and actually it
was

3 out of the blue. He had more information than I've
gotten

4 from this whole thing since I've been attending on
those two

5 chemicals, what's been found and what's been done
there.

6 Obviously, the County is a lot more informed than
what we are.

7 I was surprised. He basically answered all my
8 questions in just a few minutes on the telephone
than I'd been

9 able to get from everybody so far.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: The County has the same documents
11 you've been given, as well as that are in the
public

12 repository. All that information's there. This is
a great

13 forum to discuss that. If there are specific things
like

14 that, we're always looking for subjects to talk
about. If you

15 want to know more about HMX, RDX, the other
explosives'

16 constituents, that could be a subject.

17 DON WASTLER: Basically the subject is just what I
18 expected, from being in artillery myself, the 155
is the only

19 one that uses a combination of powder bags rather
than a large

20 bullet for a propellant. The concern is, how much
of it is

21 buried in the ground?

22 Actually what he told me was just what I expected
23 anyway, that it was just experimented with a few
times. They

24 pretty much have a record of where it's at and can
find it.

25 Actually, I suggested that they get someone from

00035

1 fire direction control, from a 155 unit, to go out
at Camp

2 Bonneville and look at the situation. He said
they've already

3 done that. So sounds like all of that is pretty
much taken

4 care of.

5 I didn't get any of that information from these
6 meetings. I was wondering if the BCT is in on that
or just

7 where the County got that information, where we
didn't.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: I can't comment specifically on
that

9 as far as what Brian may -- I don't know what Brian
told you,

10 so it's difficult for me to say what his source
was.

11 DON WASTLER: All the questions I've had so far on
12 that one particular issue, he answered them all in a
few

13 minutes on the telephone. I wasn't able to get
these answers

14 from Ecology or anybody so far, from the class.

15 I was kind of wondering, this BCT, if he's part of
16 it, there must be a lot going on there that we don't
know

17 about or that we're not being told about, that we're
not being

18 totally informed of.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: To the latter part, you are
20 informed. Specifically to what he's talking about,
I'm not

21 sure.

22 Greg, if you have something, then Christine has
been

23 patient.

24 GREG JOHNSON: Go ahead, Christine.

25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Comment, then I'll go back
to

00036

1 something.

2 GREG JOHNSON: There's only been one 155 found at
3 Camp Bonneville, and it was unfired. It was in the
demo area.

4 DON WASTLER: Basically that was the information.
5 The problem is not nearly as serious as I thought
it was.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: It's at the Landfill 4 Demo Site 1.

7 DON WASTLER: It's like they fired them a couple
8 times.

9 GREG JOHNSON: This one was probably there to be
10 disposed of.

11 DON WASTLER: It was too large to use the
facilities

12 at Camp Bonneville. In other words, we don't have
to worry

13 about cloth bags of gunpowder being buried
throughout Camp

14 Bonneville, that you can't find with a metal
detector.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

16 DON WASTLER: That was my concern.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: The 155 weapon is too big, has
too

18 much range.

19 DON WASTLER: That was my concern. Just from a
few

20 minutes on the phone, it was just an experiment
it sounded

21 like. They had all the information about where
it happened,

22 when it happened, just pretty much had a handle
on all of it.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Maybe related to 155 powder bags.

24 But we still have ongoing concern and
investigation that may

25 be required for other residuals.

00037

1 DON WASTLER: That was my main concern when they
2 were talking about the HDX and RDX with the
powder bags that
3 aren't inside of a casing or any kind of a metal
container,
4 buried randomly in the ground. That's when I got
concerned.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 DON WASTLER: Evidently, it's not as serious as
we
7 thought it was.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Great. For that one issue,
right.

9 Christine.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: A BCT question was, you
11 mentioned earlier when you stopped the BCT
minutes, notes, is

12 that right?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Was EPA and Ecology on
board

15 with stopping that procedure?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, we talked about it.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: It was agreed upon by all
18 three?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. It was a hassle.

20 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We weren't really using the
meeting

21 summaries as we thought we were going to be able
to use them

22 for just keeping track of records and notes.

However, having

23 said that, I could see where there might be a
legitimate

24 community concern to have those records. I hear
what Don is

25 saying. Maybe it would be nice to have a brief
meeting

00038

1 summary of what went on with the meetings, just
as a matter of

2 public record, put it in the library where you
guys can see

3 it. I don't think that was entirely factored
into that

4 decision as well as it could have been.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We've always thought this was
the

7 public forum where we conveyed the information.
We've always

8 had a court recorder here to get very thorough
notes on this

9 forum. But I could see where there might be
value to having

10 the other meeting summaries. I would consider
that, if you

11 think that's of value to you.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: I had it contracted before. I
could

13 look into reestablishing that contract.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: From what has been
presented,

15 I think as a citizen, I'd really like to see the
BCT pick that

16 up again. That's all I'd like to say.

17 IAN RAY: Does Jim Mansfield from the County
still

18 attend BCT meetings?

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: No. Brian Vincent is the new
20 project manager.

21 IAN RAY: Does he attend?

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah.

23 IAN RAY: We do have a County representative at
BCT

24 meetings?

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Uh-huh.

00039

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

2 IAN RAY: I'll take this issue to the chair.

3 Perhaps we could prevail on the County to have
that County

4 person tell us what's going on at BCT meetings.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: The County was adamant in one
of

6 the minutes saying that they are not there
representing the

7 community at all, they are there representing
solid waste.

8 IAN RAY: I might keep you guys on the
conference

9 call for a long time.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: They are not a liaison
whatsoever.

11 They were adamant. Pete Capell came and
expressed that.

12 IAN RAY: The RAB needs to know what's going on.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Can we clarify then for the

14 minutes, too, is it the Army's position right now
that the BCT

15 minutes that exist need not be included in the
information

16 repository?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: We can include those that exist.

18 They're not terribly voluminous. There's not a
whole lot of

19 them. We can include what there is. They're
older. I will

20 also look into seeing if we can reestablish that
contractor to

21 take minutes again. It was a professional minute-
taking

22 service. I can look into that.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: It alleviated any question that

24 there was dealings going on outside of the
community's -- that

25 you were not being transparent. By having those
minutes

00040

1 available, it also gave cause for anybody that did
have

2 technical background, that they could ask a
technical question

3 that related to what you were doing at exactly that
time.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I will see if there's sufficient
5 funding to reestablish that contract. I'll have to
look. I

6 think we have enough.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Then Jennifer will put anything
8 existing in the BCT? She will include that in,
what, a new

9 folder?

10 JENNIFER WALTERS: At the library?

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Shelf No. 7.

12 JENNIFER WALTERS: Is that how many there are?

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian.

15 IAN RAY: Would an official advisory to the Army
16 help in establishing note taking, professional note
taking, at

17 BCT meetings so that you could get funding, if the
RAB sent

18 you an official advisory?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: I think I'll be able to get
funding.

20 If there isn't funding, it will take a little bit
longer to

21 establish the contract. I don't think it's
terribly

22 expensive. I don't think it will be a problem.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are those legally closed-
door

24 meetings?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Are they legally closed-door

00041

1 meetings?
2 LOREN CARLSON: Are they open to the public?
3 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know.
4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Just a question.
5 TOM EATON: I don't know.
6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I don't think any of us know the
7 answer to that.
8 DON WASTLER: Yes, they are. Title V.
9 TOM EATON: It would be.
10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Does anyone have an answer?
11 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't have an answer.
12 SEAN SHELDRAKE: I can just add, we've done
meetings
13 like that in the past. In my experience, when I
worked with
14 the State of Idaho and County health, we have
included members
15 of the public in meetings that we've had, planning
meetings.
16 That lasted for a period of time, until the
meetings became so
17 long. It takes a lot of time. I've seen it done
before, to
18 answer your question.
19 DON WASTLER: Title V, US Congressional Code, says
20 that the meetings are open to the public, these
meetings, all
21 the meetings are open to the public, unless it's
something to
22 do with law enforcement or national security or
something like
23 that. All of these meetings in this nature are all
open to
24 the public.
25 ERIC WAEHLING: That may be. I don't know.

00042

1 DON WASTLER: Title V. I just stumbled on it by
2 accident.

3 FRANK FUNK: When you talk about entering into a
4 contract, is that a monthly contract or is it a
period like

5 six months?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll have to look at it. I was
7 doing it monthly.

8 FRANK FUNK: The reason I raise the question, if
the

9 transfer goes to County in October, you have four
months. If

10 it goes to the FBI, who knows. Might be tomorrow,
might be

11 six months, might be a year from now. Would it be
feasible to

12 make a contract for more than a month at a time?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: It's feasible. I won't get into
the

14 boring details of contracts. It's feasible,
although it might

15 be easier if I can use a credit card. There's lots
of rules

16 that govern what you can and can't do, how the
contract is

17 structured. Jaime's contract is an annual
contract. I don't

18 know the details of it. We pay per service, but
it's a

19 one-year contract. There's multiple ways to do
it.

20 FRANK FUNK: No big deal. Just a small question.

21 IAN RAY: Since we got started 10 minutes late in
22 this episode, could I get a couple more things in?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure, please. Then we'll take a
24 break.

25 IAN RAY: I want to call your attention to one of

00043

1 the handouts that I provided. There was a letter
posted on
2 the Center for Public Environmental Oversight,
which you might
3 know as CPEO, on May 9th, 2003. It was a letter
from P. Lynn
4 Scarlett, Assistant Secretary of the Interior
Department, to
5 Joseph W. Whitaker, the Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Department
6 of the Army. It's about transfers of property.
The letter
7 applying to Camp Bonneville is provided on this
handout.
8 See the end of the letter applying to Camp
9 Bonneville at "status." Funding for cleanup,
complete site
10 characterization, and regulator approval are
required for
11 transfer.
12 Now, that was an alert to me. So I started at the
13 top, and I called the Secretary of Labor. I got
down to the
14 Director of the Department of Interior. By the way,
the
15 Secretary of Labor didn't write the letter. The
letter was
16 written somewhere else.
17 I got to the Director of the Interior, Office of
18 Environmental Policy and Compliance, and he said
verbally that
19 he didn't think that Camp Bonneville could transfer
early
20 without full characterization. He gave me the
website to find
21 the paragraph. He told me it would be at
director's order 25,
22 paragraph 8.2.
23 When you see that order, and that's in your
handout,
24 the fourth page of four, it says, "A complete and
full
25 assessment of the property is made before the
acquisition is

00044

1 completed."

2 So I'm wondering, where are we here? We have
hardly

3 completed a full assessment of Camp Bonneville.
How was that

4 reconciled with early transfer in October 2003?
That's a lot

5 to think about. I don't expect we're going to come
to any

6 conclusions here tonight. But as far as I'm
concerned, that's

7 an alert.

8 One other item I'd like to bring up regarding the
9 BCT connection. There is an item on our agenda
tonight,

10 questions on the back, about work plans. At the
May meeting,

11 we were asking about the RAB getting a look at
things before

12 they're finished.

13 I went down to the repository during the month to

14 take a look at the situation. I found a work plan
that I'm

15 sure I've never seen before. It's called Sampling
and

16 Analysis Plan - Soil, Final, February 17th, 2003.
That's

17 pretty recent. It identifies the field
activities to be

18 performed. It is entirely new, with drawings of
specific

19 firing ranges that have never been discussed at
the RAB, as

20 far as I know.

21 I believe the RAB should be furnished copies of
this

22 work plan, and time should be allowed for
comment. For

23 example, the objectives should be more inclusive of
other

24 things besides explosives in demo land fills.

That's the kind

25 of thing that the RAB is expressing to me they have
an

00045

1 attitude of being proactive and looking at these
things before

2 they become final. That's the end of that issue.

3 That would conclude my portion of the agenda.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to visit that very issue
as

5 part of the question and answer on the back, how it
begins to

6 fit together, if I may.

7 Anybody else have any questions? Shall we take a
8 quick break. 10-minute break, please.

9 (Pause in proceedings.)

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Let's get started again, please.

11 Next agenda item is the update on Landfill 4, which
12 is certainly one of the RAB's most favorite
subjects. When we

13 last met, I gave you an update that we're ongoing
with

14 contracting actions to pursue the interim removal
that's

15 identified in the order, the contents of Landfill
4. Again,

16 the intention of that is a source control. It's
interim, it's

17 not the final thing, it's an interim removal to
control any

18 potential sources that might be contributing to the
19 groundwater problem. So we're in the process of
contracting

20 for that.

21 I'll say it again - I know I've said it a bunch of
22 times - the work plans haven't been written yet.

I've

23 specified in the contract that the contractor will
have to

24 come and work with the RAB. It's going to conform
to the

25 MOTCA process, which includes a 30-day public
comment on the

00046

1 work plans. There is going to be significant
public
2 components, both with this body as well as the
broader
3 community within the public comment process.
4 When we last talked, I mentioned there were some
5 issues, and I have to be careful about how much
information I
6 give because I understand it can jeopardize the
contracting
7 process from a legal point of view. But we were
hoping to
8 have a meeting on June 5th. We ended up having a
scheduling
9 conflict, so the meeting has been rescheduled for
June 20th.
10 We're hoping to resolve some of the questions that
the
11 contractors have had about what the objectives
are.
12 Department of Ecology is going to be participating
13 in that, along with the Army, so we can make sure
that the
14 contractors understand exactly what we're looking
for so that
15 we are successful at controlling removing any
potential
16 sources, controlling issues that could be making the
problem
17 worse as far as groundwater.
18 In a nutshell, that's where we are. Hopefully, if
19 all goes according to design, when we have our
conference call
20 with Ian on the 25th, we'll be able to talk to him
about that,
21 and then we'll also be able to share that with you
when we
22 meet again, whenever that may be, whether it's next
month or
23 two months from now.
24 Ecology and the Army, mostly Ecology, has been
doing
25 a lot of hard work representing what we know at the
moment as

00047

1 far as groundwater, groundwater flow directions.
Barry's

2 brought some maps to help further explain some
stuff. I'll

3 let him talk about it.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'd like to hand these around. I

5 only have five or six more copies. Please make
sure that the

6 RAB members get one.

7 You can thank Christine Sutherland probably for
this

8 map because she's been so involved in
groundwater and

9 perchlorate issues regarding Camp Bonneville,
she's really

10 spurred us on to try to take a closer look at that
particular

11 issue, develop this map, then keep refining our
thinking as

12 far as groundwater contamination and perchlorate at
Landfill 4

13 goes.

14 What we've done here, our hydrogeologist Nnamdi,
has

15 taken more of a regional groundwater data approach
to putting

16 the data together and built in the network of the
15 wells or

17 so that were interspersed throughout Camp
Bonneville as far as

18 the regional groundwater network. They're depicted
by the

19 blue crosses that you can see. There's several at
Landfill 4,

20 including the new deep monitoring well. We have
the wells in

21 the Demo Area 2 location, 3 location, then also
boundary wells

22 down in the southwest corner of Camp Bonneville.

23 We built all the deep wells into this. This is a

24 map of the deep groundwater aquifer of Camp
Bonneville. I

25 should have this up on an overhead. You can see
Landfill 4 up

00048

1 here (indicating). The red is showing the
existing known
2 groundwater plume at Landfill 4. The big green
arrows show
3 predominantly the flow of groundwater based on the
wells that
4 we have, to a south/southwesterly direction.
5 The lines that show 440, 420, 400, those are
6 groundwater elevations above mean sea level
plotted in the
7 actual groundwater monitoring wells, which give
us a general
8 sense of the flow direction. Groundwater flows
downhill, in
9 general. If you have the level of the water in the
wells, you
10 can say it's going to be going towards a lower
level
11 generally.
12 In addition to that, we have taken all the
13 residential wells that the Army had information
about, which
14 Eric supplied to us. Those are the purple
rectangles that say
15 'residential well.' You may even know a location
of one of
16 your own wells on there, or come close to it.
Valerie was
17 pointing that out a while ago.
18 VALERIE LANE: It's the only one on the south side.
19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: So we're trying to get all this
20 information into more of a regional idea. What
you've seen so
21 far has been a very small piece of it. This kind
of gives you
22 an idea of the entire 4,000 acres or 5,000 acres
around Camp
23 Bonneville.
24 The scale is 1 inch equals 820 feet. That kind of
25 gives you an idea of the distance that we have
known

00049

1 contamination at Landfill 4, which we have a plume
that's

2 maybe 300 to 500 feet in length in the deep
aquifer at

3 concentrations above five parts per billion.
That's right now

4 from what we know. You can kind of line up the
scale. You

5 have at least maybe, oh, 1600 to 2400 feet to the
nearest

6 residential well.

7 Then, based on that, the flow directions, that's

8 really a cross-gradient flow almost. We would
expect

9 contamination to predominantly flow directly down-
gradient,

10 for the most part.

11 Now, we are looking at sampling some more

12 residential wells. What Nnamdi has done, she put
this map

13 together to help the local Clark County Health
Department in

14 making some determinations, with your input, about
areas where

15 we would want to do some residential well
sampling.

16 We've had two requests. Karen and Christine have

17 requested we look into their wells. But based on
this map and

18 the flow direction, we can get some ideas about
where we might

19 want to look, if we could find some residential
wells to

20 sample. It would be directly down-gradient.
Those would be

21 the best locations, towards the south/southwest
corner of the

22 camp.

23 Any questions?

24 IAN RAY: In the lower left-hand corner of this

25 drawing, there's a triangle. It looks like it's
downstream

00050

1 from the confluence of Matney and Lacamas Creeks.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The green one?

3 IAN RAY: Yes. That would be on private property,
4 wouldn't it?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: It is.

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Surface water sampling location.

7 IAN RAY: Those are all lots in there. So that's
on

8 somebody's private property?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. These residential water well
10 samples, remember way back when Col. Knight
offered that if

11 people wanted us to come and take a grab sample of
their well

12 and test it for military constituents, i.e.,
explosives, these

13 plots, the purple triangles are those locations.

14 We also had a request from somebody to sample

15 Lacamas Creek on their property. We went and took a
sample of

16 that, as well. They all came back negative, no
detection.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Why is it the other areas you've

18 tested the surface water of Lacamas Creek, why are
those not

19 designated on here? Is that the only test you've
done?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: We've sampled within Bonneville

21 water both coming on and leaving. I think there
are three

22 separate events. They just aren't represented on
this map.

23 BUD VAN CLEVE: When was this sampling done on the

24 green triangle here off the property?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Oh, gosh.

00051

1 KAREN KINGSTON: '99.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you. I couldn't remember
3 whether it was '98 or '99.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: This is where you were going to do
5 the same thing this last summer but didn't get
around to doing
6 it?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: No, no, no, not at all. The
sample

8 represented by this triangle, as well as the
purple, was a

9 very basic turn on the spigot, let it run for 15,
20 minutes,

10 then fill a sample jar, send it in.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: What were you planning on this
last

12 summer that you didn't do? Was that looking for
seepage?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: What we were hoping to do, walking
14 up the creek, close to Landfill 4, we were hoping
to try to

15 find seepage to be able to figure out a way to get
a sample

16 for that.

17 The problem was, when the crews went out to look
for

18 seepage, you get seeps when it's raining, and the
problem was

19 the seeps didn't become obvious which was seeps or
which was

20 surface runoff. We have to revisit how we want to
do that.

21 Sean has said there's some techniques. We have a
couple ideas

22 how we might want to pursue that.

23 This green sample was just fill the bottle from
the

24 creek and send it in. It's limited.

25 BUD VAN CLEVE: If it's that old, should that be

00052

1 done again?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not sure. I think if it was
me

3 and I was considering it, I'm not sure there's a
reason to do

4 it, but I'd probably do it a lot closer to where
you know you

5 have a problem. By the time it gets down here,
it's pretty

6 dilute.

7 BUD VAN CLEVE: You drilled all these wells down

8 here in that corner. I think it probably would be
important

9 to check and see if there is any contamination
that has left

10 the site.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the intention of the sentry
12 wells down on the fence line. Gaynor talked about
that when

13 he was here a couple months ago.

14 BUD VAN CLEVE: I know. But it would seem that
you

15 would want to resample the surface water again.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We're definitely going to
resample

17 the wells. That's the intent of those wells, to
have an

18 ongoing monitoring system on the groundwater side of
things if

19 we have any contamination leaving the site.

20 Now, you raise a valid point on the surface water,

21 whether there should be some ongoing monitoring of
surface

22 water.

23 BUD VAN CLEVE: It's been a long time. A lot of
24 things change.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sure.

00053

1 ERIC WAEHLING: It's been a while.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I do want to point out also, down
3 in the bottom, this data is put together from '98,
2002 and

4 2003. There's some time differences in the
samplings that we

5 have. We would like to see them all sampled at the
same time.

6 That way we get consistent elevations and consistent
chemical

7 concentrations overtime.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: I am familiar with several of the
9 residents along Lacamas Creek. Is that 68th Street?

10 IAN RAY: Yes.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I know for a fact that especially
12 in the area where Matney forks into Lacamas, there
are some

13 extremely shallow drinking wells along there. I
know one

14 that's at 54 feet.

15 I would recommend, just because of that knowledge,
16 there would be more residential wells tested along
that

17 quadrant area.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Right. One of the things I also
19 wanted to mention that you want to keep in mind is
that the

20 flow velocities for the groundwater flow, as
understood for

21 Landfill 4, are between 50 and 100 feet per year.
You know,

22 if you're looking at 1800, 1600 feet, you're
talking a travel

23 time of 15 years, 16 years.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Sure. I'm concerned you would

25 sample water just past where Matney Creek flows in.

To me,

00054

1 that wouldn't even be a legitimate sample. My
attitude is

2 toss that out because it's getting washed by
Matney. It would

3 seem to me you should check east of the Matney fork
in order

4 to get --

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: On the surface water?

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes, for surface water. I would
7 just like to request that.

8 The other thing I would also like to talk about is,
9 for instance, perchlorate. I was trying to think
is it TCE

10 and perchlorate, they're not water soluble. If
that

11 contamination entered the water, it would sink. So
has there

12 been any work plans to test the creek bed to see if
there is

13 any accumulation?

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Actually, you're talking about
15 dense non-aqueous phase liquids when you're talking
about TCE.

16 They are to some degree water soluble. But there's
also the

17 product phase that would be an actual sinker, as
noted in

18 groundwater.

19 I'm not sure if you would see the same type of
20 effect in a creek where you've got a highly turbid
type of

21 water movement system. I think you would see a lot
more

22 mixing in that type of situation rather than a dense
23 non-aqueous phase liquid and sticking to the bottom
of the

24 creek.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: This time of year, Lacamas, it's

00055

1 pretty quiet. You would let your kids play with
that without

2 a ton of supervision because it flows so slowly.

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Compared to groundwater flow

4 velocities, the transport mechanisms, the
groundwater is going

5 to be a lot different, it is.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Christine.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: When I look at this map, the
8 general understanding is that groundwater moves in
the same

9 direction as the surface water. Is that a correct
assumption?

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Uh-huh.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Now, the sentry wells on
that

12 west side, why are they bunched up and so far south
of the

13 creek?

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Access, road access primarily.

15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So it's --

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's the closest, nearest, best
17 access point that we could get to that had a road to
it,

18 without actually having to build a bridge across the
creek, go

19 in, put wells in a different location.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: And it's a start point. What
21 happens now, we'll talk about it as part of the
question and

22 answer, but we pulled together the information that
exists.

23 We call that an RI. Then you evaluate it for
sufficiency. Do

24 you have enough? Sometimes the answer is yes.
Then you move

25 on to figuring out your remedies. Sometimes the
answer is no,

00056

1 and you have to go back and do more.

2 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If the site creates such a
3 hard time to get good samples around Landfill 4 and
this

4 Demo 2 and such, do you feel it would be more of a
necessity

5 to be able to make sure that sentry well is solid?

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think these are good samples,
7 actually. I mean, I think they're predominantly in
a location

8 that would be down-gradient of groundwater flow. I
don't have

9 a problem asking the Army to build roads or create
access

10 where we think it's reasonable to do so. We've done
that up

11 by Landfill 4. We actually did build a road to put
in

12 monitoring well locations.

13 But I'm not so sure that we just want to go start
to

14 build roads all over the place to place monitoring
wells when

15 we have existing networks and existing access
that's viable.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just look at it as the
17 severity of the chemicals present at Landfill 4,
which we

18 don't know the edge of that plume yet, because
there's still

19 parts per billion at that lower well.

20 From a community, citizen standpoint, I was very
21 concerned that that point be guarded with the best
men you

22 can, or soldiers.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I agree, Christine. I think it
24 makes the most sense at this time to place more
wells right

25 around Landfill 4 rather than so far away from where
we know

00057

1 there's any contamination. Since we have a network
of wells

2 throughout the base now that's providing us with
some

3 consistent information about long-distance
transport over the

4 long-term, now we kind of focus in on the actual
landfill and

5 the source area, get a better handle on that and
see, you

6 know, what Remedial Investigation and Feasibility
Study action

7 we would want to take on the actual source of
contamination.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand your priority.

9 Maybe a note, when you do find the edge of that
plume, as a

10 request.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Good point.

12 IAN RAY: Some of these groundwater velocities

13 reported last month, I believe, they ran from 30
some feet per

14 year --

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: There's a range.

16 IAN RAY: -- to 280 some. They were calculations.

17 They were not actually direct measurements.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's right.

19 IAN RAY: Calculations based upon some figures like

20 a constant taken out of a book somewhere?

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's right. Freeze and Cherry,
22 some of the leading hydrogeologists.

23 IAN RAY: Typical soils, so forth.

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Uh-huh.

25 IAN RAY: We don't know what the groundwater

00058

1 velocity is.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: No, but we have a pretty good
idea,

3 a calculation.

4 IAN RAY: A calculation based on somebody's
figures

5 in a book, not direct measurements at Camp
Bonneville?

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's right, sure.

7 IAN RAY: Even if you take that figure of 280
feet

8 per year...

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, in the same report, the
10 expanded site investigation, we did do slug
testing as well,

11 which is a direct test.

12 IAN RAY: Mr. Grayson showed us on the board that
13 the slug tests are practically useless, as I
recall.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: I recall that, as well.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Useless?

16 IAN RAY: Based on assumptions, so forth.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm saying there has been some
18 attempt to make direct measurements.

19 IAN RAY: I appreciate the attempt. For us to
say

20 we know the groundwater velocity is wrong. We
don't. If it

21 is 280 feet per year, still the distance from
Landfill 4 to

22 the tip of the Troutdale aquifer is still only about
10 years'

23 transit time. I don't see this is a good situation
at all.

24 I have another question. These lines here that go

25 400, 380, 360, 340, they're all straight or slightly
curved.

00059

1 I think you described those as the groundwater
elevation with

2 respect to sea level.

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Uh-huh.

4 IAN RAY: Are those based upon some actual
5 measurements or are there some assumptions in that?

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: They're based upon the actual
7 measurements in the wells that we took data from,
all the blue

8 cross-hatched wells, Ian, then it's extrapolated
over a more

9 regional basis.

10 IAN RAY: Extrapolated northwesterly and
11 southeasterly.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes, that's right.

13 IAN RAY: I just wonder, with the topography out

14 there, whether it's valid to say that those
groundwater depths

15 are really where they are. Wouldn't you expect they
would

16 follow the valley, the topography of the valley?

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: For the deep aquifer I would say
18 they would follow the topography less than for a
surface water

19 aquifer. This is the deep aquifer. I would say
they're more

20 accurate for deep aquifer than they would be for
the surface

21 water. Surface water would more likely follow
topography more

22 closely.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank.

24 FRANK FUNK: I'm sure you've told us, but I don't
25 remember. Landfill 4, how long has it been there?

00060

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Greg, help me out here. We don't
2 know its exact beginning establishment.

3 GREG JOHNSON: It showed up on the map in 1958.

4 FRANK FUNK: So from 1958 to 2003, if it moves at
5 280 feet, it would have already been showing, I
would think.

6 You said 15, 16 years.

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You have to recognize there's a
lot
8 of other things that affect contaminant transport
in an

9 aquifer other than just the flow velocity.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: As well as degradation.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah. You've got all kinds of
12 things going on rather than direct one-to-one
transport based

13 on the velocity. You have dispersion. You have
contaminants

14 that will actually stick or adhere to soil
particles. You

15 have dispersion. I'm not a super-duper
hydrogeologist. I

16 have some knowledge. There's a lot more going on
than just

17 one-to-one direct transport.

18 What we have seen, what this does show us is that
so

19 far, over the 1958, '68, '78 --

20 FRANK FUNK: 40 years.

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: -- this is how far we have known
22 contamination. The outward edge of this lower
part of this

23 plume, what was the concentration in that,
farthest away from

24 the monitoring well?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: 5 ppb.

00061

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Five parts per billion.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The highest is 212.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: 247.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: This southerly most well, not at
the

5 edge of the plume, we can't say it's at the edge,
but at that

6 location it's five.

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I mean, what you can say is that,

8 well, starting out at over 200 parts per billion,
300, 400,

9 500 feet away, you're down to five, and we're
getting near the

10 edge maybe. It's not down to one or zero, but you
can see the

11 decrease over 300 feet or 400 feet being
significant.

12 FRANK FUNK: In 40 years.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: In 40 years.

14 IAN RAY: The detail of that five parts per
billion,

15 or rather the drawings provided last RAB meeting
showed the

16 detailed water flow at that point of five parts per
billion.

17 It was southwesterly of where you would expect the
plume to

18 migrate, as if it would be swept by cleaner water.

19 I wrote that to Nnamdi. I didn't get any
response.

20 That five parts per billion, that's in a place
where it's

21 being swept by clean water from the southwest.

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I remember that, Ian.

That

23 particular well is a little bit cross-
gradient, not directly

24 down-gradient.

25 IAN RAY: If you move 20 feet to the
northwest, you

00062

1 might get 200 parts per billion. It's just
a guess.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You might. You might.
I'm not

3 sure of that, though. 20 feet might not
make that much
4 difference.

5 IAN RAY: 50.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: The main thing is we don't
know

7 exactly where the plume is. We don't know
the exact

8 dimensions of it. We're guessing. That
would be in the

9 record.

10 Erin, the 199 number is up to 247.

11 ERIN MIDDLEWOOD: I was looking at the
February

12 monitoring.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: It was from 2001. That
was a 2001

14 number. Now it's 247. I thought I'd tell
you.

15 ERIN MIDDLEWOOD: Thanks.

16 HILLARY HUNT: Where is the five parts per
billion

17 you're talking about?

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You can see Landfill 4,
right next

19 to the 440.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Right there (indicating).

21 HILLARY HUNT: Okay.

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: This is a regional map.

23 I just want to make a note, you know, we're
adding

24 more data to this as we go. This is the
first round of

25 sampling that we've gotten. We're going to
get much more

00063

1 closer, a much better understanding of the
groundwater

2 contamination, the localized versus the
regional flow

3 characteristics. We'll be adding to this as we get
more data,

4 more information, to further our understanding of
the

5 groundwater contamination at the site.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: In general, when do you
7 project to drop another one in Landfill 4 area,
another well?

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We don't have another one planned
9 right now, I don't believe.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: We wanted to get the landfill out
of

11 there first before we install another well because
of the

12 construction, and also to see how the system
responded, if

13 there was a response from that work.

14 Barry, I don't know if it's of use, additional
15 information, I just want to draw people's
attention to the

16 other two wells that were sampled. Those are
the drinking

17 water wells at Camp Bonneville and the FBI
site, which are

18 down on the valley floor, little blue Xs there.

They were not

19 detects.

20 From a regional perspective, I thought it might be

21 useful for people to see where they're located.

They're to

22 either side of the green arrow.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Are you missing one? There's one
24 down by Camp Killpack.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Right next to the southwesterly
edge

00064

1 of the arrow, you'll see another blue X. Right
next to it,

2 that's the FBI drinking water well. No, that's not
the FBI

3 well. Sorry.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: There's a drinking well at Camp
5 Bonneville, there's a drinking well at Camp
Killpack.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I meant the stars, not the Xs.

7 Sorry.

8 FRANK FUNK: Next subject.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Any more questions?

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'll try to keep providing updates
11 on this as we have more information.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Good map, Barry. Thank you very
13 much.

14 Community updates, Karen.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: Right now, let's see, it probably

16 just -- we'll go to check with Coleen on the
membership

17 committee, then just maybe check with Bud and see if
there's

18 been anything going on with that neighborhood
meeting,

19 anything like that.

20 I just wanted to keep it on the record that we're
21 moving along with the idea.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think Don Strick probably has an
23 update on that.

24 DON STRICK: The County is planning to host a

25 community meeting on July 30th. We will be
publicizing this

00065

1 in a newsletter we're sending out to the community,
which

2 should go out within a week or two. We'll also
advertise, but

3 we are certainly encouraging people to attend. We
hope to

4 have representatives from the Army and DOE
attending, as well.

5 We'll have a brief presentation that sort of gives
6 an overview of Camp Bonneville and the early
transfer process,

7 the plans for reuse of the property. We'll invite
audience

8 questions and concerns. We'll try to address any
that come

9 up.

10 I think certainly with all three agencies there, it
11 will be a very broad-based conversation.

12 BUD VAN CLEVE: You might introduce Jamie, since
13 that's why she's here.

14 DON STRICK: Jamie Damon is with Lawson &
15 Associates. Jamie is here -- they are going to be
helping us

16 with the public involvement component of Camp
Bonneville. She

17 came as an observer today. Hopefully we'll be here
next

18 session also. We'll talk at that time about a
community group

19 that we will be forming after sometime this fall,
assuming an

20 early transfer process.

21 Was there anything you wanted to add to that,
Jaime?

22 JAMIE DAMON: No. I'm busy trying to get my hands
23 around all the acronyms.

24 DON WASTLER: There is a list available.

25 JAMIE DAMON: Good.

00066

1 DON WASTLER: That tells you what all the acronyms
2 are. I think Karen will have it.

3 JAMIE DAMON: They just glide off your tongs. You
4 guys are well-versed.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Coleen.

6 COLEEN BROAD: The membership committee met back in
7 April, and there was a press release drafted. I
know it's

8 been passed on, but I haven't seen it in the paper.
It states

9 that we are actively looking for applications to be
considered

10 to be RAB members.

11 JENNIFER WALTERS: No, I never received one.

12 COLEEN BROAD: Things are being drafted and moving
13 forward. We have the members of the membership
committee that

14 will meet before the end of the month. That's
another

15 intention, to review any new applications.

16 I just got today the addendum to the bylaws that
was

17 dated August of 2001. I'm going to be reviewing
the bylaws to

18 see if they are in compliance with the RAB, what
did you call

19 it, regulations?

20 KAREN KINGSTON: The '98 guidelines.

21 COLEEN BROAD: I'm still looking for the '98
22 guidelines.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: You might want to talk with
Jennifer

24 off line.

25 COLEEN BROAD: Jennifer and I are on the same page.

00067

1 She knows what I would need. I just conveyed it to her today.

2 FRANK FUNK: As far as the bylaws are concerned,
3 where we're looking at a transfer in October possibly or a

4 transfer to the FBI, whichever, it seems to me like that's a

5 waste of committee time, to bring up the bylaws, which is four

6 months away.

7 COLEEN BROAD: You remember at the committee we
8 discussed that I would look at the bylaws and I would

9 highlight what we needed to bring up to compliance. At that

10 time it was just going to be my time, and I was volunteering

11 it. I didn't mind doing it. I just want to make sure that

12 we're right where we need to be. All we were going to do as a

13 committee is say that yes, change is necessary, or no, it's

14 not, and review the applications.

15 To be honest with you, I have been out of town, I
16 have small children that need me, and I am working

as quick as

17 I can on this.

18 FRANK FUNK: My point is, I don't think you need to
19 do it because it's going to disappear.

20 COLEEN BROAD: If it disappears, poof.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: I think also we're into the same
22 guise of Eric. Are you stopping anything because
it looks

23 like there's a transfer date in front of you?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Still full tilt.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: I think that is the established

00068

1 role of the RAB, to move along business as usual.
We'll see

2 if it's stops.

3 COLEEN BROAD: We will be as a committee convening
4 before July. You're on the committee, Frank.

5 FRANK FUNK: I'm on the committee, yeah. I make
6 lots of meetings. I'm not particularly going to
one just to

7 spin my wheels, you know.

8 KAREN KINGSTON: I think we can move on to the
9 question and answer period here.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Second page of the agenda.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Great questions. Karen gleaned
13 these and pulled them together, worked with
Jennifer. It's

14 great because it gives me an opportunity to think
through and

15 try to have an answer that makes sense rather than
16 ricocheting, thinking on my feet.

17 The first question in general has to do with what

18 documents are being written, where does the RAB
become more

19 involved, and a little bit of process.

20 One thing I want to say is it's taken me a while,

21 but I've heard loud and clear that members of this
RAB want to

22 be more involved with some of the technical
intricacies of how

23 we approach things. I'll explain how that's been
reflected

24 and how I've structured things.

25 Specifically the question was, "What are the work

00069

1 plans that the Army is working on right now?"
2 For everybody's understanding, a work plan is what
3 a -- is a document that you prepare for a field
crew to go out
4 and do something, to sample, to clean up something,
to do
5 something out in the field.
6 We're not preparing any of those documents at this
7 time. I wish we were because that would mean
there's work
8 pending. But what we are preparing at this time is
the
9 Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study
Investigation
10 documents. What those are, they pull together the
information
11 that is available on a particular area. In this
case, we're
12 in the process of developing preliminary draft RIs
for small
13 arms ranges and for Demo Site 2 and Demo Site 3,
then we're
14 writing something that we're referring to as a
groundwater
15 strategy, site-wide groundwater issues.
16 Gaynor, you all remember Gaynor, he's the one that's
17 actually writing these. My intention is, after we
have a
18 preliminary review by Ecology to make sure that we're
legally
19 sufficient, we share that with the RAB.
20 Now, the reason we want to share that, what the RI
21 does is it says, "This is what we know." It doesn't
make
22 decisions about what you do. It says, "This is what
we know."
23 Then it's evaluated for: Do you have enough
information to
24 start making decisions about the site, to choose a
remedy?
25 Then there's a process for choosing that remedy.
Or do you

00070

1 need to go back and get more information?
2 I've already got Gaynor under contract to come and
3 talk to you all about just that, to explain, "This
is what we
4 think we know. These are some of the identified
data gaps.
5 You guys might identify some additional data gaps
that might
6 not have occurred to us or Ecology." We go
through that
7 process, glean your feedback after you've had a
chance to look
8 at the drafts, then we go through the process of
finalizing
9 the RI.
10 After you've done that, you go into a feasibility
11 stage, which you write a document where you
evaluate what your
12 range of options are. Again, the RAB will have an
opportunity
13 to give input into the range of options, and maybe
you can
14 think of some other ones that we haven't, maybe you
like some
15 better than others.
16 After we go through that and you have a proposed
17 cleanup action, and remember I still have to work
through a
18 regulatory process, it goes out to a public
comment process
19 where everybody gets to look at it for 30
days, they get to
20 comment on it, we evaluate those comments,
move on or make
21 adjustments as needed.
22 Does that help a little bit, fit it together?
23 Christine?
24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Why are there no UXO
work
25 plans being written at the time?

00071

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Because we're still on the
2 characterization phase, trying to figure out:
Do we have
3 sufficient information? Do we have to go out
and do more
4 sampling? Do we not have to do more sampling?
What is the
5 future use of the property? We're just not
there yet.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are you on schedule with
the
7 order timeline?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The Remedial Investigation and
10 Feasibility Study investigation for UXO is due
this coming

11 fall.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: September.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: September.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah.

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'll be taking all the data we
16 currently have, putting it together, see where the
data gaps

17 are, if we need to go out and do more geophysical
work or

18 sampling.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's potentially
20 post-transfer?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Potentially post-transfer, yes.
22 Does that help a little bit? Does that sound
good?

23 Does it sound terrible?

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Hopefully it's in the minutes,
and

25 actually I don't remember who it was that sent me
that. Some

00072

1 of these questions come from outside the RAB.
2 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay. Actually, it touches base
3 also on the soil sampling. Again, it's finally
sunk into my
4 thick head that many members want to be more
involved in the
5 technical aspects of it. I already have the
company that was
6 doing that work under contract to come and talk to
you all, if
7 you want. They're in Atlanta, but they'd fly out
for this
8 meeting. In fact, I talked to them earlier today,
a fellow
9 named Jim Kennedy. The company's name is Atlanta
10 Environmental.
11 I've already paid them to come out here if the
group
12 wants them to, to brief the technical elements of
the work.
13 It doesn't tell you what it means, all it says is
that we
14 went, took these samples, these are the results we
have. The
15 RI knits that together to say, "Hey, this is what
we think it
16 tells us."
17 Would you like Gaynor and Atlanta Environmental to
18 come and talk to you?
19 COLEEN BROAD: Yes.
20 KAREN KINGSTON: I would think that
everybody would
21 need to get together to see if we have
questions.
22 ERIC WAEHLING: It's available. They're
already
23 under contract to do so. The Landfill 4 contract,
it's
24 already been contractually specified that they have
to come
25 and do that or it needs to be made available. It's
there

00073

1 should you choose to use it.

2 BUD VAN CLEVE: This follows along with some of our
3 requests in the past for information. While we
admit we may

4 not understand all the technical parts of it, we
think we're

5 entitled to know the process and how it's arrived
at.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. In the past I've been given
7 a very strong message by other members of the RAB
that they

8 didn't appreciate that, that they thought that was
a waste of

9 their time. This is what I'm proposing that we do
for these

10 studies.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think as much information as you
12 can give us, I think we're entitled to hear it.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: But in what forum? Would you like
14 these people to come and brief you? Do you prefer
to read

15 thick documents?

16 BUD VAN CLEVE: Can he talk in laymen's terms
17 instead of a textbook?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: How do you think Gaynor did last
19 time?

20 BUD VAN CLEVE: He did fine.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: I think he's very good. He is
22 writing these documents.

23 BUD VAN CLEVE: We're not looking for a scientific
24 encyclopedia.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: I think two years ago the RAB made

00074

1 just a monumental change as far as the majority now
want -- is

2 not just sitting in any longer. We actually want
to be

3 involved and advised according to what Congress set
this RAB

4 up to do.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: My proposed forum, might that be a
6 good way to try it?

7 KAREN KINGSTON: If you give me a chance to pole
8 everybody, I can get an idea of what they all want.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: We don't need to make a decision
10 now. I'm saying it is available. They've already
been

11 contracted and paid for. It's available to you
all.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Christine is next.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Eric, I don't know if it's
my

14 sinuses or what, but I'm in a fog. My understanding
is that

15 UXO cleanup is the most costly part of cleanup.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: For Bonneville.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: For Bonneville specific. Is
18 there any way you can explain to me how post-
transfer you can

19 allot a certain amount of money to a transferee to
clean up

20 the most costly aspect of the site correctly?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Explain how we do it?

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Explain how you can assess
23 the amount of money prior to your understanding of
what UXO is

24 out there.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: How can you legitimize an
estimate?

00075

1 Clark County says they'll take \$20 million to do
it. How can

2 you legitimize that when you don't have it
characterized?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: I can tell you the process. What
4 you do, obviously you know -- you only know what
you know.

5 You look at the information that you have available
to you to

6 date. Some of it you have a great deal of
confidence in, some

7 of it you don't have as much confidence in.

8 What you do is you build a series of assumptions.

9 The analogy I use in my mind to simplify it is just
like

10 building a house. When you start estimating how
much money

11 you need from a bank to build a home, you make
certain

12 assumptions. You know on an assumption how much per
square

13 foot on average it costs you to build a house with
these types

14 of furnishings, finishing materials.

15 It's very much like a construction project. You

16 build assumptions just like you do for a road.

17 Does every house cost \$100 per square foot to
build?

18 No, sometimes it's a little higher, sometimes
it's a little

19 lower. But you build those series of
assumptions.

20 You're absolutely right, there's opportunity for

21 inaccuracies. How do we deal with that potential
uncertainty?

22 The way we do that is two things: One, we build
in

23 contingencies. You take a conservative approach.
What you

24 also do is you purchase insurance. The Army
purchases

25 insurance on behalf of the County to cover
contingencies that

00076

1 if you have not provided sufficient funding, that
the

2 insurance company would provide funding for the
cost overrun.

3 What you're doing is, for a fee, you're
transferring

4 the risk of insufficient funding to an insurer.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Your analogy of the house,
if

6 you have to build a house and you don't
know if your

7 two-by-four or four-by-eight sheet of
plywood is in

8 San Francisco or New York, you have no idea where
these

9 materials are and how much material you're going to
need, but

10 you're building a house on presumptions that
there's a certain

11 amount of UXO when you took your nails and looked
at where you

12 can find your nails. Do you understand what I'm
saying?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: I do. I understand what you do

14 have. I think what we do know is we know where we
believe we

15 have a high probability of finding UXO. More
importantly what

16 we have is we have a Reuse Plan which tells us
where people

17 are going to be encouraged and actively invited to
interact

18 with the land. We have an idea of what that
intersection will

19 be. We know the approximate acreages and areas that
those

20 activities are going to occur.

21 We have made estimates based on assumptions, but

22 they're pretty sound. I feel they're pretty
reasonably sound

23 assumptions as to the areas of where the potential
UXO can be.

24 We are, based on the knowledge we have, making
estimates as to

25 what the density of those UXOs will be.

00077

1 I will tell you from going through this process,
2 it's primarily an acre-driven cost. The cost
differential

3 between surface, two-foot, four-foot, one UXO, 10
UXO, 100 UXO

4 per acre is not that significant. The big cost
driver is

5 acres. Everything else after that is mere
percentages.

6 If it's \$5,000 an acre, \$10,000 an acre, \$20,000 an
7 acre, depending on terrain and site condition,
whether you're

8 going two feet down or four feet down, the
incremental cost

9 difference is not that significant.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: As time has been passing, I
11 understand the target areas and certain pieces of
ordnance

12 found contribute to new let's say impact areas of
that certain

13 ordnance.

14 Now, under that scope, I might assume that might
15 continue for another two-year period until you've
really

16 characterized the site.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I don't understand how this
19 can happen in two and a half months.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, that's where the insurance
21 companies come in. Insurers will look at the
information we

22 have available to us. I'm speaking of cost overrun
insurance.

23 If you don't have sufficient funding, insurers will
look at

24 the data that we have available to us, everything
that we

25 have, and they themselves will make their own
decision as to

00078

1 whether they can accept the risk of writing that
policy to the

2 County.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How can that insurance
4 company assess the risk? I know you're not the
insurance

5 company.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: You're absolutely right. I'm not
7 the insurance company. I have yet to talk to the
insurance

8 companies. I'll be honest. That's a concern we
all have, is

9 do we have enough information for it to be insured?

10 The Army is interested we find an insurer because,
11 first of all, we want to make sure there is
somebody that's

12 willing to insure it. Secondarily, we're the ones
paying for

13 it. We're paying for the policy. We want to know
what that

14 cost will be. And we don't know.

15 This early transfer can't occur without that
16 insurance. Without that component, it can't
happen.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Have you found potential
18 insurance companies?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: The County is in the process now.
20 We review them to make sure they have adequate
bonding. I'm

21 not a lawyer, but there's all that process you go
through to

22 make sure your insurance company is going to hold
up. They're

23 big ones like AGI (sic). They're not little fly-by-
night

24 companies.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Ian.

00079

1 IAN RAY: Christine covered a lot of the questions
2 very well. Somewhere along the line, someone is
going to sit
3 down with accounting pads and a pencil, perhaps use
this chart
4 that you gave us one time where it shows 10-to-1
disparities
5 of cost-per-acre depending on whether it's sloped,
wooded, so
6 forth.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

8 IAN RAY: Someone is going to sit down with a
pencil
9 and paper and work that out.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

11 IAN RAY: Is this board going to ever get to look
at
12 how those estimates are made, the actual papers?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: The actual papers, probably not.

14 IAN RAY: Why?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Because of contractual issues,
being

16 able to bid out the work in the future. You have
to worry

17 about basically spoiling the bath. I forget what
term the

18 contracting officer used. You have to be careful
so you can

19 get a competitive bid from your contractors doing
the work.

20 You can't let them know how much money you have.

Lo and

21 behold, the bid is going to come in at exactly how
much money

22 you have, when potentially it could come in lower.

23 I'm not a contracts person. I've asked the same

24 question myself. I've been told the business
element, the

25 actual dollar figures, are not shared.

00080

1 Now, if you want to have someone come and talk
about

2 the models, how the cost estimates and line items
all fit

3 together, we could do that.

4 IAN RAY: That would help. We could do some rough
5 things on our own. I'd like to go through this
chart and the

6 Reuse Plan.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: They're far more detailed than
that

8 chart.

9 IAN RAY: Let's see the detailed chart.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Coleen.

11 COLEEN BROAD: I'm going to go back to the
12 insurance. I just want to understand the process.
13 The Army is not actually contacting the insurance
14 agencies; the County is contacting the agencies.

Then will

15 they present to you like two or three companies
that are

16 willing to offer this type of coverage?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not directly involved in the
18 insurance element of it. But my understanding is
that the

19 Army and the County are actually working together
in finding

20 insurers because really when it comes down to it,
the Army is

21 the customer of the insurance because we're
paying, but the

22 County is the beneficiary of the policy. We work
together on

23 that. But the County is actively involved in
finding that

24 insurance company.

25 COLEEN BROAD: So the money you will pay for the

00081

1 premium for the insurance, is that above and
beyond what the
2 County gets?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. It's factored into the
total

4 package. It has to be a known cost. We have to
have a

5 policy, an actual policy, prior to the transfer.

6 COLEEN BROAD: Are you aware of any policies that
7 have been written in this nature?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm told that there are policies
9 that have been written in this nature. Again,
I'm not

10 involved with insurance. I couldn't say I
personally have

11 seen them.

12 COLEEN BROAD: Thank you.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: One of the things we checked
into,

14 some of the insurance companies that we could
look into, and

15 one of the things we were told by AGI (sic) might
have been

16 one of them, one major cost overrun, and that's the
end of the

17 insurance, that they cancel.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know about that.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: They gave me a base that they've
20 done that on. For instance, there is already a
small arms

21 range that has been cleaned up that's pretty much
like our

22 small arms range. It was a little bit smaller,
I believe.

23 That was estimated, it came in, the estimation was
\$50 million

24 to remediate that, which is pretty much the whole
package that

25 is being offered to us in exchange for it to be a
park.

00082

1 If there is one cost overrun in one of these work
2 plans, what does the Army do after that point? Do
you have an

3 agreement with Clark County so if they can't get
insurance

4 after a major cost overrun, that you will self-
insure?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: First of all, I want to say we've
6 actually got quite a ways off topic from the
question. I can

7 answer that as quickly as I can.

8 The agreements haven't been finalized with Clark
9 County. I can't answer the question about what
happens if

10 there's one cost overrun. I know it's in the
Army's interest

11 to make sure that the probability of a cost
overrun is

12 unlikely. We want to make sure that they
have more than

13 enough money to cover it. You pay more
for that.

14 But in finality, I can say that
ultimately the

15 Federal Government is always still on the
hook. We put it

16 there; ultimately we're responsible for
it.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: I don't have a problem
moving on

18 then.

19 FRANK FUNK: I don't want to change the
subject, but

20 I'd like to move out of here. I've got
something I have to

21 do. Are we going to have a meeting in
July?

22 COLEEN BROAD: June.

23 FRANK FUNK: It is June now.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: He's asking about
scheduling the

25 next meeting.

00083

1 COLEEN BROAD: Sorry.
2 ERIC WAEHLING: July or August?
3 IAN RAY: July.
4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I think in July.
5 ERIC WAEHLING: Just asking.
6 KAREN KINGSTON: Second Wednesday, is
that right?
7 Do you have it arranged?
8 JENNIFER WALTERS: For here.
9 KAREN KINGSTON: Second Wednesday.
10 ERIC WAEHLING: That would be July 9th.
Seems just
11 around the corner.
12 FRANK FUNK: Same location?
13 JENNIFER WALTERS: Right.
14 ERIC WAEHLING: That's vacation time
for a lot of
15 people.
16 BUD VAN CLEVE: August isn't any
better.
17 VALERIE LANE: That's what I was
thinking.
18 FRANK FUNK: Your insurance thing,
you can talk
19 about that all night, but I'm going
to leave.
20 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm not sure what will have changed
21 between now and then from my perspective, just so you
know.
22 VALERIE LANE: You might know more about the FBI.
23 ERIC WAEHLING: We may, we may not.
24 VALERIE LANE: Roll the dice.
25 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Didn't you say something was

00084

1 going on June 20th?

2 ERIC WAEHLING: We're meeting with the contractors
3 that are bidding on the Landfill 4 project.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Even if it's a short meeting, there
5 are things.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay. I'll be on vacation the week
7 before, but all right. So July 9th. Going once,
going twice.

8 Sure you don't want to do it in August?

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Nice try, Eric.

10 DON WASTLER: We could have one next week, if you
11 like.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay, July.

13 Question No. 2.

14 DON WASTLER: It sounds to me like with the
15 questions that everybody is asking, the answers
you're giving

16 on this cost estimation, you're pretty much throwing
darts in

17 the dark.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't agree.

19 DON WASTLER: They keep coming back asking you if
20 you have the funding, but it doesn't sound like you
have a

21 definite anything to go by to make an estimate.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Well, we have been
working on

23 estimates, and we do. We feel that we
have sufficient

24 knowledge to make the estimate. As I
said, the insurance will

25 cover the contingencies.

00085

1 KAREN KINGSTON: One thing I would like
to say is I

2 think one of the things I want Clark
County to know

3 especially, one of our reasons we press this issue
really

4 isn't anything to do with Clark County's transfer,
et cetera,

5 but I think there's a general consensus among the
community

6 board here that we want whoever the transfer is to
receive as

7 much cleanup money as they possibly can.

8 So we have from the beginning pressed all of these

9 issues about cleanup and contamination and having
the Army

10 look into different things just purely so that when
it is

11 transferred, the largest amount of dollars
available will go

12 with it, not a low ball. That's probably the
biggest thing

13 we're fighting. I just wanted you to know when
you hear all

14 this argument going on, it's not directional.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: The Army's intention is to
transfer

16 an appropriate amount of money.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Yeah, well, someone tried to sell

18 me a bag of chips that had a warning on it. This
is the same

19 understanding.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: No. 2. The question was -- I

21 believe the question had to do with, "Has the Army
obligated

22 the money for the Camp Bonneville transfer?"

23 The answer is no, because we haven't come to

24 finality on how much that would be, is the
transfer going to

25 occur, all that kind of stuff.

00086

1 As far as the schedule for the process, the Army,
as

2 we all talked about, one of the reasons why this
opportunity

3 is in front of us is the money is available this
year. We

4 need to accomplish this FY. The last day of the
FY is

5 September 30th. If it happens, it will have to
happen

6 sometime before September 30th.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are you prepared to do it
in

8 two weeks or the 29th?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: What do you mean in two weeks?
How

10 close are we?

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Honestly, it will be closer to
the

13 29th than it is in two weeks. We have a lot of
work to do,

14 some of which is a public process, public
component of it.

15 With a suitability to transfer document, early
transfer

16 document, there's a bunch of stuff that needs to
happen.

17 No. 3, the question was an update on the sentry
18 wells. One of the wells had a detection of five
ppb. What

19 was the designation of that well, LC-MW-05-D.

20 First of all, I think there might be a little

21 confusion as to which well had the -- that we
showed a

22 possibility of ammonium perchlorate detection. I
handed out

23 last time a field report that was submitted by
the Army to

24 Ecology. Under MOTCA we're required to give them
a field

25 report. The intention of what I shared with you was
submitted

00087

1 to Ecology to fulfill that.
2 The well MW-05-D, although it was part of the
3 boundary area of wells in this paper, that well
actually is
4 located immediately adjacent to the crater that we
believe is
5 Demo Site 3.
6 KAREN KINGSTON: Just point to it.
7 ERIC WAEHLING: Good point.
8 KAREN KINGSTON: What people were assuming is the
9 well is going out on 68th, that one of those wells
came up
10 with that.
11 ERIC WAEHLING: It wasn't one of those wells. It
12 was actually a well in the general area, but it was
up here by
13 this crater that we're investigating (indicating).
14 KAREN KINGSTON: The crater is?
15 ERIC WAEHLING: Right here (indicating), Demo
16 Site 3.
17 KAREN KINGSTON: Demo Site 3. So that is still
18 within a close boundary of being off-site.
19 ERIC WAEHLING: It's in close proximity. I'll talk
20 about that in a second, tell you what we know, what
we don't
21 know. It's not one of the wells right on the fence
line.
22 The reason it was included in that is we have a
23 circle, a large crater, at Demo Site 3. We
installed five
24 wells around that - four shallow and one deep. The
reason we
25 installed the deep well was that it gives us a data
point to

00088

1 triangulate for groundwater flow directions, to
generate these
2 maps that Barry has provided today.
3 There were actually two wells in that area that we
4 detected something. As is mentioned in that field
report that
5 I handed out last time, and I talked to before, we
had
6 reason -- there are issues with that well, those
two wells,
7 potentially with the laboratory that did those
reports. We
8 had questions.
9 Our first step in resolving those questions was
we
10 went out and took samples again from those two
wells and we
11 sent them off to two independent labs, two
different labs.
12 Those labs reported non-detection. Hopefully
you all still
13 have that handout I gave last time. It spells
out what we
14 did, how we did it, what the results were.
15 The ongoing plan is, that doesn't actually solve
16 anything for us. It gives us a hint, but doesn't
solve
17 anything. What it means is we need to continue
monitoring all
18 the wells on Bonneville, to include these, to see:
Was it an
19 issue with the lab? Was it really there and it
shows up
20 seasonally? What's going on? That's one of the
questions
21 that we have. One of the ways to resolve that
is ongoing
22 monitoring to see what shows up over time.
23 KAREN KINGSTON: So we can recommend to you then
24 that you take this as an indicator that there is
a possible
25 seasonal higher level of ammonium perchlorate in
particular,

00089

1 because that's what we're talking about, but that
you will use

2 that in your findings?

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Actually, I wouldn't take it as
5 there's a possible seasonal fluctuation. The QA on
those

6 samples, some of its constituents, like the DO in
those

7 samples, were way, way, way out of line. I would
say probably

8 there was a QA issue, not a seasonal fluctuation.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: What was the name of the lab?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: It was done by a government
11 organization called CHPM, which is the Center for
Health and

12 Preventive Maintenance. Excuse me, medicine, not
maintenance.

13 I'll be honest. My team, we're not very happy with
14 it. We're not happy with the data. We're not
happy with the

15 quality of the report. We're trying to figure out
what we can

16 do with it.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: This was a State-certified lab?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: It's Corps of Engineers certified
19 lab.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Corps certified?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: They're also EPA certified, I
22 believe.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: EPA? Is that right, Sean?

24 SEAN SHELDRAKE: I don't know.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: We're not happy with it.

00090

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Of course, you're not.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: We would never be done anyway as
far

3 as only a single sampling event. You need a
minimum of at

4 least two years' worth of data.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: Where was the sample sent to?

6 Which satellite office?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: They're back east in Edgewood,
8 Maryland. The confirmational samples?

9 KAREN KINGSTON: Yes.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: They were sent to private labs.

It

11 went to CHPM. It was a CHPM lab.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: Where?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Back in Maryland, Edgewood. I
14 believe it was back in Maryland.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: So can we get that from you?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: It will be part of the RI report.

17 That will all be part of it. I can see if I can
find the

18 date, the address. I don't know that I even have
it.

19 Tom?

20 TOM EATON: If you determine there were problems
21 with an EPA-certified lab, would you make sure to

report that
22 to our lab-certification program.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know for sure that they
are.

24 TOM EATON: If you conclude there were some issues

25 there, poor data analysis issues, it is an EPA-
certified lab,

00091

1 let our certification program know that.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: I will.

3 As far as the confirmational samples, they were
sent

4 off to Severn Trent Laboratories, Inc., and
Analytical

5 Resources, Inc., which is ARI. Both labs are
certified by

6 Washington State Department of Ecology.

7 With that said, hopefully that clarifies a little
8 bit. I've pretty much spelled it out, that we
need to

9 continue looking at those wells to see what they
tell us, but

10 they aren't the wells that are on the fence line.

11 DON WASTLER: Have you contacted the people that
12 live right on the border and possibly -- are they
aware of

13 what you just found?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: We're not sure what we just found.

15 The other wells that are on the boundary haven't
shown

16 anything.

17 DON WASTLER: They're still all clean; there's no
18 problem, right?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. But, again, with that said,
20 that is results from a lab we don't have a whole lot
of

21 confidence in at the moment. That's why we need to
sample

22 again.

23 Should we see something there, of course, that's the
24 whole reason they're there, to give us an indication
if we

25 have a problem.

00092

1 IAN RAY: Do you believe that that five parts per
2 billion that was detected at Demo Site 3, do you
believe that

3 could have been a false positive, like it might not
have even

4 been perchlorates?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: One of the theories is they might
6 have had a contaminated container or the laboratory
equipment

7 wasn't properly decontaminated.

8 IAN RAY: It's kind of a disturbing thing to know
9 that the source is a couple of miles up the creek
here, and

10 you're detecting the bad stuff down here at the
corner.

11 That's pretty disturbing.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. Most likely the source
would

13 be that crater.

14 GREG JOHNSON: Actually that demo area would
15 actually be the source.

16 IAN RAY: Right there locally?

17 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: If it's there. Of course, we hope
19 it's not, and we continue to endeavor to resolve
whether it is

20 there or not.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Would you be able to tell me what
22 month that was taken?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: That was in January.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: That was in January?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

00093

1 Now, No. 4. The question had to do with talking to
2 not only schools but emergency responders about the
hazards.

3 I'm assuming the hazards of UXO at Camp Bonneville.
4 We've actually had a couple meetings historically
5 with the 911 center in Vancouver as well as a
meeting with

6 Clark County. I believe there was a sheriff's
representative

7 there talking about the issues at Camp Bonneville.

8 911, that briefing that we had with them, was to
9 inform them as to what was out there, but also we
were moving

10 in to doing some work. We briefed and discussed and
11 coordinated what emergency procedures would be in
the unlikely

12 event there's an accident, should somebody get hurt
out there.

13 Who calls whom? Where are you going to meet them?

All that

14 kind of stuff. That was done in '98.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: '98?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. Ian Larson was the BEC at that
17 time.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Don't you feel the difference in
19 the characterization and what you know about Camp
Bonneville

20 now in 2003 is dramatically different than what you
knew in

21 1998?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: I would agree that we know more
now

23 than we did in '98. The standing procedures,
though, wouldn't

24 change. In that case, the procedure, if there was
an

25 emergency, is somebody would meet them at the gate
and escort

00094

1 them to the area.

2 Perhaps it would be a good idea to revisit. It's
3 been a long time ago, five years ago. Maybe we
need to

4 revisit with those organizations to refamiliarize
everybody

5 with the procedures, things like that.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: And schools?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: The question of schools, we
haven't

8 done any work with the schools. As part of a
community

9 education program, it may be a good idea to work
with schools

10 and have an education program. Maybe it's not. I
can't tell

11 you. It has been done elsewhere. It wouldn't
surprise me at

12 all if as part of the redevelopment package, the
community

13 education element, there is a schools program. But
there

14 isn't anything right now.

15 LOREN CARLSON: Have you thought about the concern

16 if you do inform the schools of what's going on,
there brings

17 more attention to the site that it might not really
need?

18 KAREN KINGSTON: I think the -- I'm holding off on
19 the tape. I have a videotape that was made at
another base

20 that was specifically designed for the schools
within the

21 proximity. It goes on the premise nowadays that
teaching a

22 child, "When you see it, don't touch it, don't
get anywhere

23 near it, back away, go get an adult"
is a far better safeguard

24 for an injury to a child that could
cause death. I do see

25 your point, especially out in the
rural area, with as

00095

1 investigative as the kids are out
where we live.

2 I think the general safety contention
nowadays,

3 especially being dictated by the Government and
OSHA, is

4 teaching the kids "don't touch it, get away from
it." One of

5 these times when we don't have much going, I'll
bring the film

6 in that I have to review it.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: That's a community decision.

8 LOREN CARLSON: I think caution needs to be used on
9 that. Maybe you go to the schools, you give them
the overall

10 idea of the precaution. Thinking as a 15-year-old
kid, if you

11 bring attention to something, you know you're not
supposed to

12 be out there... A lot of community isn't really
aware of

13 what's going on out there, it brings more attention,
it will

14 bring more curious kids out there. Might be a
problem.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: Information is empowerment. You
16 have to somehow fit this into the whole picture. It
is a

17 serious danger out there.

18 LOREN CARLSON: You can give them information
19 without site specifics.

20 DON WASTLER: What he's saying is not all of them
21 are mommy's little angel.

22 LOREN CARLSON: I have a couple of them.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Congress did spell out that the
24 schools -- it is written actually that you will
contact the

25 schools. It's written.

00096

1 ERIC WAEHLING: As part of the transfer?

2 KAREN KINGSTON: No. That you are supposed to have
3 a public safety program going, and that you will be
contacting

4 the schools. That's written.

5 At some point, probably that's something we can
6 visit down the line.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll have to see what the Army's
8 policy is on that. I didn't know there was
Congressional

9 mandate to do that.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: There is.

11 VALERIE LANE: There's probably three different
12 school districts. South side is Camas, on 232nd is
Evergreen,

13 and I bet you Hockinson is a whole 'nother school
district.

14 DON WASTLER: Right.

15 KAREN KINGSTON: Right.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: That may be an excellent idea.

17 VALERIE LANE: Three different school
districts.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: I might point out
that Commander

19 Warren right behind you is the new commander for
the central

20 precinct for the sheriff's office. I invited him
out here

21 because I felt he should be updated on what's going
on out

22 here.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: I had the pleasure of meeting him
24 before we started.

25 BUD VAN CLEVE: Good.

00097

1 ERIC WAEHLING: We are way over time.
2 Does the Army have an obligation to inform the
3 Health Department of elevated levels that might be
detected on

4 Camp Bonneville?

5 As you heard earlier today, Department of Ecology
is

6 in communication with the Health Department about
what's being

7 found on Bonneville, its potential impacts off the
8 installation.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: One question about that. Do you
10 contact Camas? One of the RAB members contacted
Camas.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I haven't contacted Camas.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: They seem to be unaware.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Okay.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: Thank you. Last one.

15 JEROEN KOK: I'll take that one. I'll take a stab
16 at it.

17 I did some web-based research, had a tough time
18 finding anything that was clear and easy to
understand,

19 especially at this hour of the evening.

20 I did find a document that does give a brief

21 description and start to highlight some of the
differences

22 between a public benefit conveyance and an economic
23 development conveyance.

24 Essentially, the public benefit conveyance is

25 intended by Congress to ensure that the end use
serves a

00098

1 public interest. A lot of conveyances that fall
into this

2 category are parks and recreation end uses,
historic monument

3 end uses, and also education and public health end
uses.

4 I think, as most of you know, the County was
5 pursuing a public benefit conveyance. The National
Park

6 Service was the sponsor of that conveyance method.
They were,

7 by law, required to be kind of the pass-through
agency so that

8 the Army would pass the title through the National
Park

9 Service to Clark County through that method.

10 As the County started to evaluate the potential for
11 an early transfer, I think both the County and the
Army

12 recognized that the time constraints involved in
achieving the

13 conveyance by the end of the fiscal year required a
more

14 expedient method of transfer. Both the Army and
the County

15 agreed that an economic development conveyance
through the

16 Office of Economic Adjustment was the more
appropriate method

17 to convey the property. At this point, the County
is pursuing

18 an economic development conveyance through the OEA
with the

19 support of the Army.

20 I don't know if Commissioner Stanton or Brian

21 Vincent have anything to add to that.

22 BRIAN VINCENT: No, it's pretty simple.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Does that open the door,
post

24 transfer, to pretty much do what the County pleases
regarding

25 what they consider the economic development of the
community?

00099

1 JEROEN KOK: The Reuse Plan doesn't change by
2 switching it from public benefit conveyance to
economic

3 development conveyance. We'll have a limited
amount of money

4 to implement a cleanup plan to implement the Reuse
Plan. None

5 of that's going to change.

6 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: My understanding of economic
7 development is that it can -- you can cement the
whole place

8 over under that. They have other bases they've
paved over.

9 JEROEN KOK: Typically economic development
10 conveyances are for subdivisions, light
industrial

11 developments, where a community is looking for
economic

12 development opportunities as a result of the
transfer. It

13 frees up land to bring jobs to an area.

14 Certainly the regional park will provide some

15 primary and secondary economic benefits to Clark
County, but

16 the Reuse Plan to implement it as a regional park
does not

17 change.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Aren't the guidelines for an

19 economic development conveyance specifically
saying you have

20 to have X amount of employees that you're going
to be

21 utilizing with the property, X amount of money
that has to be

22 generated off the property in order to even
qualify for an

23 EDC?

24 JEROEN KOK: There does have to be a baseline

25 economic impact as a result of the reuse. I
think we've been

00100

1 able to demonstrate to that point that the
Reuse Plan as a

2 regional plan will meet those baseline
requirements.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: What are the number one, two
4 and even three points of the Reuse Plan that you
expect to

5 generate these funds? Last I saw, parks are really
a loser on

6 the funding. They don't generate enough to really
keep them

7 rolling.

8 JEROEN KOK: Right. It depends on what type of
park

9 you're looking at.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you have any of those?

11 JEROEN KOK: I would say that camping is probably
12 the primary generator for money on this site, that
camping

13 fees will bring in income, and also generate the
other

14 positive economic impacts. You have people coming
to the area

15 that are going to camp. They're going to buy
groceries,

16 they're going to go out and visit the area, those
kind of

17 things.

18 KAREN KINGSTON: Would also we presume that National

19 Parks bailed on this and that's what switched it
over to

20 economic?

21 JEROEN KOK: I hadn't heard that.

22 COLEEN BROAD: Who made the decision to make the
23 switch?

24 JEROEN KOK: I think it was a mutual decision with
25 the County and Army, again, in order to expedite the
early

00101

1 transfer, maximize the chance of it happening
successfully by

2 the end of the fiscal year.

3 COLEEN BROAD: You're saying you're going to do the
4 EDC in accordance with the LRA, that after you have
the land,

5 after it is transferred, what contractually are you
obligated

6 to perform to the LRA or could you just blacktop
it?

7 JEROEN KOK: You mean the Reuse Plan?

8 COLEEN BROAD: Yes.

9 JEROEN KOK: I think we're obligated. We've had
10 this discussion before, and Eric has done a good
job of saying

11 the Reuse Plan, that the money dedicated to the
cleanup of the

12 site is to implement the Reuse Plan, and nothing
else.

13 Certainly to do a high level of development, well
above and

14 beyond the Reuse Plan, would take a whole lot
more money to

15 clean up the site to be able to do.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Does Battle Ground Lake,
the

17 other tent camping areas - you're Parks and Rec -
-

18 JEROEN KOK: I am.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: -- currently are they
20 generating funds?

21 JEROEN KOK: They generate revenue. I don't
recall

22 specifically how those state parks do as far as
meeting their

23 operating budget.

24 COLEEN BROAD: I was going to say, generating

25 revenue and being in the red or the black are two
different

00102

1 things.

2 JEROEN KOK: A lot has to do with the scale,
3 attractions, all of that. The County currently
doesn't have

4 any camping facilities, so we don't have any
direct experience

5 with that locally.

6 VALERIE LANE: The day use at Battle Ground Lake
has

7 just made a lot of money because they charge \$5
for every rig

8 that pulls in there. They made like \$1100 the
month of

9 January from the horse people for riding their
horse around

10 that tiny park.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: We have extended way past our
12 original conclusion. I'm still driving home
tonight.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question real quick. I
14 understand there's surveyors going out to the
camp. You

15 didn't report on that. What are they going out
there for?

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Surveyors? Clark County is
17 surveying the boundary, the fence line. That's a
Clark County

18 effort. It's not an Army effort. We need a
legal description

19 of what the property is so that we can transfer
it. That

20 requires establishing boundaries.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Any other updates you can tell
us

22 happening out there ongoing?

23 GREG JOHNSON: I have one that's not really Army
24 related.

25 Department of Ecology, about a month ago, we sent

00103

1 out a request for proposal to about 12 or 13 UXO
contractors

2 for doing quality assurance work. I'm in the
process right

3 now of kind of going through them. We want to
make sure they

4 have no affiliation with the Army Corps of
Engineers or BRAC

5 or the County or anyone else.

6 What we're going to use them for is to do quality

7 assurance of the geophysical work that's going to
be done out

8 there because we're anticipating having a lot of
that done so

9 we can tell if they're getting eight out of 10
items or if

10 they're getting seven out of 10 items, whatever.

11 We don't have a company picked out yet. We're
still

12 in the process of doing that. Probably going to be
another

13 month or two.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a memorandum here from the
15 Assistant Secretary of the Army. It is dated 6/5,
this month.

16 It says he is directing the services, Army is one of
them, to

17 conduct a record search for past and current
perchlorate use

18 and sample to ascertain perchlorate occurrence at
our

19 installations, both active and closed, as well as
formerly

20 used defense sites. He's directing that to be done.

21 Are you aware of this? Are you doing this?

22 ERIC WAEHLING: We've already done that. It is
23 called the Army Environmental Center.

24 KAREN KINGSTON: Is there a website that shows what
25 the perchlorate base is?

00104

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Not to my knowledge, but there may
2 be. I don't know of any.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: If you hear of one, will you pass
4 it on?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I will. I don't know if there's
one
6 out there. These have already been reported. As a
matter of

7 fact, we did it a year ago, to meet that. I'm
always getting

8 queries in response to that.

9 Shall we adjourn? Anyone want to make a motion?

10 COLEEN BROAD: I motion we adjourn.

11 JEROEN KOK: Second.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you everybody. We'll see you
13 on the 9th.

14 (Meeting adjourned.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00105

1

CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)

) ss.

4 County of Clark)

5

6 I, Jaime S. Morrocco, a Notary Public for
Washington, certify that the Camp Bonneville
Restoration

7 Advisory Board Meeting here occurred at the time and
place set

forth in the caption hereof; that at said time and
place I

8 reported in Stenotype all proceedings had in the
foregoing

matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to
typewriting 9 under my direction; and the
foregoing transcript, pages 2 to

70 both inclusive, contains a full, true and
correct record of

10 all such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had
and of the

whole thereof.

11 I further advise you that as a matter of firm
policy, the Stenographic notes of this transcript will be

12 destroyed

two years from the date appearing on this
Certificate unless

13 notice is received otherwise from any party or
counsel hereto

on or before said date;

14 Witness my hand and notarial seal at Vancouver,
Washington, this 15th day of June, 2003.

15

16

17

Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR,

CM

18

Notary Public for

Washington

19

20

21

22

23
24
25