

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

August 14, 2002
7:00 p.m. to 9:09 p.m.
Fire Station 88
6701 N.E. 147th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington

COURT REPORTER: Sarah C. Thomas, RMR, CSR

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

3

MR. WAEHLING: Good evening everybody. Thank you very much for coming out tonight on a beautiful evening.

4

5

Before we go around the room and introduce ourselves, I would like to introduce you to a new member of my group, Jennifer Walters. Jennifer Walters is filling the shoes of Connie Lee. If you remember a few meetings back, Connie was not going to be joining us any longer. She is still working at Fort Lewis, but her husband has taken a job overseas and it was too difficult to work the schedule. Luckily, Jennifer is stepping into her shoes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

I'm sure you will all be working with her and look forward to working. This is her third day on the job, so you have to be very nice to her.

16

17

So I would like to start by going around the table and introducing ourselves. Then we will start the meeting.

18

19

MR. WASTLER: Don Wastler, live here. Grew up here. Member of the Restoration Advisory Board.

20

21

MR. JOHNSON: Gregory Johnson, Department of Ecology.

22

23

MR. WAEHLING: Eric Waehling, U.S. Army, Camp Bonneville.

24

25

MS. WALTERS: Jennifer Walters, Fort Lewis.

MS. SUTHERLAND: Christina Sutherland, RAB,

1 neighbor.

2 MS. LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB, neighbor.

3 MR. OVERBAY: Bruce Overbay, RAB.

4 MR. KOK: Jeroen Kok, Clark County.

5 MR. VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, neighborhood
6 association and RAB.

7 MR. RAY: Ian Ray, RAB, local neighbor.

8 MR. MAURER: Chris Maurer, Department of Ecology.

9 MR. NELSON: Mike Nelson, Corps of Engineers,
10 Seattle.

11 MR. WAEHLING: Thank you very much.

12 As always, tonight's agenda is flexible. We can
13 take it any direction that we want. We sent it out as
14 guidance. We will start with open community issues.

15 One question I have -- I just wanted to make sure --
16 did people get the last copy of the RAB minutes in the mail?
17 Everybody get a copy of the agenda? I want to make sure we
18 deal with any issues associated with that.

19 Are there any open discussion for community issues
20 before we start in on any of the items?

21 MR. RAY: Thanks for the timely delivery of the
22 minutes this month. It helped a lot.

23 MR. WAEHLING: Good. We will hopefully continue
24 with that.

25 Are there any other past issues?

1 Ian.

2 MR. RAY: Power lines out of the trees. I wasn't
3 here last month. Two months ago there was an issue about
4 power lines in the trees and the fire danger. Is that
5 progressing somehow?

6 MR. WAEHLING: It is, as a matter of fact. Two
7 things. One, it turns out I was only partly correct in my
8 understanding of where the power was on and where it was not,
9 where it was turned off on the installations. It turns out
10 that some of the power has been turned off, but because of the
11 location of the two drinking water wells and needing to supply
12 well power to the FBI range, and because of the way its system
13 is designed, it hasn't been shut off to all the buildings that
14 aren't currently occupied.

15 So I submitted a work order to Fort Lewis to have
16 the power distribution system looked at, and to isolate all
17 the buildings that are no longer being occupied and we don't
18 need power for, and to just have the links energized that are
19 going to buildings that need the electricity, which are only
20 very few of the 40 some odd buildings out there.

21 Today I was out there with a contractor, who is
22 putting together a lane for me to stabilize, to look at the
23 buildings, and help develop a plan and what it takes to
24 stabilize the buildings. I wanted to make sure that the
25 building didn't degrade any further. So we are out there

1 replacing roofs and having a building stabilization plan put
2 together so that Steve and Warren have a better understanding
3 of what they are to be doing to make sure the buildings remain
4 in good condition and focus our effort.

5 So part of that effort may include the -- the same
6 people from Fort Lewis were down and were discussing the power
7 distribution systems. Pretty soon we will have some idea of
8 how we can isolate and shut off the power if we don't need it.
9 That way we don't immediately need to worry about the power
10 lines and the power issue.

11 That was kind of a long answer.

12 MR. RAY: Two months ago there were member lists
13 available. Is that something that we have?

14 MR. WAEHLING: It was handed out. We have other
15 copies here tonight if you want.

16 MR. RAY: I will pick one up.

17 MR. WAEHLING: Okay.

18 MR. RAY: Any news on the early transfer?

19 MR. KOK: None, other than the County is still
20 working to pursue that. Pete Capell is heading up that effort
21 out of Public Works. We are hiring a consultant to help us
22 put more detail into the reuse plan.

23 And essentially what we are being asked to do is to
24 start to flesh out what those proposed reuses might look like
25 on the ground in kind of a conceptual way. So, for example,

1 identifying parking requirements and square footage of parking
2 lots for certain reuses, starting to better quantify the areas
3 for tent camping and R.V. camping, looking at where utility
4 trenches might be located, those kind of things.

5 So putting more detail into the reuse plan to, I
6 think, start to work towards getting to a point where there is
7 enough detail in the plan that the Army can do a better job of
8 estimating the cleanup costs with the reuse plan.

9 MR. RAY: To help the ECA?

10 MR. KOK: I think it's, in part, that, that
11 information would be to help the ECA. I think, also, what is
12 driving that request and the timing of it is the County's
13 efforts to evaluate potential early transfer options.

14 MS. SUTHERLAND: Is the FBI range exclusive of FBI
15 or making it public?

16 MR. KOK: The reuse plan contemplated an FBI range
17 and a separate public range. And that hasn't changed as far
18 as I know.

19 MS. SUTHERLAND: I guess I was curious if there
20 would have to be more public, you know, works with getting a
21 public range out there or just because there is an FBI range
22 that can carry over and include a public range without a
23 public, you know, more of a public knowledge, you know. Is
24 that already taken care of?

25 MR. KOK: There was a lot of public input as the

1 draft reuse plan was developed. I would imagine that the
2 County will re-engage the public before the reuse plan is
3 finalized. I would imagine we would cover all those issues
4 again.

5 MS. SUTHERLAND: Was the ECA stating that the public
6 did not want the public firing range? I thought I read just
7 negative comments about -- about that.

8 MR. WAEHLING: I think -- I think it wasn't directed
9 specifically to the public.

10 MS. LANE: It was the hours they were going to
11 shoot. They were going to shoot around the clock.

12 MR. KOK: Noise, light impact, traffic impact. So
13 in that context there was probably some discussion.

14 MS. LANE: And the FBI wants to definitely be
15 separate. They don't want to be with a public range. I
16 wouldn't blame them.

17 I have a question. Clark County is going to take
18 this over and they are going to allow tent camping and fires
19 out there. I have sat here four or five years and listening
20 to all the comments about how camp fires never start the
21 forest fires. There is living proof right now in Oregon.

22 Are we going to be able to sue the City of
23 Vancouver?

24 MR. KOK: I am sure we will have to consider fire
25 danger in the way the park is operated.

1 MS. LANE: Due for a fire here.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: If the camp fires are allowed would
3 the site be UXO free to where we wouldn't have to wait for DNR
4 as the fire service if there are camp fires, if there is a
5 camping area?

6 MR. WAEHLING: I think there is actually --

7 MR. KOK: I don't know if there are two questions
8 there. The areas identified for camping and all the other
9 uses will theoretically be cleaned up to allow safe use of
10 those --

11 MR. WAEHLING: No theoretically. They will be
12 cleaned up to allow safe use.

13 MR. KOK: -- to allow safe use of those areas, which
14 would include camp fire.

15 It sounds like the second part of your question is,
16 if there is a fire, who, then, has responsibility to respond.
17 And I don't think that's going to change significantly with
18 the property being converted to a regional park.

19 MR. WAEHLING: I think it has more to do with
20 whether the area that the fire is in is wildfire land or
21 within a developed structure area. DNR responds to all the
22 wild land fires.

23 MS. LANE: They respond to -- even when the house
24 caught fire, DNR was there, plus Camas, plus Vancouver. It's
25 a border point. You are in Camas, you are on DNR land, and

1 you are -- somehow or other you are Camas School District, but
2 you are Vancouver address. And all three were there when the
3 house caught fire.

4 MR. WAEHLING: I think what's most important,
5 someone will respond.

6 MS. LANE: They were water trucks, but they did
7 respond.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: I understand that the camping area
9 would be free of UXO and stuff like that. But the impact area
10 is still under consideration about the fencing and such like
11 that. If the camping areas backed up near that area, would
12 the fire department not even approach the area or are you
13 assuming that the fence line is Fire District Five and on the
14 other side would be DNR?

15 MR. KOK: I'm sure the jurisdiction details would
16 get worked out as we develop the site.

17 MR. WAEHLING: But I can say under the current reuse
18 plan the only thing I could possibly foresee, given the layout
19 of the property, there won't be tent camping near the impact
20 area. It's to the west. There is a road dividing it. How do
21 you define near?

22 But your point is well taken, that part of the
23 planning process for all parties will be to consider that sort
24 of eventuality. What if there is a fire and it is to burn
25 into the central impact area? How do we deal with it? Do we

1 try to contain it? Do we escort fire fighters going in?
2 That's one of the planning elements I don't think anyone has
3 given thought to just yet.

4 MR. VAN CLEVE: The fire departments in the area all
5 have a reciprocal agreement to back each other up. In the
6 Hazel Dell area, we have Fire District Six part of it. But
7 you may have Fire District 11 or Fire District Five.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: None of the fire districts have
9 guidelines on how to deal with UXOs. They might say: I'm not
10 even getting near that area. That's what I'm concerned about.
11 I think it should be strongly addressed.

12 MR. VAN CLEVE: The policy will change if it's under
13 the umbrella of the County.

14 MS. LANE: They are going to protect the home first.
15 That's -- your first fire department is going to respond to
16 the houses. If the forest caught on fire and is coming they
17 are going to try to save the homes. If they don't think they
18 can save them, because there is a lot trees around, they are
19 going to do that.

20 MR. WASTLER: I have three things I would like to
21 say. First, on the fire, there is a fire station, if I'm not
22 mistaken, on Powell Road. They actually have their own little
23 road that's off limits to everyone else to Summer Hills. It
24 would be nice if they made a gate so that those guys from
25 Powell Road could have access into Camp Bonneville.

1 MR. WAEHLING: I'm not even sure where Powell Road
2 is.

3 MR. WASTLER: Powell Road is on Livingston Mountain.
4 Like you are going to up to Larch Mountain. I think there is
5 a fire house up there. Whether it's maintained or not, I
6 don't know. I know there is an access road between those two
7 subdivisions even though it's off limits. The gate is closed.
8 But it says that it's fire access road.

9 Then they could have access to Camp Bonneville from
10 Summer Hills, because Summer Hills is right next to Camp
11 Bonneville.

12 MR. WAEHLING: This certainly sounds like an issue
13 the County needs to give some thought to.

14 The second one was Christine was talking about the
15 fire range. I think what she's saying is some people approve
16 of the FBI range, but probably object to the public range,
17 which would probably -- that's probably how I'd feel about it.
18 It depends on how far they are going with the public range.

19 The third thing I wanted to say, I was going to
20 mention anyway, was on Thursday in the newspaper they have the
21 neighbors section that has a list of all the different
22 meetings, and public meetings, and things that are being held
23 throughout the County. I was wondering if the Army ever calls
24 The Columbian and informs them of these meetings so that it
25 would be posted in The Columbian, these meetings, when they

1 are going to be and if.

2 MR. WAEHLING: No.

3 MR. WASTLER: So the people that read the neighbors
4 section of the neighborhood section on Thursday are looking
5 through the public meetings to see what is going on, they can
6 see the Restoration Advisory Meeting will be held on this
7 date, at this location, at this time. That would be
8 notification for members of the entire County to try to find
9 out what is going on.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: That contact is Nicole Gress,
11 G-R-E-S-S.

12 MR. WAEHLING: People think it's a good idea?

13 MS. LANE: Sure.

14 MR. VAN CLEVE: It wouldn't hurt.

15 MR. WASTLER: You talk about communicating with the
16 public. Actually, I've looked in that section and looked for
17 these meetings before, and I've never seen them.

18 MR. WAEHLING: We don't call anybody, but we could
19 do that.

20 MR. WASTLER: I think all the neighborhood
21 associations have a posting in there.

22 MR. RAY: You have to have the copy into Nicole the
23 Thursday before the following Thursday.

24 MR. KOK: The Thursday before the publication on a
25 Thursday?

1 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. A week in advance.

2 MR. KOK: A week before.

3 MR. WASTLER: That's all I had to say. Thank you.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Yes, Ian.

5 MR. RAY: I missed the BCT representation question
6 last month. I did read about it in the minutes. There was
7 something, we are thinking about it. Is there any more
8 thinking?

9 MR. WAEHLING: That was from Ecology, so I can't
10 speak for them. But I personally -- the Army doesn't think
11 that's a very good idea.

12 MR. RAY: This seems to be an issue that we don't
13 agree on. I think most of the RAB thinks the other way, at
14 least to have the option to go. We may choose not to.

15 MR. WAEHLING: I understand. I understand that and
16 I'm not unsympathetic or insensitive to reasons behind that,
17 though I still feel that it really would be detrimental to our
18 process.

19 MR. VAN CLEVE: Are you saying that the subject is
20 dropped?

21 MR. WAEHLING: No. I'm not going to say the subject
22 is ever dropped. I'm saying that the Army's position is that
23 I would not advocate having the public participation or
24 opening up the BCT or technical discussions to open public
25 participation.

1 The RAB is the forum to flesh that out. We have
2 representatives from the Department of Ecology and from EPA,
3 and all the contractors come here. We provide all the
4 minutes. But the negotiations, discussions that we have in
5 BCT are best left to BCT.

6 MR. VAN CLEVE: We've heard all that, but I still
7 don't agree with you.

8 MR. WAEHLING: And I appreciate that, Bud. I'm not
9 sure what to say.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: Does that mean the subject is dead,
11 then, or do we pursue this?

12 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are you a third of the deciding
13 factor and Ecology is a third and --

14 MR. WAEHLING: No.

15 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are you 100 percent?

16 MR. WAEHLING: The BCT, the decision is the Army's.

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: Okay.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Although I did seek counsel input
19 from the BPA and the Department of Ecology. They were of the
20 same opinion.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Did -- Karen was talking about some
22 type of legal precedent or something.

23 MR. WAEHLING: Karen mentioned that she was aware
24 that there was legal precedent of other RABs that took legal
25 action. We are unaware of any of those that were brought to

1 our attention. We would certainly reconsider it within the
2 light of --

3 MR. JOHNSON: I think she has. I guess she's not
4 going to be here tonight.

5 MR. WAEHLING: I should mention that I talked to
6 Karen Kingston today. She was a RAB member. She did tell me
7 she wouldn't be able to join us tonight.

8 MR. JOHNSON: If she does have something like that,
9 forward it to --

10 MS. SUTHERLAND: I'll make a note. Then we can look
11 at it and --

12 MR. VAN CLEVE: There shouldn't be discussion until
13 Karen can be here, because she seems to have information we
14 don't have. It's not going to be dropped.

15 MR. WAEHLING: I don't think the legality should be
16 the strict driver. If there is a legal driver to it, then we
17 will certainly have to reconsider. But my thought process
18 isn't one of we are not going to do it, because we are not
19 legally required to.

20 I've given it a lot of thought, an awful lot of
21 thought. And I really think it would be detrimental to the
22 negotiation process. You can't negotiate in a public forum.
23 I really don't see a way around it.

24 I'm not going to squelch any discussion. If people
25 want to continue to talk about it, I will.

1 MR. VAN CLEVE: I don't think we would like to talk
2 about it. I think we'd like to have it resolved.

3 MR. WAEHLING: I understand.

4 MR. NELSON: Maybe a way to move this discussion,
5 last month's minutes, page 87, Eric, you made the comment,
6 "Can you help me out with some specifics about information
7 that you think we're not getting to you? We almost always
8 after the BCT meetings when we have a RAB meeting and provide
9 this, what we talked about."

10 I think the key here is, are there specific things
11 that the RAB is seeking from the BCT that would help us begin
12 to evaluate our participation?

13 MR. VAN CLEVE: How they arrive at their decisions
14 and the process.

15 MR. WAEHLING: Perhaps a better -- more discussion
16 about the thought process --

17 MR. VAN CLEVE: I don't question the decisions that
18 are made --

19 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

20 MR. VAN CLEVE: -- in the BCT meetings. I think it
21 would help us to better understand the decisions if we knew
22 what went on and the process to arrive --

23 MS. SUTHERLAND: A reenactment scenario at the RAB
24 meetings I don't feel would be sufficient, because just
25 watching how the questions get answered, it's beneficial.

1 Because we live here, you know, and so --

2 MR. VAN CLEVE: There may be an issue that's the
3 main subject of the meeting that we are not really concerned
4 with, and we don't even want to bother with the details, and
5 nobody wants to attend. But the point is, now we don't have
6 that option.

7 MR. WAEHLING: I understand.

8 MR. VAN CLEVE: It's not that we would like to come
9 to all the meetings. We certainly wouldn't. I'm sure we
10 wouldn't. Some of the stuff I don't want to get involved in.
11 I don't have time for it.

12 But there may be a particular subject matter that I
13 am particularly interested in or somebody else might be
14 interested in. Karen knows a hell of a lot more about it than
15 I do. We may have nobody that would want to go to a meeting.
16 That's not the point.

17 MR. WAEHLING: I hear you. I really do.

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: What is your worst fear if you have
19 someone there? What would be -- I understand it would be
20 difficult, your conversations would be difficult, because you
21 would feel you couldn't be open and candid with coming to a
22 conclusion. But, you know, what do you think -- you know, you
23 are not having a discussion at your BCT meetings amongst
24 people that have nothing to do with what you are talking
25 about.

1 If -- we are directly, directly affected. You and
2 Greg and Barry, you guys don't live here, and don't have
3 history, and such.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

5 MS. SUTHERLAND: I think just listening and maybe
6 even via e-mail the person that attends could give some input
7 on some of the history that you -- not history of where a
8 piece of UXO is, but just input, community input. I don't
9 feel like a by-stander at a grocery store. I feel like I
10 should be --

11 MR. WAEHLING: What I'm hearing is it sounds like
12 the RAB, that's the role of the RAB. If the RAB isn't
13 fulfilling that need then we need to fix the RAB; not change
14 the forum.

15 MS. SUTHERLAND: How would we fix that?

16 MR. WAEHLING: That's a good question. I don't have
17 an answer to that immediately.

18 My concern -- you asked what my concerns were. I
19 know that when you negotiate in public -- you can't negotiate
20 in public. People are not as willing to compromise and to
21 step away from their own position in a public forum.

22 Frankly, a lot of the decisions aren't made strictly
23 at the BCT meetings. It's discussion. We have technical sub-
24 committees that continue to meet. There are discussions that
25 occur over the telephone, via e-mail amongst everybody. The

1 BCT meeting is not the only communication that occurs amongst
2 Ecology, the Army, the EPA or amongst our contractors. So --

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: We understand that, though.

4 MR. WAEHLING: So in my opinion, my mind, that
5 further cements the notion that the issue is that the RAB
6 process isn't working, rather than holding the BCT meetings
7 public is going to fix that. Somehow we -- I need to do a
8 better job in conveying that information and facilitating
9 input from everybody; not just from a single representative
10 that has the time or the motivation to attend a BCT meetings,
11 whether they are here or up in Olympia.

12 Because the RAB forum is supposed to be the
13 community's opportunity to interface with us.

14 MS. SUTHERLAND: How could we -- if we don't know an
15 issue maybe you are compromising on and it might be an issue
16 that we, as a community, do not want to compromise, but we
17 would compromise on something else. There could be valuable
18 input on compromising.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Again, you have all the minutes from
20 our meetings and then, alternately, in the legal drivers --
21 not the legal drivers, but the formal opportunity to have
22 formal written input is when we have public participation and
23 the public commentaries on decision documents.

24 None of these decisions have been made nor are they
25 finalized until we have an action plan, or ROD, record of

1 decision, using circular terms. Those all go out to a public
2 forum, public comment. We have to respond to every comment in
3 writing.

4 There's lots of opportunity.

5 MS. SUTHERLAND: The minutes are two months out and
6 they are not word for word.

7 MR. WAEHLING: No. They are not word for word.
8 They are summaries.

9 MS. SUTHERLAND: That's part of the problem. It's
10 discouraging, considering I have to raise my kids down from a
11 street they can ride their bike to. It is.

12 MR. KOK: Eric, I think you make a valid point. It
13 seems logical that a lot of the initial follow-up discussion
14 occur outside of the schedule BCT meetings via e-mail, tele-
15 conference or whatnot. So, I think, in part if we were at BCT
16 meetings, but we're not party to the e-mail traffic or
17 telephone conversations, that kind of thing, you are only
18 seeing part of the discussion.

19 So in a sense you are not getting a complete picture
20 of that detailed level of discussion.

21 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are there people that are at those
22 meetings that weren't part of the e-mail traffic, the tele-
23 conference calls? There have to be people at those meetings
24 that weren't involved in certain aspects of it. So wouldn't
25 there be some bringing up to speed, just a small amount that

1 maybe we can -- after time we would be able to catch up?

2 MR. WAEHLING: I think it's safe to say that
3 everybody -- depending on the subject area, everybody is
4 there.

5 Wouldn't you, Greg?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I know -- I figured this out
7 earlier. I don't know if I have it with me. But for a
8 six-week period we had 11 -- as a member of the technical
9 team, we had 11 teleconferences. I had, I think, 30 e-mails.
10 And that was just to get -- go from one BCT to the next on
11 what the technical team was doing.

12 But in my case I worked from, you know, from Ian to
13 me, away from Barry, so after I have a teleconference -- and
14 Ben -- I usually brief them on what happened so that they are
15 being brought up to speed as we go.

16 So that way when there is a BCT meeting we kind of
17 come in with our cards on the table. You guys have your cards
18 on the table. That's when the discussion begins.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

20 MR. VAN CLEVE: Isn't that information summarized at
21 the BCT meetings.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it is. Or it's negotiated at the
23 BCT meetings.

24 MR. KOK: So I guess it kind of gets to the point
25 I'm trying to make. That is, maybe we should try -- I'll just

1 throw this out as a suggestion -- to maybe walk through the
2 BCT minutes and kind of get a blow by blow where there is some
3 opportunity, then, for the RAB to ask questions or discuss
4 certain topics that were dealt with in BCT meetings.

5 So that we are not there, we are not directly
6 observing, we are not involved in a lot of the other
7 discussions outside of those meetings, but it may be a step in
8 the right direction for us to get a better insight and better
9 appreciation for what went on at the BCT meetings.

10 MR. WAEHLING: We can do that. Frequently -- I
11 don't know if you know this. Frequently when we come to these
12 meetings it's immediately after the meeting.

13 MR. KOK: Right.

14 MR. WAEHLING: It's what we are talking about --
15 when Jerry or one of my contractors is presenting to you all
16 that's the very same information that we just got a few hours
17 earlier. So in many ways you are seeing the discussion as it
18 occurs.

19 Maybe we could do a better job at relaying the
20 conversation.

21 MR. KOK: I think we see a lot of information, like
22 the documents, and the conclusions of studies, and sampling,
23 and that kind of thing.

24 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

25 MR. KOK: What I'm hearing is missing is the

1 discussion of: Well, we have decided to approach this problem
2 in this manner, without any insight of how you decided on that
3 approach, and maybe what alternatives were considered and
4 rejected.

5 MR. WAEHLING: Okay.

6 MR. KOK: So I guess maybe kind of walking us
7 through the decision-making process without getting into a
8 whole lot of technical detail or a whole lot of politics.

9 MR. WAEHLING: For example -- I'm just throwing this
10 out here, because it's something that internally I've been
11 working over in my mind.

12 For example, we are developing a plan. We are
13 trying to figure out a strategy to characterize the lead
14 issues for the small arms ranges. Particularly we are trying
15 to figure out how do we approach the small arms ranges that
16 don't have berms to stop the bullets. We are having
17 discussions where it's everything from we were considering
18 sampling small mammals, mice, to going to sampling soil and
19 sending the soil out to a lab versus an on-site XRF, which is
20 a device that uses lead content using radiation.

21 How we go about choosing one of those instruments or
22 methodologies, is that what you are talking about?

23 MR. KOK: I think that's what I'm hearing. I think
24 that would be useful information for me to better understand,
25 when you have the technical presentations, how you chose the

1 methodology.

2 MR. WAEHLING: Thought process.

3 MR. KOK: And why you did. I think that gives us --
4 gives us a better appreciation for the findings and the
5 conclusions that you guys come to.

6 MR. VAN CLEVE: Understanding the process.

7 MR. WAEHLING: That's a whole 'nother kettle of
8 fish. We can work on doing a better job of that. That's
9 important.

10 Yes, Ian.

11 MR. RAY: In that regard we are going to talk about
12 cost estimating a little bit later this evening.

13 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

14 MR. RAY: This got on the agenda. Is this the
15 reasons we are talking about? It was rather sudden that the
16 RAB discovered that you are going to excavate landfill four
17 instead of pumping three, or some other method like that.
18 That was kind of a shock.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Well, actually, because we excavated
20 doesn't necessarily mean we don't do the other.

21 MR. RAY: I realize. But you came to some decision
22 about excavating, and going out for cost estimates, and going
23 that route, rather than pumping three that we've been hearing
24 about for years. To me, I would have liked to have been
25 present or closer to the front end decisions.

1 MR. WAEHLING: Okay. I would like to clarify just
2 that the pumping and treat you were referring to or some other
3 ground water treatment methodology is not necessarily
4 dependent upon the removal actions. If we remove -- just
5 because we do a landfill removal doesn't mean that we are done
6 with the ground water. They are not independent, but -- they
7 are linked, but separate issues.

8 Actually, I -- along the lines of what Jeroen is
9 just saying, Mike is going to talk about the logic about
10 how -- how we go about developing a cost estimate. It's a
11 fluid and dynamic thing that starts early on and doesn't
12 really end until we are done.

13 MR. NELSON: Don't steal my script.

14 MR. WAEHLING: Maybe we can work on enhancing that
15 to apply it to the other areas and do a better job of
16 communicating.

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: Is there any way that between each
18 RAB meeting, if we are not allowed to go to the BCT, if you
19 can take an outline, someone could just take an outline of
20 just the main points you just conferred on?

21 MR. WAEHLING: The minutes aren't doing that?

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: They are two months late. The
23 conversation is so old that there is nothing to discuss any
24 more, because two months out a decision has most likely been
25 made via the 40 e-mails.

1 MR. JOHNSON: You are right.

2 MR. WAEHLING: Really, what you are asking for is a
3 quicker turn-around of the BCT minutes.

4 MS. SUTHERLAND: For sure.

5 MR. WAEHLING: We can work at doing a better job of
6 that.

7 MR. KOK: If you have a BCT meeting -- I know this
8 is not necessarily easy. But if you have a BCT meeting like
9 today and then the RAB meeting this evening, if you could just
10 hit the highlights of what was discussed.

11 MR. WAEHLING: We did do that for a little while.
12 It sort of -- we could sort of make a better effort.

13 MR. KOK: If we could get that as a regular agenda
14 item that would be a great first step.

15 MR. NELSON: A couple years ago we were doing a lot
16 of sampling, whatever. We come to the RAB meetings, we had a
17 lot of dialogue going on quite frequently at these RAB
18 meetings. Almost half the meeting was taken up on technical
19 issues. There was a lot of give and take.

20 There has been quite a drought on that work. We
21 haven't been able to come back to you and give you updates on
22 sampling, and cleanups, and hauling soil or excavating soil.
23 That might be part of the problem, too.

24 MR. KOK: I think that the point is not so much lack
25 of presentation of results as it is better insight of how

1 decisions are made.

2 MR. WAEHLING: Yeah.

3 MR. KOK: What alternatives are discussed.

4 MR. WAEHLING: I'm thinking, thinking back to some
5 of the presentations, Jerry's the level one screening, I think
6 he thought he was communicating that logic behind the process.
7 Perhaps we didn't do a very good job at it. Maybe we need to
8 work at doing a better job of communicating.

9 Because sometimes, particularly when it comes to
10 engineers -- no offense to the engineers in the room --
11 sometimes the communication is lost.

12 MR. KOK: Especially when you have a lot of
13 information to digest.

14 MR. VAN CLEVE: Eric, I think we are all in
15 different ways saying pretty much the same thing. I don't
16 need more meetings to go to. I don't think any of us are
17 looking for more meetings. But we are looking for more
18 information.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Which is why we need to figure out a
20 better way to communicate. We'll turn around the BCT minutes
21 quicker.

22 MR. VAN CLEVE: Let's try. If we are not happy with
23 it we will try something else.

24 MR. WAEHLING: We will do a summary preferably with
25 Ecology and EPA right here so we can get everybody's

1 perspective, not just mine, on how the meeting went.

2 I will try to work with the contractors to do a
3 better job in communicating using less legal jargon and more
4 -- do are a better job of communicating.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Would it help if someone from the
6 technical team kept you guys informed via e-mail of what we're
7 doing?

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: Sure.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Would that help?

10 MS. SUTHERLAND: I'll read that.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Or would that just inundate you guys
12 with more junk than you want?

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: This is not junk.

14 MR. JOHNSON: A lot of times we don't accomplish
15 anything.

16 MR. VAN CLEVE: We have the option of reading or
17 chucking it.

18 MR. JOHNSON: That's an option. I'd be willing to
19 do that for you guys, a summary. Then if you don't like it
20 you can dump it.

21 MR. RAY: I would like to receive that. There are
22 some things starting to happen about how this RAB is going to
23 communicate with the community. Every little bit of stuff
24 like that that the RAB can get helps us in our mission of
25 communicating, being the conduit with the community. So that

1 stuff would be very well received.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Basically I've got right here some
3 updates from the level one screening since the last time --
4 this was June -- which are pretty important. I mean, things
5 have changed 180 degrees. And a lot of people at Ecology, I
6 just found out tonight Chris didn't even know, because we had
7 this meeting on the 26th and got it out. Then everybody went
8 on vacation, went their own ways.

9 The only person, I think, I communicated with in
10 here is Christine. We communicate via e-mail.

11 Maybe what I need to do is to after we have one of
12 these meetings or after we make a decision, maybe I can fire
13 it out to the RAB or people who have e-mail on the RAB and
14 they could give it to other people. I'd be willing to do
15 that, even if it's just a couple paragraphs.

16 MR. WAEHLING: It's actually pre decision.

17 MR. JOHNSON: It's stuff that they haven't even
18 heard. Right here I have four proposals that I pass up to
19 Jerry and Jerry Moore passes to Eric and Daniel Flemming
20 passes to EPA. Then they make the decisions.

21 This would be stuff that you guys would get prior to
22 that, if you have objections to it or you could see how the
23 process is panning out.

24 I'll start doing that if you guys would like that.

25 MS. SUTHERLAND: I like the idea.

1 MR. JOHNSON: If that would help.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: Sure.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Things are kind of dead right now with
4 the exception of this, so I'll go over this tonight. If we
5 get a chance I'll go over this. If not, then I'll e-mail this
6 to you guys.

7 MR. WAEHLING: Actually, if there was a few
8 minutes -- it's not on the agenda -- I was hoping that there
9 was an opportunity. Greg has been going out to Camp
10 Bonneville frequently the last few weeks, walking the site,
11 seeing things for himself. I just thought you might be
12 interested in what his impressions are, versus the Army's
13 impressions on the site, and what he sees. He has a lot of
14 experience with UXO.

15 MR. RAY: Somebody is going to walk the creek in
16 August. You are going to look for outcroppings of bedrock.

17 MR. WAEHLING: Right.

18 MR. RAY: We don't have time to talk about all that
19 tonight, but the RAB would be interested tonight to know the
20 progress of that exercise.

21 MR. JOHNSON: My e-mail will be strictly from a UXO
22 standpoint. I'm trying not to get involved in the other
23 stuff.

24 MR. WAEHLING: But when Ben Forcer returns from
25 vacation, certainly we can talk about that. We have the

1 hydrogeologists here to talk.

2 MR. JOHNSON: We have a new hydrogeologist on board.
3 We can help with that. I'll be more than happy to share my
4 UXO world with you guys.

5 MR. WAEHLING: We have run a bit over, but there has
6 been some really good and important discussion.

7 MR. JOHNSON: I think I need to get everybody's
8 e-mail who would be interested on that. If you could pass a
9 piece of paper around. We only have, what, seven people here.

10 MR. OVERBAY: There is an e-mail list that was given
11 out.

12 MR. JOHNSON: I will get that and e-mail it to you
13 guys.

14 MR. RAY: Speaking of e-mail, conventionally, when I
15 write to you, Eric, I included a copy to Connie Lee. Will
16 Jennifer --

17 MR. WAEHLING: Yes, please.

18 MR. RAY: -- get the copy?

19 MR. WAEHLING: Yes, please.

20 MR. RAY: We need her e-mail address.

21 MR. WAEHLING: We will provide it to you.

22 Do you have it yet.

23 MS. WALTERS: Waltersj@.

24 MS. SUTHERLAND: For curiosity, how many packets of
25 the minutes do you send out, you know, roughly?

1 MR. WAEHLING: A count?

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

3 MR. WAEHLING: I am going to guess 20.

4 MS. WALTERS: Twenty something.

5 MR. WAEHLING: Twenty-five. I'll find out. I think
6 she makes 30 copies when she sends it out to the print shop.

7 Does anybody have any other discussions for
8 community issues before we roll into the open house?

9 We have discussions about wanting to have an open
10 house. We even have a tentative date scheduled for the end of
11 September. We need to start planning for that open house.

12 And we also -- I've had some revelations that
13 perhaps from the Army's side the last week in September isn't
14 particularly good for us. It has to do with our fiscal year
15 and our crunch time to try to meet certain requirements that
16 we have at the end of the fiscal year.

17 I've also heard from the County that perhaps another
18 date would work better for them, as well. But let's talk
19 about that and also talk about how we want to conduct the open
20 house.

21 So where do we want to start?

22 MR. KOK: Well, I can let you know. I talked to
23 Pete Capell, the Public Works director for Clark County, about
24 dedicating time, and effort, and resources to the open house.
25 I advised him that tentatively that the RAB had talked about

1 doing that in late September.

2 And his response was that from the County's
3 perspective it would be -- it would be better to spend our
4 time and resources on an open house later in the year. His
5 suggestion was in mid November, but before the holidays.

6 In large part he said that was based on the fact
7 that the County's doing a fair amount of work in completing
8 the feasibility study for potential for early transfer and
9 that some significant results of that, that feasibility study,
10 should be completed probably sometime in mid to late October.

11 And so in his mind there wasn't much for the County
12 to contribute to the open house in September, but there would
13 be, I think, some significant contribution from the County if
14 the open house was held after that feasibility study was
15 completed by the county. I think so much so that he indicated
16 that the County would probably hire some sort of participation
17 specialist to really engage people about the pros and cons of
18 early transfer option and provide some significant community
19 outreach, have an opportunity for input from the community
20 regarding that possibility.

21 MR. WAEHLING: Do you think the County might have
22 more detailed information on the reuse plans by that time,
23 too?

24 MR. KOK: I think, based on the time line that he
25 and I discussed, that more detailed, at least conceptual

1 information, would be completed by mid October, early to mid
2 October.

3 MR. WAEHLING: So we would have more information
4 about the reuse and detail -- and more detail and we have --
5 the County feels it would have more information to work off of
6 discussing the early transfer options in November?

7 MR. KOK: Right.

8 MR. WAEHLING: That's something to consider as far
9 as the timing of the open house.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: I might suggest if this is not a
11 good time for the Army and it's not a good time for the County
12 and RAB is not really hot to do it at this time, why don't we
13 table it for a better time when we have more time to plan it
14 and a time that's better. There is no hurry to have it in
15 October when we can have more time, more than positive things
16 to say later.

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: I agree with tabling it for a
18 while, but I do see a large value before an early transfer
19 might take place to letting some of the interested neighbors
20 to come and take a look at the options the County is looking
21 at before it does take place, even if you have to wear ear
22 muffs and coats.

23 I think it would be a different scenario than what
24 we were looking at earlier of a tour. It would be a definite
25 valuable informational meeting.

1 MR. KOK: I think that's exactly why Pete wanted to
2 delay it until that information is compiled.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: I think the sooner that information
4 gets out to the community members, I think, it would be
5 valuable. Do you know what I mean?

6 MR. VAN CLEVE: It's not impossible to think about
7 setting up a tour for NACC. This would be all the presidents
8 of the neighborhood associations of Clark County that
9 represent 33 neighborhood associations. You would probably
10 get representation from maybe 15 to 18. Then they could take
11 the word back to their organization as kind of a pre-tour.

12 MR. WASTLER: One that we had in July with just the
13 RAB, that was a thrill to me, to go in there and see that
14 place. Since everybody, since this whole cram thing, if I
15 might suggest, rather than have one big tour, maybe you could
16 post something in the newspaper where people who are
17 interested could possibly make reservations for, you know,
18 different times; you know, small tours instead of have a big
19 thing like the one they had a few years ago, where there was
20 200 people, you know, with shuttle bus and the whole thing.

21 Maybe you could put something in regards with what
22 Christine was saying, post it in the paper so everybody will
23 know what's going on. If you are interested in a tour, you
24 know, contact so and so. Then they can make reservations so
25 it can just kind of a small, gradual thing week by week or

1 maybe month by month, or something.

2 Does that sound negotiable or does it have to be one
3 big open house? I think the July thing that we had, that was
4 really an adventure.

5 MR. WAEHLING: I see that as two individual items.
6 We can certainly host RAB meetings out there if the RAB would
7 like to do that. We can certainly accommodate that.

8 Now, as far as the feasibility of having individual
9 tours on call, I'll have to consider them. Frankly, I have to
10 consider the manpower that's available to do it. I have to
11 drive 130 miles to get here for these meetings to provide site
12 tours. I might likely would not be able to accommodate that.

13 MR. WASTLER: It was just a suggestion.

14 MR. WAEHLING: It's a good suggestion. I have to
15 discuss it with Steve and Warren to see what their work load
16 is like.

17 MR. WASTLER: Maybe split it into two different
18 tours or something.

19 MR. WAEHLING: That would accommodate seeing the
20 property. It wouldn't provide the opportunity for the County
21 and for others to provide some feedback for the FBI, for the
22 County.

23 I talked to the Naval Reserve. The Naval Seabees
24 have been helping us out doing maintenance out there. They
25 might want an opportunity to show off their handiwork,

1 repairing bridges, stuff like that.

2 MR. VAN CLEVE: Once we get into September we start
3 losing daylight fast.

4 MR. KOK: We had talked about a Saturday from 10:00
5 to 3:00.

6 MR. WAEHLING: We are talking when, a Saturday
7 morning?

8 MR. KOK: That would work.

9 MR. WASTLER: It was just a suggestion.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, let me ask something. There
11 is probably going to be some work going on during that time
12 frame, it's looking like, the recon effort. That might be
13 something you might want Warren to consider as far as doing it
14 in October, November. From Ecology's perspective we would
15 rather do it in the September time frame, before all that work
16 starts out there.

17 MR. WAEHLING: As far as --

18 MR. JOHNSON: If you are going to have two teams out
19 there working.

20 MR. WAEHLING: But they are not doing any intrusive
21 investigations. You are concerned about conflicts between the
22 teams and the tours?

23 MR. JOHNSON: There's standard tours.

24 MR. NELSON: If we had it on a Saturday there
25 shouldn't be.

1 MR. JOHNSON: But as far as the planning process
2 goes, we are all going to be pretty busy. I'm going to be
3 reviewing work plans.

4 MR. WAEHLING: You are talking about the resource
5 requirements to support that and then, on top of that, adding
6 an open house?

7 MR. WASTLER: It wouldn't be anything conflicting
8 with the cleanup.

9 MR. JOHNSON: The cleanup is priority, I'd say.

10 MR. NELSON: Oftentimes when we have a report or a
11 study, or something to go out for public review and comment,
12 like a 30-day period, we have a workshop and open house to
13 introduce the public to the documents, the plan, the study,
14 have an all-day workshop. And they can come in and see
15 different stations and talk to people that are involved in
16 this.

17 Jeroen, you were talking about somebody coming in
18 who is a professional. That way we are able to reach a lot of
19 the public and inform a lot of the public in the beginning
20 what they are seeing, what the intentions are, so that they
21 have a better chance to give good, meaningful comments and
22 give a thorough review at the start point. It's worked well
23 for us on a lot of different issues.

24 I would suggest if we did that on a Saturday, have
25 this as a workshop, that we would be able to communicate to

1 the public and have the County come in and present their
2 conceptual plan, present some of the issues of the early
3 transfer as a start point for that public review.

4 MS. SUTHERLAND: Greg, is it a conflict because of
5 the tour or conflict because of the month?

6 MR. JOHNSON: It's because of the month. I want to
7 do it, but I would actually want to stick to a September date
8 or earlier. Clark County wants to go later.

9 MR. WAEHLING: I think what Greg is concerned about
10 is we are going to be throwing an awful lot of manning at the
11 Department of Ecology. You only have so many hours in a day.
12 We wouldn't be requiring much of Ecology as far as preparation
13 work.

14 MR. JOHNSON: The thing is, we want to be involved
15 in the open house.

16 MR. WAEHLING: I'm not saying not involved, but as
17 far as the planning and organizing wouldn't necessarily put
18 that much of a burden on Ecology. I don't know how you want
19 to participate.

20 MR. JOHNSON: I know once the field work starts we
21 were all going to be pretty busy, and you, too.

22 MR. NELSON: It sounds to me like it's the Army
23 supporting Clark County. It's Clark County's show. We are
24 here to support them and facilitate them.

25 MR. WAEHLING: It's a team effort.

1 MR. JOHNSON: I thought it was all of us together.

2 MR. WAEHLING: Honestly, the last week in September,
3 September 28th, I believe is the date, we can't do that within
4 the Army.

5 MR. NELSON: It's definite?

6 MR. WAEHLING: Two days before the end of the fiscal
7 year.

8 MR. NELSON: We won't have our vans for the
9 transportation to see this.

10 MR. WAEHLING: Let's talk more about how we can try
11 to --

12 MR. JOHNSON: Or we can go later. Personally, I
13 think in the field season is going to be a bad time to do it.

14 MR. WAEHLING: So am I correct in understanding the
15 general consensus is that we should wait until the November
16 time frame, when there is more meaningful substance to develop
17 within the County; is that correct?

18 MR. KOK: Yes.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Everybody is in agreement with that?
20 We need to work with Ecology to try to make sure we
21 don't have conflict or overload Ecology.

22 MR. JOHNSON: And they may be done by November.

23 MR. WAEHLING: One hopes.

24 MS. LANE: Do they work out there in the rain? If
25 they do, they may be working. If they don't, they will be

1 done by the end of October.

2 MR. NELSON: They'd rather not do that again.

3 MS. LANE: Two days before Halloween is when the
4 rain comes in.

5 MR. JOHNSON: We would like them in the field by
6 September, but that's probably --

7 MR. WAEHLING: September, October.

8 MR. JOHNSON: They are looking at maybe, what, ten
9 weeks' worth of work. A lot of times these UXO jobs get
10 extended. It happens a lot. It ends up being more than what
11 you thought it was or you may want to go and double check an
12 area a little better than you did or you had originally
13 planned. If they did get in the field the end of September,
14 it would be October, November, till about the middle of
15 December.

16 MR. WAEHLING: Where the last time they were just
17 getting started in January. They would rather not do that
18 again.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

20 MS. LANE: Usually it starts flooding off the hills
21 right about a week before or after Thanksgiving. The water
22 just flows off the hill. I mean, it just floods everything.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Plus you don't get maybe eight hours a
24 day of light.

25 MS. LANE: Who cares about the light when it's

1 raining.

2 MR. JOHNSON: You can't have guys walking around in
3 UXO areas when it's dark.

4 MR. WAEHLING: So we are going to wait until
5 November. I don't want to put off planning until November. I
6 would still like to continue planning now so that come
7 November we can do a bang up job.

8 Jeroen, do you think -- within the spirit of manning
9 this thing, do you think you could have short updates on where
10 the County is at?

11 MR. KOK: Sure.

12 MS. SUTHERLAND: I have a question for you. Was
13 what you were referring to earlier, a memorandum of agreement
14 you were working on for the -- with the Department of
15 Interior?

16 MR. KOK: The memorandum of -- the DOE, is that what
17 you are talking about?

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: I just have these notes. This lady
19 commented about that we need to develop a memorandum of
20 agreement and you would forward a copy.

21 MR. VAN CLEVE: Was she from the interior
22 department?

23 MR. KOK: Are those minutes from the last meeting?

24 MS. SUTHERLAND: DC trip.

25 MR. KOK: The DC trip? Was that part of Pete

1 Capell's that --

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: I don't know if they told you about
3 that.

4 MR. KOK: I wasn't part of that meeting. I don't
5 know exactly.

6 MR. VAN CLEVE: On the trip to Washington.

7 MR. WAEHLING: I can tell you the possible role that
8 the Department of Interior would have. Don't ask me why it's
9 structured this way. I don't -- I don't completely understand
10 it myself.

11 When the property is ultimately going to move, early
12 transfer or not, the Army cannot give the property directly to
13 Clark County. It has to go through a sponsor. That sponsor
14 can be the Department of Interior, Park Service. They can go
15 through -- I guess it could go through the Department of
16 Education. For some reason it has to go through a third
17 party.

18 I'm not a real estate person. Maybe that's what
19 that's referring to.

20 MR. KOK: I think what you may be referring to,
21 Christine, is the fact that there were discussions in DC about
22 the potential for early transfer. But what the County may
23 have been looking for was some written confirmation from the
24 Department of Interior that it was okay for us to continue to
25 pursue that and they were supportive of that as a potential

1 method of transfer of the property.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: Would that include -- that
3 agreement include the guidelines of the MPS would transfer --
4 would okay a transfer to Clark County?

5 MR. KOK: I think that would happen in a more
6 detailed follow-up document that actually conveys the
7 property.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: Would that be available to us?

9 MR. KOK: When it's drafted.

10 MR. WAEHLING: It's a pretty extensive real estate
11 agreement. It's a public document, if that's what you are
12 talking about.

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: Well, it would include the
14 guidelines or conditions.

15 MR. KOK: Yes.

16 MR. WAEHLING: Describe the property, the
17 conditions, the --

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: That's what I am trying to say.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

20 MR. WAEHLING: That will be an important document
21 that everybody will need to see.

22 Any other questions? Do we want to talk about the
23 open house a little bit more?

24 MR. VAN CLEVE: What's there to talk about?

25 MR. WAEHLING: Do we want to take a quick, five-

1 minute break?

2 (A short recess was taken.)

3 MR. WAEHLING: In conversations with Ian -- and, I
4 guess, he talked to a few other people -- there was some
5 interest in how we go about developing cost estimates. In
6 fact, Ian was surprised that we do develop cost estimates. He
7 was concerned why are you doing it now without RAB
8 participation and all.

9 I guess I have a couple comments or things just to
10 talk about before Mike starts to talk about how we go about
11 developing an estimate. One of the things people should know
12 that from very early on, the place, Camp Bonneville, was
13 closed in '95, and in 1996, people were trying to make some
14 sort of estimate as to what things were going to cost. So
15 from day one -- actually, even before '96, I think even before
16 they closed it -- they tried to come up with an estimated cost
17 of what it would cost to clean things up.

18 As we gained more and more knowledge we tried to
19 refine those estimates. Those cost estimates are a living
20 document, is how we refer to them, because they are constantly
21 being revised and will continue to be revised until we are
22 finally done.

23 So I just -- I sense that Ian was concerned if we
24 had developed a cost estimate we had already made the decision
25 about what's going to happen out there. That's not the case

1 at all. It's just for our budget forecasting we try to make
2 estimates, of the range of possibilities which is the most
3 likely cost going to be associated with this site, whether it
4 be the UXO, landfill four, or the above ground storage tanks
5 we took care of. We always try to project what we anticipate
6 the costs are going to be two or three years out so the money
7 and decision reaches us at the same point.

8 So as an out point from that, Ian asked that we
9 maybe talk about for a few minutes about how we go about
10 making an estimate for what a cleanup is going to cost. And I
11 think Mike might be using landfill four as an example about
12 how he developed those cost estimates. But with the same
13 principles will apply to any of the other sites.

14 So go ahead.

15 MR. NELSON: To add to what Eric said, we develop an
16 estimate as early as we can, because in the BRAC program Camp
17 Bonneville competes on a national level with funding
18 appropriated by Congress. So if we get our estimates in early
19 enough, we begin to refine, again, for the BRAC program, where
20 we are heading.

21 Even though I passed out some maps from landfill
22 four, as Eric said, this is an estimating process for, say,
23 landfill X or any one of our sites.

24 What we do in the early stages -- and we presented
25 this to the RAB, also, several times -- is we go out and

1 collect site information, do site investigation. In that
2 process we do mapping, both of the surface and sub surface of
3 a landfill site, which we did at landfill four. We also
4 gather information through borings on contaminated soil. We
5 also do surface soil sampling as part of that very early
6 stage. We also do ground water sampling at the site.

7 In our case here we also sampled surface water in
8 Lacamas Creek. Part of the site information we need to
9 collect to begin to refine our estimates.

10 In the mapping step that we did at the site we used
11 two processes; electromagnetic process. Also, we used ground
12 penetrating radar. What that gave us is the ability, then, to
13 develop an estimated footprint, an estimated extent of that
14 landfill.

15 On that map, first map you see, there is kind of an
16 egg shaped circle. From that mapping we determined it's about
17 a half acre in extent. It's also between 11 and 12 feet deep.
18 It all came from surface mapping.

19 We also did soil borings. We found from the soil
20 borings and the surface sampling that the soil issues in our
21 landfill were not of a great concern. They are not a major
22 issue. That began to help us refine that cost.

23 What we did find, as you are aware, that the ground
24 water contamination was of more concern to us, as well as to
25 you folks. This, again, began to lead us down a path to

1 refine that cost.

2 Right now we are in the process of going back into
3 the field at our landfill to do more, gathering more
4 information, put in two more wells. Also, to examine the
5 weathered bedrock along the wall of Lacamas Creek. Again,
6 this will give us more information to begin to refine that
7 eventual cost to deal with the problem at landfill four.

8 What we concluded at our site here is that it's
9 likely that the debris, the use of that site in the past has
10 contaminated that ground water, both the debris in that site
11 and also the surface demolition that was done out there
12 likely was a source of contamination for that ground water.
13 Now, this is the material that's on the surface or buried in
14 that half-acre plot out there.

15 So in the cleanup planning process we plan to go out
16 there on the surface and do some trenching, some backhoe
17 trenching along the perimeter, along the line that we show on
18 that first map, begin to do some probing along that surface to
19 see, can we begin to refine where the edge of that landfill
20 is. Also, can we go out with a backhoe and dig into the
21 landfill to see where the bottom of that debris is, that
22 contamination.

23 Again, it helps us refine, go from that early
24 mapping to actual digging of the ground to see where the
25 extent of that contamination is. That begins to help us

1 refine the cost.

2 The next step would be to go into the design and
3 awarding of a contract.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Could you talk about a little bit
5 about what cost drivers are, how we go about -- we go about
6 estimating what the costs are, or are you going to get to that
7 in a minute?

8 MR. NELSON: We know we have a site, we have a
9 certain amount of contaminated soil. We have a lot of
10 uncontaminated soil. You handle these two pieces of soil
11 differently. Some of it you can analyze it, put it into a
12 stock pile and say: This is ready to be used as backfill.
13 There may be another waste pile that you know it's tested
14 that, and it needs to be treated on site or at a disposal
15 site.

16 Those are the kinds of things you begin to analyze.

17 What you did early on, since you haven't gone into
18 the site and done any probing, and the cost model we use to
19 generate the early cost, you have to assume a certain
20 percentage of it will be contaminated and a percentage not
21 contaminated to develop these different costs.

22 MR. WAEHLING: What you are saying is early on, when
23 we don't have a whole lot of information, we will use default
24 assumptions based on what other landfills have been like.

25 MR. NELSON: That's right.

1 MR. WAEHLING: Let's say we will assume 40 percent
2 of the soil will be considered hazardous and needs to be
3 treated or disposed of in an appropriate manner and the other
4 remaining 55 percent will not be. So under certain cost
5 drivers associated with that, depending on how far it is to
6 that landfill or what it would cost to bring the piece of
7 equipment to test it, that sort of stuff.

8 As you gain more, we identify what those percentages
9 are for that site.

10 MS. SUTHERLAND: Did you find a good site that
11 paralleled this Camp Bonneville landfill?

12 MR. WAEHLING: We don't look for individual ones.
13 Say hundreds of other sites, on average X percentage. That's
14 what we do early on when we don't have a lot of information,
15 we put it into a computer model. As we gain more information
16 we are able to greater refine that. We can now plug in a more
17 accurate knowledge base for that particular landfill.

18 MR. WASTLER: Are there any areas that are forested
19 that are contaminated that you will have to remove the soil?
20 How would you do that, if an area is forested? Do you have to
21 take the trees out and do the whole thing or is there some way
22 of treating that?

23 MR. NELSON: If the contamination was around the
24 tree and the roots of that tree it would have to come out.

25 MR. WASTLER: Have you ever had to do very much of

1 that?

2 MR. NELSON: No, we haven't. Our sites haven't been
3 in areas where we have had a lot of trees that have been
4 contaminated.

5 A good example would be above ground storage tanks.
6 One of those tanks was leaking, and it actually came down and
7 contaminated the soil under the building. We felt -- took the
8 tank out. We took the soil out. And we determined in order
9 to clean that soil you would have to destroy the building.

10 In that case we determined the contamination had
11 been removed along the foundation. It's not migrating. It's
12 captured. Leave the building intact.

13 MR. WAEHLING: Where people can't get to it, because
14 there is a building on top of it. Should that building be
15 torn down in the future, the Army is responsible for coming
16 back and remediating the remainder of the soil. We are always
17 responsible for anything like that we leave behind at a future
18 date.

19 MS. SUTHERLAND: That wouldn't be covered under an
20 insurance policy? That would be covered under the Army did
21 it?

22 MR. WAEHLING: Pretty much, yeah.

23 MR. NELSON: The records show that it's there. It's
24 part of the transfer documentation. It's there. Somebody
25 needs to clean that if the building is ever removed.

1 MS. SUTHERLAND: I think I talked to Pete about it.
2 He said all that would be conferred under an insurance policy
3 that you would buy along with the transfer.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Under an early transfer scenario, if
5 cost were to be exceeded for these cleanup areas. But in this
6 particular case it was something that we identified a couple
7 years ago and the decision was made that, since the County
8 wanted to continue using that building, that in this case the
9 building would be left in place.

10 MR. KOK: The cost to clean that up would be
11 factored into the overall clean up.

12 MS. SUTHERLAND: So if there are areas that you have
13 not identified, ten years down the road, you would not be --

14 MR. WAEHLING: Under the early transfer scenario if
15 they purchased cost overrun and liability insurance, that is
16 correct. The insurance company would be responsible for that.

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: The insurance would only cover ten
18 years at the maximum.

19 MR. WAEHLING: I can't answer that. I don't have
20 any idea.

21 MS. SUTHERLAND: I looked around a little bit. It
22 went one to ten years, one million to 50 million. I assume
23 you would be buying the 50 million package.

24 My concern is if something goes off in ten years.

25 MR. WAEHLING: I couldn't tell you. I don't know

1 anything about the insurance packages.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: Can I get this clear, though? If
3 it goes early transfer you would not be liable for anything
4 that you have not documented?

5 MR. WAEHLING: Previously identified.

6 MS. SUTHERLAND: Previously identified; is that
7 correct?

8 MR. WAEHLING: As I understand it.

9 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are you digging pretty good?

10 MR. WAEHLING: What is that?

11 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are you digging pretty good?

12 MR. WAEHLING: What do you mean, "digging pretty
13 good"?

14 MS. LANE: Finding everything that's out there.

15 MR. WAEHLING: Yeah, actually.

16 MR. VAN CLEVE: When you find -- you are looking for
17 contamination in the soil, how many different tests do you
18 have to run to determine whether it's clean or dirty.

19 MR. NELSON: I will get to that in a minute once we
20 excavate the ground. Let me go on a minute here.

21 MR. VAN CLEVE: Go ahead.

22 MR. NELSON: Once we have done this initial test
23 trenching to see where the limits of that egg-shaped or that
24 oval-shaped footprint that you see on that first map, then we
25 can begin to prepare the contract documents. We are going to

1 have a contractor go out there and do this work.

2 And the way it's set up now is whenever you open
3 ground up as a hazardous waste site like this, you can bet
4 it's going to be more than you anticipate. It's always like
5 that.

6 So you begin to build in quantities that give you,
7 then, a price that if the contractor exceeds the first amount
8 you anticipated at that site, you have in his contract pricing
9 for additional contaminated soil. So you are protected by
10 cost overruns. You have enough in the budget to cover, then,
11 what you think will be the ultimate amount of soil.

12 Oftentimes we don't get that high in the contract,
13 anyway. But that's one way to protect as far as overruns on
14 quantity.

15 But to answer your question about how do we know,
16 then, from the testing, once we go in and we excavate the
17 first batch of soil the contractor sets it aside. His
18 analytical people go in and sample the bottom of the hole for
19 metals, explosives. In this case you are looking for
20 pesticides, explosives, petroleum products, metals; things
21 like that that we can expect to find.

22 So what a contractor does is he goes in the bottom
23 of the hole and if he sees more contamination he continues to
24 dig another patch of soil. Then he comes back in, and does
25 the testing, and decides on the basis of what he has.

1 MR. RAY: On those tests do you use field spot tests
2 or do you have to go back through the lab and do all the
3 certification?

4 MR. NELSON: We use steel screening process for
5 explosives. We pull a sample off the side wall and take it to
6 an on-site laboratory.

7 MR. WAEHLING: The final confirmation that says you
8 can stop would be done at a certified lab.

9 MS. SUTHERLAND: How do you decide where to test and
10 how many per section?

11 MR. NELSON: That's part of the design, the early
12 design of the project. If you've got an area that's about a
13 half acre on the footprint, you say: How many samples do I
14 need? You set up a grid pattern. They might be a grid
15 that's, say, 50 foot by 50 foot. In that grid you take one
16 sample and combine those into a composite, and then you do the
17 analytical analysis on that site for that particular
18 contamination.

19 Now, the laying out of this grid is purely up to the
20 design team for the kind of contamination you are dealing
21 with.

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: Is -- the design team is the
23 contractor or you?

24 MR. KOK: Mike, all that would be statistically
25 based to make sure you have representative sampling?

1 MR. NELSON: That's part of the BRAC cleanup team.

2 MR. WAEHLING: A lot of it is predetermined by
3 regulation, what you have to do.

4 MS. SUTHERLAND: Do you know what it is?

5 MR. WAEHLING: I don't know what it is off the top
6 of my head. I think it varies depending on the acreage and
7 what you are looking for. I know -- I'm fairly certain they
8 have a statistical process by which you determine how many
9 samples you need. You take individual spot samples in or
10 whatever. There are guidelines we have to follow.

11 MR. NELSON: It is statistically based. When you
12 get your completed field screen testing you feel confident you
13 have achieved the bottom of the whole cleanup. The contractor
14 just steps aside.

15 That information has to go back to the analytical
16 laboratory, full laboratory for the confirmation sample. We
17 don't say the work is done until that confirmation sample is
18 done in the laboratory.

19 MR. WAEHLING: Did you mention about contract
20 options, so that if we have certain uncertainties, depending
21 on how things go, we can award options?

22 MR. NELSON: Yeah. You can award options for
23 additional digging and hauling. You can also have options for
24 additional analytical process. You build this in up front, so
25 that you don't end up reaching a point where your contractor

1 is out of money and you got more work to do. You always have
2 these options lined up ahead of you should you need them to
3 complete the job.

4 MR. RAY: With those uncertainties, with all those
5 various uncertainties, you had to go somewhere and ask for
6 some money. That had to be based on certain numbers, like the
7 volume of stuff you are going to have to take out, and the
8 labor and machinery.

9 MR. NELSON: It is.

10 MR. WAEHLING: Exactly.

11 MR. RAY: You had to give some specific numbers.
12 How do you get specific numbers with all this uncertainty?

13 MR. NELSON: By the time you do that initial testing
14 you say: This truly is a half-acre footprint. Yes, it truly
15 is 11 to 12 feet deep. More than likely you have had possible
16 leaching of the contaminate off the side walls or deeper than
17 12 feet in certain areas. So you add in increments of
18 additional volume to cover yourself should you have to go
19 ahead and dig deeper.

20 MR. WAEHLING: More to the point, Ian, these numbers
21 are not as certain as we would like them to be. In many
22 instances after we do extensive studies they are a best guess.
23 That's why we have to build in contingencies.

24 Let's, hypothetically, say our best guess is the
25 landfill is 11 feet deep. Even after trenching it's not

1 unheared of, quite common, that it ends up being a lot deeper
2 than 11 feet. You may have missed the deepest part of the
3 landfill.

4 That's why we build in these contingencies, where
5 the contract says remove 11 to 12 feet and then a contingency
6 might be an additional four feet past that in case we need it.

7 MR. RAY: Regarding specific numbers like that, if
8 you look at this cross section in the plan view and you make
9 some calculations, this egg thing is more like an acre and the
10 depth down to the known contamination is more like 40 feet.
11 It's not ten feet deep.

12 So that's a heck of a big volume to be excavated.
13 You know you are going to have to go down to where that
14 contamination is already found.

15 MR. NELSON: That's a possibility.

16 MR. RAY: Well, it's there. You have to go get it.

17 MR. NELSON: It's in the water. What you are trying
18 to do, the whole process here is trying to remove the source,
19 what caused contamination. It's likely to be what's in that
20 half acre at some depth, maybe 11 feet plus four, 11 foot plus
21 six. That's the source.

22 If you remove the source, then you no longer have a
23 contamination being fed down into the lower aquifer, down into
24 the bedrock. The key is to cut off the source.

25 I think that's one of the reasons, even though I

1 know probably it was startling to you folks, to remove the
2 landfill. The thought was it may be to our benefit to remove
3 the source, dig that landfill out, cut out that contamination
4 from going any further down into the soil.

5 To answer your question more directly, once you get
6 to the bottom of that estimated depth, that second fixture,
7 you may be quite a bit deeper. We are not sure how much
8 deeper. Some of our backhoe trenching initially would begin
9 to tell us, give us some indicators how deep we should go.

10 MR. OVERBAY: Mike, is that also in your cost of
11 work you are working on, include bringing material back in to
12 refill --

13 MR. NELSON: Yes.

14 MR. OVERBAY: -- or reusing material after it's been
15 burned and sterilized?

16 MR. NELSON: Yes. It's all part of that process.
17 You are likely to have a certain amount of that soil that's
18 not contaminated. You set that aside and you can use that as
19 part of your backfill.

20 MR. OVERBAY: The part that's not contaminated would
21 be your cover. Then you have something for vegetation. It
22 won't grow in a sterile environment, but you use that top two,
23 three feet, whatever it is, that's not contaminated, you put
24 that back over, you got vegetation that will grow on that.

25 MR. NELSON: You restore that site.

1 MR. WAEHLING: We have to fill in the hole and
2 regrade it back to its original contours. You can't just
3 leave a big swimming pool.

4 MR. OVERBAY: That would be defeating the purpose.

5 MS. SUTHERLAND: Hypothetically, if you don't -- the
6 soil you are digging has low amounts of contaminants in them
7 and you don't find hardly -- virtually no items of a source,
8 what would you infer from that? Would you infer that it's
9 past a level where you can feasibly dig it?

10 Will you pool your resources and put your focus on
11 the ground water, as cleaning the ground water, considering
12 that all of it's gone now from the landfill, if you find
13 other --

14 MR. WAEHLING: I think maybe a point of
15 clarification is that the removal of the landfill -- we have
16 gotten into the specifics of this at one site. Mike has done
17 a good job just summarizing. It's an interim action. It's
18 not the final action. It's only by removing the landfill it
19 simplifies the problem how do we address the ground water.

20 It doesn't mean we stop looking into the ground
21 water issue. By removing any potential source it simplifies
22 the problem, because you know it's not going to get any worse,
23 that the plume -- there will be additional material added to
24 the ground water.

25 MS. SUTHERLAND: Could there be a possibility the

1 material has been exhausted?

2 MR. WAEHLING: Yes.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: What would you do, continue to dig
4 it?

5 MR. WAEHLING: We will have proven -- the only way
6 to definitively prove that you cut off any future source of
7 contamination is to remove it. We can do things like capping
8 the landfill, which is where you put an impermeable barrier on
9 it designed to keep rain water from flushing through the
10 landfill and flushing into the ground water.

11 You never know for sure if it works. The ongoing
12 monitoring and maintenance issues associated with it. You
13 always have that question, nagging question in the back of
14 your mind, if this thing has somehow failed are we still
15 continuing to add to the problem?

16 If we have a site, small like this, yes, it could be
17 deeper than we estimated, by definitively removing any
18 possible sources it simplifies the issue how we need to
19 address the water.

20 We still need to address the ground water, whether
21 it's a pump and treat system. All sorts of technologies that
22 are available to us.

23 MS. SUTHERLAND: I understand.

24 MR. WAEHLING: I just wanted to make sure.

25 MS. SUTHERLAND: Do you look at the complexity of it

1 if, in fact, the soils you were testing don't have near the
2 values that this 2D does?

3 MR. WAEHLING: Are you thinking it's a waste of
4 money?

5 MS. SUTHERLAND: If you keep going, you do your
6 levels and your soil samples come up just vague, they don't
7 have very high numbers -- you know, you are not really finding
8 anything -- are you going to keep going? When do you say
9 enough is enough and then you start looking at the ground
10 water issues? You start to characterize that hill a lot
11 better.

12 MR. WAEHLING: We are going to continue to try to
13 answer those questions, how fast it's moving, where it's
14 going, to the extent that it's traveling regardless of the
15 interim removal action.

16 The question of when do we stop digging is one we
17 haven't had those discussions yet. It's two factors; how
18 clean is clean and then to the extent that we can reach with
19 our equipment. Those are probably two considerations we use
20 to answer that question.

21 Am I answering that question well?

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: I don't really think -- I don't
23 think you can.

24 MR. WAEHLING: We are not that far at all.

25 MS. SUTHERLAND: I thought you are starting that

1 next month.

2 MR. WAEHLING: We are not going to start digging.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: I wrote down somewhere that you are
4 going to dig in August.

5 MR. WAEHLING: We are going to walk up the creek
6 looking for the bedrock.

7 MS. SUTHERLAND: Sorry. I thought you. --

8 MR. WAEHLING: Maybe we gave the wrong impression.
9 We are not digging. We have to design it, talk to you about
10 it. We just came up with a concept. We haven't even started
11 figuring out how we are going to get rid of the landfill.

12 MR. WASTLER: I think what Christine was trying to
13 ask, what is the tolerance? In a blue print, a blue print
14 will say in the corner "tolerance." How much do you have to
15 find before you get serious about it?

16 MR. WAEHLING: We haven't even begun to answer that
17 yet.

18 MR. KOK: Aren't there like DOE or EPA standards, X
19 parts per million is the cutoff point where it's no longer a
20 hazard?

21 MR. WAEHLING: Greg, we should bring copies. Let's
22 try to do that. I will work with you on that.

23 In Washington State regulations there are several
24 lists of chemicals and if you have this much in your soil, if
25 you exceed this concentration in your soil, then X. If you

1 are below this, then Y.

2 MR. NELSON: If you want to search the net.

3 MR. JOHNSON: It is on the internet.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Maybe we can bring some copies.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. If there is certain parts you
6 want copied.

7 MR. WAEHLING: Let's bring copies. We can point to
8 different sections so they can learn more about that
9 regulation, what we were needing to work with.

10 MR. JOHNSON: I think it's pretty big.

11 MR. WAEHLING: The purple book, bring copies of the
12 purple book.

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: The reason why I was asking is Ben,
14 when he was here two meetings ago, he talked about -- I was
15 trying to remember the conversation, but it was something
16 about, if all of that has been hypothetically it's all gone
17 from the landfill, what do we do now? He said the worst case
18 scenario would be -- the most cost occurring expense would be
19 to do the pump and treat.

20 I was asking if you had already thought -- is that
21 plan E -- if you don't find anything in that landfill, are you
22 going to start looking at that? Is that even a consideration
23 if you don't -- if the soils you start testing in that
24 landfill are very low?

25 MR. WAEHLING: They are separate issues, the

1 technology that is appropriate to treat the ground water,
2 those decisions.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: One would lead to the other,
4 wouldn't it?

5 MR. WAEHLING: No. Because the technology of pump
6 and treat is to treat the ground water that's already
7 contaminated.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: If the plume isn't exhausted,
9 wouldn't the plume --

10 MR. WAEHLING: That's a question of where you
11 located it. The question of where you stop digging in the
12 landfill is to keep it from getting any worse. The technology
13 of pump and treat, or any of those ground water treatment
14 technologies, is to treat the water; not the soil.

15 MS. SUTHERLAND: I understand that. I have time to
16 think it over and ask again.

17 MR. WAEHLING: It will probably be next year before
18 we do any of that.

19 MR. VAN CLEVE: Are there any aquifer recharge areas
20 within the boundaries of the camp that you know of? How do
21 you identify those and are they included in any of these tests
22 that you are doing?

23 MR. NELSON: At this landfill there are none. We
24 are finding that there are none-

25 MR. VAN CLEVE: Okay.

1 MR. NELSON: -- because of the sub surface soil and
2 in the side rock layer there is no recharge at this point.

3 MR. WAEHLING: But within the camp there could be.

4 MR. VAN CLEVE: Could be in the camp?

5 MR. WAEHLING: Most likely lower down, where it's
6 flat.

7 MR. VAN CLEVE: I wouldn't think up a hill it would
8 be, but down.

9 MR. WAEHLING: It's projected that there is.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: You don't know whether there are or
11 aren't?

12 MR. WAEHLING: They tend to be large regional areas,
13 not discreet locations.

14 MR. VAN CLEVE: Pretty obvious wet land areas.

15 MR. WAEHLING: We are not talking a few acres. We
16 are talking large regions the size of counties.

17 MR. VAN CLEVE: More in a basin or something.

18 MR. WAEHLING: Valleys. A hydrogeologist can better
19 explain. It's not a discreet point on the ground that's
20 considered a recharge location. Yet some recharge most likely
21 occurs on sections of Bonneville, but not within the
22 boundaries of the landfill.

23 MR. VAN CLEVE: I was just curious whether there was
24 any contaminants near any of the suspected recharge areas.

25 MR. WAEHLING: With the additional wells that are

1 going in in August, we are trying to get a better
2 understanding if that's the case.

3 MS. SUTHERLAND: A quick question about the wells.
4 If you don't find too many contaminants in the well, is it
5 safe to consider what's running below it?

6 MR. WAEHLING: It's not likely. The wells are going
7 to extend through the weathered bedrock, which is where we
8 found the contamination, and into the solid bed rock.

9 MS. SUTHERLAND: According to this, it looks like
10 you find it underneath the weathered bedrock.

11 MR. WAEHLING: We found it at the bottom. Weathered
12 bedrock is sitting on top of the solid rock. It's sitting on
13 it like a ceramic bowl. The water doesn't penetrate that
14 rock. There is no pathway. There is no cracks. It's not
15 permeable.

16 But the weathered bedrock is full of cracks and
17 fissures. That's why the water is there.

18 MS. SUTHERLAND: So the recharge underneath the
19 bedrock would be from higher up on the mountain?

20 MR. WAEHLING: Most likely lower. The Troutdale
21 would be to locate where the bedrock is nonexistent.

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: Are you saying there is no water
23 underneath there?

24 MR. KOK: Well, it could be above; it could be
25 below. The Troutdale is a regional aquifer.

1 MS. SUTHERLAND: It's very deep, though. I
2 understand it's recharged from the top of the mountain.

3 MR. KOK: More than likely we've got recharge areas
4 up in the foothills and Cascades that have contributed to the
5 large regional aquifer.

6 MR. WAEHLING: But at this location the rock
7 prevents the water from permeating. It would be as if you
8 have an aquifer underneath the table and one sitting on top.
9 The table surface prevents the two communicating.

10 MR. NELSON: Ian, do you feel better? Are you more
11 comfortable?

12 MR. RAY: Oh, yeah.

13 MR. NELSON: Did we communicate that?

14 MR. RAY: I was doing some simple calculations here.
15 By the depth and the P and the Y dimensions. I see like
16 75,000 cubic yards. And maybe, I think, Bruce was telling me
17 one day 18 yards per truck load or something like that.

18 MR. OVERBAY: Well, if you take a truck and transfer
19 you can get a maximum of 22 to 24 on a dry load. Now, weight
20 is going to play a big part into it. Say Greg gets out there
21 and says: No. We are going to start digging that out in the
22 wintertime. That's going to cut down to 18, 19 yards because
23 of weight restrictions.

24 MR. WAEHLING: These all play into our cost
25 estimates.

1 MR. RAY: So that figures out to be like 4,000
2 trucks. They have to go up that windy gravel road and hairpin
3 turn at the little Lacamas Creek bridge. We begin to wonder
4 about fixing the road.

5 MR. WAEHLING: It's a significant design feature.
6 These are all design elements of how -- we have to figure out
7 how we are going to do this. It's going to take some time,
8 and we are going to bring you along in the process and tell
9 you what the challenges are.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: Cost of diesel fuel.

11 MR. WAEHLING: It's going to be a big job, though,
12 but it's the best way to guarantee.

13 MR. WASTLER: Is there access from another area? Is
14 there a road actually without having to go through what they
15 were describing? Is there an access from a state road or
16 County road in the back?

17 MR. WAEHLING: We will look at all the possibilities
18 as far as whether we can access via another. That's how we go
19 about coming up with an estimate. As we gain more and more
20 information we can define it. We can try to fill in any
21 details you want about how we go about trying to define the
22 cost estimate.

23 MR. NELSON: We have the model. We ran the model.
24 First cut for the budget.

25 MR. WAEHLING: Well, thank you, Mike. We have just

1 a very few minutes.

2 MR. WASTLER: I just have one question about the
3 cost of cleanup.

4 MR. WAEHLING: Okay.

5 MR. WASTLER: You guys were talking about how you
6 are not cutting any trees larger than a six-inch diameter, and
7 you are being real careful to restore and maintain the
8 environment that's there. I'm wondering, is that adding to
9 the cost?

10 MR. WAEHLING: Sure.

11 MR. WASTLER: Would it be cheaper for you to just go
12 ahead and disregard that or is it costing more for you guys to
13 have respect for the environment?

14 MR. WAEHLING: It potentially could cost more having
15 to work around trees and things like that. It makes access
16 more difficult for equipment, and for surveying, and all.

17 As far as what exactly the additional costs will be,
18 I can't tell you at the moment. We are going to do our best
19 to avoid cutting down large trees. It may be unavoidable.

20 MR. WASTLER: I was just curious how much more it's
21 costing the Federal government to maintain that.

22 MR. WAEHLING: I couldn't give you a specific
23 answer.

24 MR. WASTLER: You say rather than just level the
25 places and --

1 MR. WAEHLING: We have just a few minutes left. I
2 was going to ask, if Greg wanted to just talk, if you want to
3 have some of Greg's thoughts.

4 MS. LANE: Has he seen any sick or injured animals
5 over there?

6 MR. JOHNSON: I have a found a lot of wildlife.

7 MS. LANE: We had two dogs on our block both come
8 down with benign throat tumors. I think that was unusual. I
9 thought that was just unusual, that four or five houses two
10 dogs both come down with that.

11 MR. WAEHLING: Sorry to hear that. We have seen
12 lots of wildlife.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Woodpeckers, all kind of stuff out
14 there; bear, cougar signs.

15 MS. SUTHERLAND: Bald eagles?

16 MR. JOHNSON: I saw an eagle. It wasn't a bald
17 eagle.

18 MR. KOK: Greg, you were saying you found fragments.

19 MR. JOHNSON: We found a lot of fragments. I've
20 been working in the impact area for about the last couple
21 weeks doing some assignments to the technical team. What we
22 are doing is kind of double checking the way points that were
23 taken during the recon, some of the data, slope angles and
24 things like that.

25 Yeah. I found a large amount of frag in the trees.

1 MR. KOK: How are you finding it?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Magnetometer.

3 MR. KOK: That's just in the impact area?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Around the targets in the impact area.
5 There is certain parts of the impact area I went to
6 investigate, some berms. When I got up there all they really
7 were, were places where it had been logged 20, 30, maybe 40
8 years ago. You would see the log laying on the side. You are
9 would see a stump and a crater.

10 When they were doing the reconnaissance they put
11 down "Crater," but -- so that kind of, you know, made us
12 wonder what it was. So I went out to look at some of these.

13 We are going to talk to Parsons, the contractor. We
14 are going to try to get them to standardize their verbiage.

15 MR. WAEHLING: The reason we weren't sure about the
16 crater, did they mean an impact crater from an artillery round
17 exploding or a stump falling down?

18 MR. KOK: The stump falling over and the root ball?

19 MR. WAEHLING: Right. That reconnaissance was the
20 very first time it had ever been done. If you remember they
21 had a form that they were filling out electronically that was
22 just a crater. It didn't make a distinction between root ball
23 crater versus impact crater.

24 Actually, we went to some of these craters and found
25 both. We found both craters that were obviously root balls

1 and craters most likely the result of impact. That was a
2 distinction the technical team needed to have a better
3 understanding of.

4 That's one of the reasons why Greg has been out
5 there.

6 MR. JOHNSON: We did find another target area. It
7 was identified as berms during the recon, but it was a target
8 area. Me and Eric went and looked at it. I wanted a second
9 opinion.

10 But it's 300 feet, approximately, away from the car
11 targets. So when we are talking about the 600-by-600 foot
12 grids we are going to put over them and do, it would have been
13 caught in that.

14 MR. VAN CLEVE: Target area for what?

15 MR. JOHNSON: We were thinking 105s. I have a lot
16 of frag -- frag analysis. You can actually see the rotating
17 bands. We know that 60 mortars, 81 millimeter mortars don't
18 rotate. They are fin stabilized. The four deuce does rotate,
19 but it has almost a three-inch band on it. The 105 has about
20 one-inch to inch-and-a-half band, depending on whether it's a
21 Howitzer or gun. Then the 155 has about a two- inch band.

22 You can see from these that they were pretty much
23 105s. Then we did find a bigger piece of frag that looks like
24 it was probably a base plate from maybe a 155.

25 So mainly it was 105s. Plus the range where this

1 target is is kind of out of the range of a 60 millimeter.
2 Sixty millimeter mortars, it's best case you are looking about
3 2,000 meters. This is a little bit beyond that. I think at
4 Bonneville they probably didn't use all four increments when
5 they fired the 60s. They probably just wanted to get them
6 into the range.

7 Also, on the other hand, there have been no 60 or 81
8 tag booms found. Normally in a range where you have mortars
9 you find those everywhere.

10 MR. VAN CLEVE: This firing point for these would
11 all be pretty much the same place, so then it would be in
12 intervals, then, unless you get some shortfall?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Right. Exactly. What I found today,
14 when I'm saying target area, I mean coordinates. There is no
15 evidence of a target there. The recon found no evidence, and
16 me and Eric found no evidence.

17 But it's close enough around those car targets and
18 refrigerator targets that that whole area is probably the
19 primary area of concern. But the 600-by-600 grids are going
20 to cover that.

21 MR. VAN CLEVE: That's good. A lot of times not
22 necessarily firing at something.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Probably a lot of it was that. They
24 were training, so they had new guys.

25 But they got their work cut out for them. We

1 figured that out.

2 MR. WAEHLING: Ecology has dedicated a lot of energy
3 and resource in helping this thing move along. Greg is being
4 on the ground floor himself and seeing it for himself, instead
5 of just relying on reports a evidence of that.

6 MR. JOHNSON: The work in the impact area is going
7 to be a lot of years of work, depending on which way we go on
8 it. You guys want me to go into -- do you have time? Is it
9 too late?

10 MR. WAEHLING: We can do it next time.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. There might be some changes by
12 then, too.

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: I have two questions.

14 MR. WAEHLING: Yes, please.

15 MS. SUTHERLAND: I just wanted to tell you that on
16 the northwestern side -- the most northwestern side there
17 is -- right on the other side of the fence, on the community
18 side is an old 1940s truck that's all rusted. It looks like
19 it has big, huge holes in it. So if you go to the fence and
20 look out, it's in this forested --

21 MR. WAEHLING: Outside the boundary of Camp
22 Bonneville.

23 MS. SUTHERLAND: But it looks like something I've
24 seen pictures of. You know the road that goes north right as
25 you go up to the gate? It's 227th.

1 MR. WASTLER: 232nd.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: There is a path between 232nd,
3 where he is talking about -- between Camp Bonneville there is
4 a little path I used to ride my horse on for many, many years.
5 I saw it there again. You can probably go to the fence on the
6 Camp Bonneville side and look at it. It might be --

7 MR. WASTLER: We know that as McGrews, because they
8 used to live on top of the hill. The main gate, then you make
9 a hard left. The road that goes parallel up the trail. Then
10 if it keeps going. We used to call that McGrew.

11 MR. JOHNSON: You are saying there's holes in it and
12 stuff?

13 MS. SUTHERLAND: Yeah. It's very rusted.

14 MS. LANE: People go up there and target practice
15 besides the Army.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Maybe somebody towed it.

17 MS. SUTHERLAND: I just wanted to ask you, Jeroen --
18 I don't know if you know the answer to this. I was reading
19 the Department of Interior, Federal lands, NPS, minutes I
20 talked to you about earlier, and they said that they are not
21 interested in monitoring lands with institutional controls
22 transferred to a park; no fencing or anything like that. I
23 was curious if you knew anything about that.

24 MR. JOHNSON: I'm going to look into this, because
25 that definitely raises -- piqued my curiosity. I don't know

1 if Eric has seen this. Her name was Wendy Ormut.

2 MS. SUTHERLAND: Is she with the Army.

3 MR. JOHNSON: She is with the Federal Lands and
4 Parks.

5 MR. WAEHLING: I don't know. I know that we
6 transferred property to NPS and NPS has taken property from
7 the Army.

8 MS. SUTHERLAND: Just one property?

9 MR. WAEHLING: There have been a number of
10 properties.

11 MS. SUTHERLAND: That have UXO?

12 MR. WAEHLING: That have institutional controls.
13 I'm not sure what she is talking about.

14 MS. SUTHERLAND: I think it was regarding the first
15 Army site with UXO to be transferred. There's only been one
16 other and it was the Navy.

17 MR. JOHNSON: She specifically said in there fence
18 around impact area.

19 MR. WAEHLING: We will have to look into that.

20 MR. JOHNSON: I was going to call her, or something,
21 and talk to her.

22 MS. SUTHERLAND: I just didn't know if you had an
23 answer.

24 MR. KOK: As far as I know, institutional controls
25 are going to be a must.

1 MS. SUTHERLAND: That's what I understood.

2 MR. KOK: If the National Park Service has a problem
3 with that --

4 MR. WAEHLING: The National Park Service isn't the
5 only mechanism we can use to transfer the property. That's
6 just one potential sponsor. We will look into this.

7 The question that's before us now is, when do we
8 want to meet again?

9 If we are planning for an open house in November, we
10 might want to look at September to try to do a little bit
11 more.

12 MR. KOK: Sounds like we have enough to fill an
13 agenda.

14 MR. WAEHLING: September it is. That would be the
15 second Wednesday, the 11th.

16 Are there any other issues before we adjourn? Of
17 course, I'll be available after the meeting.

18 We will see you again on September the 11th.

19 (The hearing was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

