



**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes
Sierra Army Depot (SIAD)
6:30 pm Wednesday July 07, 2004
Skedaddle Inn, Herlong, California**

Attendee	Organization	E-mail Address/Phone
Gil Azevedo	RAB Community Member	530-257-7422
John Harris	Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)	jharris3@dtsc.ca.gov 916-255-3683
Regina Rankin-Schaap	Lassen County Local Reuse Authority (LCLRA)	530-251-2685
Keith Hoddinott	Office of the Surgeon General	410-436-5209
Michael Dukes	ARCADIS	mdukes@arcadis-us.com 510-233-3200
Cathy Armstead	Armstead Associates	cearmstead@aol.com 303-838-6969
Beshara Yared	US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacto Dist	besharaGyared@USACE.eng.mil 916-557-6923
James Brathovde	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	JBrathovde@rb6s.swrcb.ca.gov 530-542-5572
Kris Escarda	DTSC	916-255-6683
Michael Wolfram	US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Wolfram.michael@epa.gov 415 972-3027
Duane Schlusler	Community Member	530-827-2563
Michael Trainor	Sierra Army Depot (SIAD)	Michael.Trainor@sierra.army.mil 530-827-1650
Tony Larson	Lassen Times	530-234-1016
Thomas Yssez	Honey Lake Conservation Team	530-755-0258

1.0 Mr. Trainor (sitting in for Ms. Huston) Sierra Army Depot Environmental Specialist. Roll Call, Reading of Minutes to the last meeting, approval of Minutes:

Mr. Trainor opened the meeting by announcing that in previous meetings audio tape recorders were used to record the RAB conversations but unfortunately the tape recordings have been difficult to understand. Mr. Trainor explained stenographers were going to be tried in this meeting and he introduced the three stenographers from Truckee Meadows Community College, Ruth, Vicki, and Tej who would record the meeting minutes for this July 7, 2004 meeting.

Mr. Trainor also announced that the RAB meetings would continue to be audio recorded. The minutes from the previous RAB meeting (May 12, 2004) were reviewed and accepted by the RAB with the condition that Gil Azevedo would be given additional time to review the minutes because he had not received them in his mail, and any mistakes he found would be incorporated into the meeting minutes.

2.0 through 4.0 Mr. Erickson BRAC Environmental Coordinator for Sierra Army Depot, BRAC update on the Follow up on the status of institutional control issue for the East Shore of Honey Lake, Status of Honey Lake and Update on Pole Line Road

Mr. Trainor introduced Mr. Erickson and announced Mr. Erickson would condense agenda items 2.0, 3.0 and 4.0 into his presentation.

Mr. Erickson initiated his presentation by explaining that the East Shore OE parcel includes the North Cross Depot access, the west part of the Airfield that has not been transferred and the north part of the East Shore. Mr. Erickson stated the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the East Shore OE parcel had been completed and approved. The removal action includes OE clearance to a depth for all metal equal to or greater than 20- mm metal projectiles in size. Mr. Erickson stated a 20- mm projectile is about 4/5 of an inch in diameter by about 4 to 5 inches long. Mr Erickson stated that there are a couple of exceptions where some very large items would be left in place. Mr. Erickson explained how they were clearing the OE by using a metal detector that uses electrical current and not magnetics. The crew sweeps the ground surface and any metal item or anomaly identified is flagged. The flagged area is then dug up until they find the metal item or what was creating the anomaly. Mr. Erickson stated that they are about 55% done with the sweep and the only ordinance and explosive-related material they found has been within 2 to 4 inches below ground surface (bgs).

Mr. Erickson explained that the East Shore parcel is contaminated with the OE and OE scrap from the Honey Lake demolition area. Old munitions were taken onto Honey Lake for demolition and kickout blew OE onto the area which includes the East Shore. Mr Erickson stated, the East Shore wasn't used for testing or firing, therefore, OE has been assumed to be shallow and investigations have confirmed this assumption.

Mr. Erickson stated that OE removal was being performed at 100% of the East Shore OE parcel after bushes are removed. OE personnel are walking side by side covering the area, including the wetlands, and the Corps of Engineers/Huntsville District is performing quality assurance monitoring to make sure the OE removal is complete.

Mr. Erickson stated that there were some discrepancies in Poleline Road from before the investigation. So it was decided to just do 100% clearance and investigation of Poleline.

Ms. Rankin-Schaap: I'd like to know how far along Poleline Road? Where does the 100% start? The entire Poleline Road?

Mr. Erickson: The whole road.

Ms. Rankin-Schaap: You're going to redo the whole road?

Mr. Erickson: The whole Poleline Road has 100% clearance.

Mr. Erickson explained the intent and the purpose of subsurface clearance is to make the property suitable for reuse. Therefore, the Army would not have to put any institutional or engineering controls in place but the Army realizes that the DTSC doesn't agree with them. Mr. Erickson explained that they've reached agreement with Lassen County to incorporate land-use restrictions that will be recorded with the East Shore parcel transfer and that the use of the property in the future can't change from open space without concurrence from DTSC. Mr Erickson asked Mr. Harris if that was his understanding.

Mr. Harris: In general. It will lay out what uses are appropriate and any sort of specific do-nots. There will be a few, but it's mainly to say that it's not cleared for unrestricted use. It won't allow for residential, day care, hospitals and those types of uses, which you wouldn't want to necessarily, build on an ordinance area anyway. A lot of the appropriate and non appropriate uses are just common sense. But, that has to still be worked out.

Mr. Erickson reiterated that the OE clearance work on the East Shore parcel is over 55% complete and the anticipated completion date is the middle of August.

Mr. Erickson stated that the finding of suitability for transfer (FOST) has been reviewed by the regulators and the response to the regulators comments is anticipated to be complete by the middle of July. Mr. Erickson explained that because the Army's schedule was to transfer the property by the end of September, the FOST would be put out for public review before the field work was complete, with the caveat that the FOST will not be finalized until the field work is complete and that the Corps of Engineers provide certification that the work is complete.

Mr. Erickson moved his presentation to discussing the Honey Lake OE parcel. He stated that the draft EE/CA for the Honey Lake OE parcel is being reviewed internally with the Army and after the Army has completed there review they will discuss the recommendations with the regulators and the Honey Lake Conservation Team. Mr. Erickson announced the Honey Lake OE parcel EE/CA should be out for public review by the end of 2004.

Mr. Erickson asked if anybody had any questions on his presentation.

Mr. Wolfram: I'm Michael Wolfram with USEPA, and my question is - I'm looking for a time line on when the field work will be completed and when you will have the results available so the regulators will be able to look at the final results to verify the results are in agreement with what's written in the FOST.

Mr. Erickson: The field work is projected right now to be completed any time within the first part to the middle of August. Shortly thereafter, the Corp will give the Munitions and Explosives Concern [MEC] statement, the statement that says the work is complete. We're having the contractor write the report as they go along. So within a few weeks to a month after that, when everything has been completed, it will be available for review.

Mr. Wolfram: So we'll have a window of opportunity to look at the final results and make sure we're in agreement with them.

Mr. Erickson: Yes.

Ms. Escarda: What will the regulators respond to? The field work? Will that be available to the public before the public review period ends?

Mr. Erickson: No, because the public review period on the FOST is actually going to end about the same time as the field work.

Mr. Harris: I am concerned about the timing of this FOST. How can you put a document out for public comment that says it's suitable to transfer? Until you have the results, you don't know if it's suitable to transfer.

Mr. Erickson: What we expect then is that it won't be transferred and it won't be signed as suitable for transfer until it is finalized.

Mr. Harris: But you are going to put a document out for public comment that says it is suitable for transfer when you have no idea if it will or will not be suitable for transfer. So how is the public supposed to make meaningful comments on a document that may or may not reflect the reality of the situation?

Mr. Wolfram: Would a solution to that be to put a cover letter along with that FOST stating that this document was written based upon 55% of the work being completed. We have written this assuming that when the other 45% is complete, it will mirror or it will be exactly the same as the first 55%, and if it changes, then we'll go back and revise the document to make necessary modifications.

Mr. Harris: I think that is something that is workable. I mean, I think it's dependent upon the Army to fully disclose to the public what their supposed to be reviewing and how accurate the document is.

Mr. Erickson: Well, we intend to do that, but if we're doing it under clearance, I think 100% of the property, or we're doing a clearance to depth, now, we're not going to quit until we reach that point. So the document is accurate for what we've completed.

Mr. Harris: But what you are asking the people to comment on, you won't know if that it is true. You're saying that it's suitable to transfer at the time that you're asking the public to comment on the FOST. It isn't suitable to transfer because you haven't completed your remedial action.

Mr. Erickson: We're asking them to review it and comment on it as if it were true. It will be identified that it is not complete, and that it will not be finalized until it is. But, if we do what we say we are going to do, the FOST will not change, and if there is some drastic unknown out there that we didn't know about, then the FOST won't be approved, the property won't be transferred and we'll have to start over.

Mr. Harris: Okay.

Mr. Wolfram: And just for clarification of the clearance to depth, would you say to 12 inches or a clearance to depth to 18 inches?

Mr. Erickson: Clearance to depth is if they find a piece of metal that they detect, that they dig until they find it. But they have a test plot that has 20-mm projectiles at 6 and 12 inches and 37-mm projectiles at 18 inches. They check that every day. One projectile is horizontal, one is vertical on each of those levels, and they check it everyday before they allow the instruments to go to work.

Mr. Wolfram: And you can help me with the wording in the clause because I just looked at your draft copy, but I don't remember, did it define clearance to depth as far as the depth of the instruments are tested for? I mean, does the FOST actually say it is cleared to depth to 12 inches or 18 inches?

Mr. Erickson: It's clearance to depth to whatever is found. It could be deeper, if something is found.

Mr. Wolfram: And I'm not disagreeing with that process. I think what I'm looking for is maybe some wording that actually is included in the document so people understand what that means.

Mr. Erickson: -- If you could help us to figure out that wording. We've tried all kinds, and we can't get people to understand.

Ms. Rankin-Schaap: We've gone round and round about that too.

Mr. Wolfram: You know, maybe USEPA can work with that, and we can come back with some kind of recommendation, because when I reviewed the documents, that was one of my comments, because I was going to wait to see how you clarified the removal action. And somewhere I'd like to see certification in there based upon the tests that are set every day to 12 and 18 inches as far as the 20 mm and 37-mm projectiles - that will work - that the Army is confident of clearance to a depth for that size of projectiles. Something like that.

Mr. Erickson: Okay. If I have the words that you said tonight, and then explain that the instruments are tested to 12 inches for 20 mm or 37 mm.

Mr. Wolfram: I think 3 or 4 sentences would probably do it. And I think that will help the reader understand exactly how deep it's actually cleared. And I don't know how to include that, but you just gave the information on all of the OE that was found from 2 to 4 inches. I think that bit of information along with your depth of clearance, the accuracy - that you have with certain instrumentation and that you do have a high level of confidence in the accuracy. I think that would give the readers a good understanding too.

Mr. Erickson: Okay.

Mr. Erickson: So the EPA will help. I'll look into the most recent version that we have of the FOST, and try to come up with some wording to insert.

Mr. Erickson: Okay.

Mr. Erickson: Thanks.

5.0 Mr. Dukes and Ms. Armstead – ARCADIS/Armstead Associates, Overview of Restoration Program Reports and Activities

Mr. Trainor introduced Mr. Dukes, Project Manager for ARCADIS and Ms. Armstead of Armstead Associates who is a subcontractor to ARCADIS on the restoration sites at SIAD. Mr. Dukes initiated the presentation by announcing that all the wells for the insitu remediation zone (IRZ) studies are installed except one and that one would be installed the next day. Mr. Dukes stated if they can keep to their schedule they will start injections into IRZ wells the week of the 19th of July. He also stated they are anticipating preliminary results in about three months and possibly for the next RAB, although the testing period will most likely be for at least one year before definitive conclusions can be drawn.

Ms. Armstead reiterated that the main focus of the IRZ studies is to change the aquifer conditions from oxidizing to reducing to allow for reduction of TCE concentrations. Ms. Armstead reminded the RAB members that they were trying to change to reducing conditions in the aquifer by injecting quite a bit of food grade molasses in order to reduce TCE concentrations

Mr. Dukes announced that they were working on the preliminary designs for the Corrective Action Management Units (CAMUs) on the OPF and the UBG where contaminated soil from the OPF would be placed into the CAMUs as the final remedy. Mr. Dukes then asked Ms. Armstead to summarize where they were in the Three Sites Record of Decision (ROD) process.

Ms. Armstead announced that the Draft Three Sites ROD, had been given to DTSC and the Regional Water Quality Board for review. Ms. Armstead reminded the RAB members that prior to the preparation of the ROD a Three Sites Proposed Plan was prepared and sent to all the RAB members and announcements of a community meeting to discuss the remedies described in the proposed plan were put in the Lassen County times and the Reno Gazette. Additionally, the announcement placed in the two papers stated that the proposed plan was available for review in the repositories. She also stated that no-one attended the community meeting and that written comments were not received, therefore, they were moving forward with obtaining approval of the Draft Three Sites ROD and design for the remedies.

Ms. Armstead stated they were expecting to receive comments from DTSC and RWQCB within a few weeks and that James Brathovde would be submitting the Final Three Sites ROD to the RWQCB meeting.

Mr. Dukes and Ms. Armstead both announced that the Remedial Design and Remedial Action Plan for the three sites may be available for the next RAB for review by the RAB members.

Mr. Dukes concluded his presentation by announcing he would keep the RAB members informed of the progress on the enhanced biodegradation studies and the Three Sites ROD. He also promised to have a power point presentation at the next RAB. Mr. Dukes then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Brathovde: On your IRZ pilot studies in TNT, DRMO and Abandoned Landfill and Southern Sites Area, I noticed that the spacing is about ten feet or about roughly ten feet apart from injection wells to the observation wells. You're going to inject the molasses slurry into the aquifer and create an anaerobic environment to scale it up to effectively remediate a larger TCE plume. Would that also be the same grid spacing for the larger scale treatment?

Mr. Dukes: Possibly. Because remedies are already in place at the TNT and DRMO we are just trying to demonstrate that we can obtain reducing conditions in these two areas and enhance the attenuation process. Therefore, ten feet or so may be the design.

Ms. Armstead: But for Building 210, we have 50-foot spacing between injection wells. The 50 foot spacing has been designed because it is more cost effective for the large 210 Area TCE plume. In the Abandoned Landfill and Southern Sites Area the TCE plume is smaller and has a much lower TCE concentration (i.e., less than 150 ppb) and it would be cost effective to design the wells at full scale with 10 foot spacing.

Mr. Brathovde: The injection wells at the Southern sites, were those installed or just tagged?

Ms. Armstead: Those are our last wells that we're installing right now.

Mr. Brathovde: Currently?

Mr. Dukes: Yes

Mr. Brathovde: Thank you.

6.0 Discussion (group)

Mr. Trainor opened the meeting to questions or other discussion for items than anyone wanted to address. No other items were brought to the floor for discussion. Mr. Trainor then asked the RAB members for agenda item suggestions for the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Azevedo: Basically, the Honey Lake update. And I'd be interest in some of the information that maybe Cathy has on the monitoring of wells as to temperature and static levels, if they have changed or migrated in any way.

Ms. Armstead: We monitor site-wide water levels, so we can provide you with an overview.

Mr. Harris: Anything else on the agenda. Six, eight weeks from now, we should have some preliminary designs for our CAMUs. Do you think you could bring the design for the CAMUs Michael? We can give the RAB members a little bit better idea of what physically is going to be going on out there and how it's going to shape up.

Mr. Dukes: Of course. I would be happy to.

Ms. Rankin-Schaap: Of course, I'd like to continue to see the BRAC updates. By then, we should be pretty close to completion, if not completed for the East Shore parcel and West Airfield parcel.

Mr. Wolfram: When we do have a meeting, the remainder of the field work should have been completed in one month and we can hear about the rest of what is unearthed. We'll be able to determine whether what was included in the FOST initially still is correct.

Mr. Harris: September 22nd works out for me.

Mr. Wolfram: I was just thinking, it would be nice before the land is actually transferred, for everyone to hear what was commented on to be sure we're headed in the same direction.

Mr. Harris: We need to work on the land-use controls, because that will need to be in place before the transfer can take place. We need to see the completion report and sign off on it, that the property actually has been cleared sufficiently before the property can be transferred. All that has to be done irregardless of the date. We'll get that done as expeditiously as possible. Does September 22nd sound okay?

Mr. Azevedo: It's as good as any.

Mr. Trainor: We'll go ahead. Next RAB is September 22nd.

Mr. Trainor: Any other agenda items?

Mr. Schlusler: There has been a considerable amount of discussion upon new membership. How are we proceeding with that? And I see that you do have three names down here of which you said that you'd like to have. One of them is me, and I have not yet been informed as to whether I'd be a member of this board or not. We need the answer to who the new members are.

Mr. Harris: I wasn't at the last meeting, so I'm a little bit behind on information. But RAB membership goes through the Army, so the Depot needs to let the people know who will be on the board. I'll put that on my agenda to see where that stands and then we'll make sure that you get contacted. And, hopefully, if we can we'll be able to have all that flushed out and actually have a few more members on the RAB. So I'll work with the Depot to get our kinks worked out.

Mr. Trainor: Are there any other items that you'd like to discuss at this time?

Mr. Harris: If there's nothing else. Anybody from the public wish to raise a comment, question or concern?

Mr. Harris: Well, alright. I move that we adjourn, and we'll learn more at our next meeting the 22nd of September.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:32 pm

Meeting Minutes by Ms. Armstead of Armstead Associates and Ms. Huston of Sierra Army Depot with assistance from student stenographers from Truckee Meadows community college.



**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SIERRA ARMY DEPOT
6:30 p.m., Wednesday September 22, 2004
Skeddadle Inn - Herlong, California**

- 1.0 1830-1840 ROLL CALL, READING OF MINUTES TO THE LAST MEETING, APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Co-Chair)
- 2.0 1840-1855 STATUS OF THE CLEANUP ON THE EAST SHORE PARCEL AND THE FINDING OF SUITABILITY FOR TRANSFER (FOST) DOCUMENT (Mike Erickson)
- 3.0 1855-1905 STATUS OF HONEY LAKE ENGINEERING EVALUATION AND COST ANALYSIS (EE/CA) (Mike Erickson)
- 4.0 1905-1935 OVERVIEW OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM REPORTS AND ACTIVITIES (ARCADIS / ARMSTEAD ASSOCIATES)
- 5.0 1935-1945 STATUS OF INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE RAB (Lisa Huston)
- 6.0 1945-2000 DISCUSS FUTURE RAB DIRECTION AND MEMBERSHIP SOLICITATION (group)

6.1 RAB Members Questions and Discussions

6.2 Schedule Next Meeting and Agenda Items