



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY  
P.O. BOX 268  
FORT WINGATE, NM 87316

March 22, 2011

Mr. James P. Bearzi  
Chief, Hazardous Waste Bureau  
New Mexico Environment Department  
2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-6303

Dear Mr. Bearzi:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to the New Mexico Environment Department's (NMED) Second Notice of Disapproval letter for the Parcel 6 RCRA Facility Investigation Work Plan, dated October 21, 2010. The NMED granted a deadline extension for the work plan to March 31, 2011. The NMED comments and Army responses are listed below. The referenced revised tables and figures will be sent under a separate cover by the U.S Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.

**COMMENT 1**

Where the Permittee proposes to collect soil samples for volatile organic carbon (VOC) analyses, it must ensure that relatively undisturbed discrete soil samples are collected and that the soil is not homogenized prior to analysis.

**RESPONSE:**

The Army will ensure that relatively undisturbed discrete soil samples are collected and that the soil is not homogenized prior to analysis. No changes were made to the Work Plan.

**COMMENT 2**

In Section 8.2.2 (Sampling Data), page 8-11, the Permittee states "[f]ollowing the excavation activities, confirmation soil samples were collected from the bottom of the excavations and the site was backfilled with clean soil, regraded, and revegetated." The Permittee did not include the sampling depths for the confirmation soil samples. The sampling depths for the confirmation samples are also not included in the referenced document (*Final Report Removal and Disposal of Western Landfill; USACE, 2005*). The Permittee must revise the Work Plan to specify the depths beneath the ground surface or from the base of the excavation at which confirmation samples were collected. If the sampling depths are unknown, the Permittee must state this in the revised Work Plan.

**RESPONSE:**

All confirmation samples were taken from the bottom of the excavation as stated in Section 8.2.2, page 8-11, of the April 30, 2010 RFI Work Plan. Appendix E1 of the Historical Information Report, dated February 23, 2009, contains excerpts from the (*Final Report Removal and Disposal of Western Landfill; USACE, 2005*). Section 6.1.1, page 11, of the Historical Information Report describes the confirmation sampling. It states confirmation samples were

**RESPONSE:**

During the summer of 2010 the subject pad-mounted transformer (Transformer 04) was removed as part of the building demolition project but the pad remains. A hole where the piping rises from below the ground was under the transformer. The Army will obtain one sample composited from each side of the pad and at the hole in the middle of the pad. Transformer 01 (and pole) and Transformer 03 (and pole) were also removed during 2010. All four transformer sites will be sampled.

Section 12.4 and Table 12-1 will be revised to change the discrete sample at the pad to a composite sample. A simple figure will be added on page 12-5 showing the sampling layout. Text will be added to Section 12.3.2 describing the transformer removal.

**COMMENT 5**

In Appendix N (Comment Response Table) Comment Number 29, the Permittee states "[t]he Army BRAC Headquarters will be providing a letter to the NMED on the sampling of igloo interiors in Parcel 22. The sampling of igloo interiors in Parcel 4 and 6 will be similar to those proposed for Parcel 22." NMED received the letter from BRAC Headquarters, dated June 11, 2010. In the letter the Permittee requested a description for swipe sampling protocol and regulatory criteria to be used. NMED provided a response, dated October 1, 2010 which included the requested protocol for sampling igloo interiors. The Permittee must refer to NMED's letter and revise the Work Plan to include proposed sampling methods for igloo interior sampling.

**RESPONSE:** Refer to the Memorandum for DAIM-ODB-RA by the U.S. Army Legal Services Agency dated March 3, 2011 concerning the Army position on sampling of the igloo interiors at Fort Wingate. To address the 12 igloos in the memorandum the Army proposes submitting an addendum to the Parcel 6 RFI Work Plan containing interior igloo sample protocol pending the resolution of the interior igloo sampling issue. The 12 igloos include B1005, B1008, B1009, B1015, B1021, B1022, B1047, B1048, B1056, B1080, B1081, and C1103. The sampling methods for the igloos specified in the U.S. Army Legal Services Agency letter will comply with the protocol in the October 1, 2010 NMED letter. In the meantime, the Army will implement all the field sampling requirements of the April 30, 2010 RFI Work Plan to include addressing all comments in NMED's second NOD letter dated October 21, 2010 excluding the igloo interiors. The Army plans to begin fieldwork during the week of ~~April 4~~, 2011.

MAY 2 SWS

**COMMENT 6**

In Section 13.3.8 (Scope of Activities), page 13-13, the Permittee requests "NFA" at AOC 78/82. Based on the geophysical survey results, the soil sampling results and the metallic anomaly intrusive investigation, NMED concurs that no further characterization is necessary at AOC 78/82.

**RESPONSE:** Acknowledged.

Chuck Hendrickson, U.S. EPA Region 6  
Sharlene Begay-Platero, Navajo Nation  
Eugenia Quintana, Navajo Nation  
Edward Wemytewa, Zuni Pueblo  
Steve Beran, Zuni Pueblo  
Clayton Seoutewa, Southwest Region BIA  
Charles Long, Navajo Nation  
Rose Duwyenie, Navajo BIA  
Judith Wilson, BIA  
Eldine Stevens, BIA  
Ben Burshia, BIA



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency  
Environmental Law Division  
901 North Stuart Street, Suite 420  
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

JALS-EL

3 March 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR DAIM-ODB-RA

SUBJECT: Fort Wingate Depot Activity RCRA Facility Investigation Work Plan

1. The United States Army Legal Services Agency, Environmental Law Division has reviewed letters of June 23, 2009, July 22, 2009, and February 4, 2010 sent from the New Mexico Environment Department ("NMED") regarding the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA") Facility Investigation Work Plan at Fort Wingate Depot Activity ("FWDA"). In those letters, NMED purports to require the Army to sample the inside of munitions storage igloos in Parcels 4a, 6, and 22 under the terms of the Army's RCRA hazardous waste permit. Because such a requirement is outside the scope of RCRA, the Army cannot sample the inside of these igloos, with the exception of 12 igloos that FWDA's contractor used to store waste military munitions.
2. There is no evidence that the Army or its contractor stored hazardous wastes in any of the igloos in these parcels (with the exception of 12 igloos specifically identified and used for the storage of waste military munitions, discussed below). New Mexico has adopted the federal regulations regarding the management of specific hazardous wastes. *See* 20.4.1.700 NMAC ("Except as otherwise provided, the regulations of the EPA set forth in 40 CFR Part 266 through July 1, 2008 are hereby incorporated by reference."). Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §266.202 (a)(2), unused munitions, or components thereof, are not a solid waste if they are being repaired, reused, recycled, reclaimed, disassembled, or reconfigured. The igloos in these parcels were used for the storage of unused munitions awaiting use (or reuse) and unused components of munitions (propellant) awaiting recycling. Therefore, there could not have been any release of hazardous waste subject to the RCRA permit.
3. Moreover, New Mexico cannot claim there was ever a spill of a hazardous waste in the igloos. New Mexico has adopted the federal regulations regarding the identification and listing of hazardous waste. *See* 20.4.1.200 NMAC ("Except as otherwise provided, the regulations of the EPA set forth in 40 CFR Part 261 through July 1, 2008 are hereby incorporated by reference."). Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. §261.33, spills of commercial chemical products ("CCPs") may be hazardous waste. Those specific CCPs are listed at 40 C.F.R. §261.33(e) and (f). However, at FWDA, there is no evidence that any listed CCPs were stored – let alone spilled – in igloos in these parcels. Although the unused propellants that were stored in Parcel 22 contained a combination of chemicals that may have included CCPs, because there is no evidence that these CCPs were stored in their pure form, they cannot be hazardous waste. *See* RCRA Online 11161 ("If you cannot show that the products are listed under §261.33(e) and (f) (e.g., if the pesticides contained a combination of chemicals, rather than the pure chemicals), the residues would not be a hazardous waste under §261.33.").