Base Realignment and Closure Division

John Kieling
Chief, Hazardous Waste Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-6303

RE: Additional Information Related to the August 16, 2019 Proposal to Reset Enforceable Schedule and Resolve Programmatic Issues at Fort Wingate Depot Activity (FWDA), McKinley County, New Mexico. EPA # NM6213820974

Dear Mr. Kieling:

The purpose of this letter is to follow up on a task identified in the Army's August 16, 2019 letter regarding Fort Wingate, NM. Specifically, this letter transmits an initial list of issues (Enclosure 1) associated with the FWDA program that are affecting the outstanding documents identified in the Army's August 16, 2019 letter. The initial list of issues includes a description of the issue, the actions that have been taken related to the issue, and a proposal for discussion on how to resolve the issue. As noted in the August 16, 2019 letter, we again request to schedule an initial meeting with NMED staff in Santa Fe in September or October of this year to begin to resolve these issues.

If you have questions, please contact me at mark.c.patterson.civ@mail.mil or at (505) 721-9770.

Sincerely,

Mark Patterson
BRAC Environmental Coordinator

CF:
Mr. Dave Cobrain, NMED-HWB
Mr. Benjamin Wear, NMED-HWB
Mr. Michiya Suzuki, NMED-HWB
Mr. John Verheul, NMED OGC
Ms. Laurie King, EPA Regions 6 (6LCRRC)
Mr. Charles Hendrickson, Region 6 (6LCRRC)
Ms. Renee Terrell, BRACD
Mr. Ian Thomas, BRACD
Ms. Sue Ryan, BRACD
Mr. Mark Patterson, BRACD
Mr. Arnold Newman, USACE
Mr. Kevin Davee, USACE
Ms. Loretta Turner, USACE
Mr. Scottie Fiehler, USACE
Mr. Steve Smith, USACE
Mr. Alan Soicher, USACE
FWDA Admin Record, Ohio / New Mexico
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Taken to Date</th>
<th>Proposal for Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limit of Detection (LOD)/Limit of Quantitation (LOQ) for analytical testing at laboratories</td>
<td>NMED has requested that the Army use analytical laboratories that can achieve quantitation limits below regulatory screening levels.</td>
<td>Army has researched which DoD Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) certified analytical laboratories can achieve what LOQs for the required analytes. None of the found laboratories can achieve LOQs below screening levels for all required analytes.</td>
<td>Army and NMED need to come to agreement on how to resolve this concern, potentially including how to prioritize which analytes are most important for ensuring the LOD is below regulatory screening levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seashell Electronic Database</td>
<td>NMED has requested that the Army provide analytical data in a searchable electronic database (for both historical data and newly collected data).</td>
<td>Army has committed to providing all newly collected data in Excel or Access database format. Army has considered how to address the request to provide historic data in this searchable format, and determined it would be exceedingly difficult to provide historic data in this format unless it is already in a searchable format.</td>
<td>Army is requesting that NMED accept that historical data will not be provided in searchable electronic format unless it is already available in that format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Incremental Sampling Methodology (ISM)</td>
<td>In response to Army proposals, NMED has given direction on how and where it might be appropriate to use ISM for soil sampling at Fort WIngate.</td>
<td>NMED has considered ISM's direction on the use of ISM, and is seeking clarification on the use of ISM data, particularly for data that has already been collected (e.g. through aprons and revegetation at Fort WIngate).</td>
<td>Army and NMED need to clarify the criteria that should be used to determine when and how ISM might be used at Fort WIngate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Additional Characterization vs. Remedial Actions and Confirmation Sampling</td>
<td>To further define nature and extent of contamination, NMED has requested that Army perform step-out sampling at locations five to ten feet from the original sample location in at least four directions.</td>
<td>Army considered this direction from NMED. Army is requesting that NMED provide flexibility on how to address such contaminates, either by determining the scale of step-out sampling for characterization of nature and extent, or by proceeding to an interim removal action followed by confirmation sampling. Army understands that it assumes all risk for needing to remediate any areas not characterized as clean.</td>
<td>Army is requesting that NMED allow Army to determine how best to address potential contamination, either by determining the scale of step-out sampling, or by implementing remedial actions and confirmation sampling. Regardless, Army understands it assumes all risks related to this determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Requests for follow-on work plans prior to approval of initial reports</td>
<td>NMED has requested that Army submit follow-on work plans prior to initial reports are approved (e.g. requesting a Phase 2 work plan in a Notice of Disapproval on an initial report).</td>
<td>Army has considered this request. Preparing a follow-on work plan before an initial report is approved creates significant uncertainty for Army funding and contracting requirements. Army proposes to submit work plans for follow-on phases of work only after receiving approval of the current phase of work.</td>
<td>Army is requesting that NMED approve initial reports before requiring submission of work plans for follow-on phases of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing additional comments on previously reviewed documents</td>
<td>NMED has generated new comments and revised new issues that were not identified in earlier reviews of the same document.</td>
<td>Army reviewed the historic record and found differing direction on this topic, including to use the risk guidance in place when the field work begins, when the field work ends, and when the risk screening is being performed. Army proposes to use the work plan to document which version of the risk assessment guidance will be used. When the risk is determined, Army will use the screening levels in place at that time.</td>
<td>For revised document submittals, Army is requesting that NMED only comment on the parts of the document that were reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NMED Risk Assessment Guidance version</td>
<td>There has been inconsistencies on which version of the NMED Risk Assessment Guidance to use.</td>
<td>Army reviewed the historical record and found differing direction on this topic, including to use the risk guidance in place when the field work begins, when the field work ends, and when the risk screening is being performed. Army proposes to use the work plan to document which version of the risk assessment guidance will be used. When the risk is determined, Army will use the screening levels in place at that time.</td>
<td>Army and NMED need to consider this proposal and come to agreement on how to resolve this concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Field Changes protocol - Notification to NMED</td>
<td>Army is seeking to confirm protocol.</td>
<td>Army proposes to contact NMED by telephone regarding field change proposals, seek concurrence verbally, then follow up with email to NMED documenting the change. This change would then be documented in the report.</td>
<td>Army is requesting that NMED consider this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NMED Assigned Deadlines</td>
<td>NMED is assigning deadlines in NODA/Approval letters that are sometimes not feasible for the Army to meet (for ingression/infrastructure funding reasons).</td>
<td>Army has requested to discuss schedules with NMED before assigning deadlines in NODA/Approval letters to avoid the need for requesting extensions. Army is again requesting that NMED consult with Army prior to assigning deadlines for future submittals.</td>
<td>Army is requesting that NMED consider this proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue No.</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action Taken to Date</td>
<td>Proposal for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Appendices in Documents</td>
<td>Army is requesting clarification on what to include (and not include) in appendices section of work plans and reports.</td>
<td>Army reviewed the historical record and found the following examples of items that NMED directed not to include as appendices in work plans/reports: Explosives Management Plan, Environmental Protection Plan, Property Management Plan, Waste Handling Facility Existing Plan for Chemical Warfare Material, Physical Security Plan for Recovered Chemical Warfare Material, Accident Prevention Plan, Uniform Federal Policy - Quality Assurance Project Plan (UFP-QAPP), Explosives Safety Submission, Landfill Disposal Management Plan/Documentation, Final Installation Site Contingency Plan, RCRA Soil Survey of McKinley County, New Mexico, [Cultural Resources] Programmatic Agreement, Pipeline Road Construction Specifications, Laboratory Quality Control Limits, Building Post Carnation Sampling Report, USACE Sampling and Analysis Plans, Aquifer Test Package.</td>
<td>Army and NMED meet to clarify the criteria that should be used to determine what to include in appendices on Army submittals to NMED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Groundwater Risk Assessment</td>
<td>In reviewing the Northern Area Groundwater RFI Report, NMED commented that it is not appropriate to perform a Risk Assessment as part of the RFI.</td>
<td>Army considered this comment and sought clarification from NMED. Ben Werner provided the following clarification on 22 August, 2016: “In NM, all groundwater is considered a potential drinking water source, therefore, if any contaminant exceeds its screening level, the site will fail IA.” Army considered this response and is seeking to better understand how NMED views risk mitigation options for groundwater contamination.</td>
<td>Army and NMED meet to further explore this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NMED Statement</td>
<td>NMED has included the following statement in document approval letters: “Approval of this document does not constitute agreement with all information or every statement presented in the document.”</td>
<td>Army is requesting clarification from NMED on the implication of including this statement in document approval letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Keiling,

The purpose of the attached letter and Enclosure 1 is to follow up on a task identified in the Army’s August 16, 2019 letter regarding Fort Wingate, NM.

If you have questions, please contact Mark Patterson at mark.c.patterson.civ@mail.mil or at 505-721-9770.

FedEx Tracking Number: 8146 9770 8020

Respectfully submitted,

Christy Esler | Program Manager
Sundance Consulting, Inc.
Woman-Native American- Owned Small Business
4292 Tallmadge Rd. | Rootstown, OH 44272
330 578-3024 Office | 330 727-0042 Cell
330 358-7311 (U.S Army office/ Fort Wingate Army Depot)

cesler@sundance-inc.net
www.sundance-inc.net

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
This message (including any attachments or enclosures) contains information that may be confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify me by return email and destroy the communication.
From: Mark Patterson  
Date: 29 Aug 2019  
Sender's Name: Mark Patterson  
Account Number: 2403-9258-4  
Company: US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
Address: 819 TAYLOR ST  
City: FORT WORTH  
State: TX  
ZIP: 76102-6124  
Phone: (817) 886-1857

2 Year Internal Billing Reference: Additional Info: 16 Aug 19

To: Mr. John Kieling  
Recipient's Name: Mr. John Kieling  
Company: NMED-HUB  
Address: 2905 Rodeo Park Dr. E, Bldg. 1

City: Santa Fe  
State: NM  
ZIP: 87505

Express Package Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Business Day</th>
<th>2 or 3 Business Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FedEx First Overnight</td>
<td>FedEx 2Day A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Priority Overnight</td>
<td>FedEx 2Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Standard Overnight</td>
<td>FedEx Express Saver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Packaging

- [ ] FedEx Envelope
- [ ] FedEx Pak
- [ ] FedEx Box
- [ ] FedEx Tube
- Other

Special Handling and Delivery Signature Options

- [ ] No Signature Required
- [ ] Direct Signature
- [ ] Indirect Signature

Does this shipment contain dangerous goods?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Indirect Signature

- [ ] This box must be checked.

Payment

- [ ] Enter FedEx Acct. No. or Credit Card No. below:
- [ ] Total Packages: 1
- [ ] Total Weight: 8 0.2
- [ ] Total Declared Value: 611

Note: The liability is limited to $100 per article unless you declare a higher value. See back for details. By using this service, you agree to the shipping conditions on the back of this airbill and in the current FedEx Service Guide, including terms of service and liability.
Delivered
Friday 8/30/2019 at 10:11 am

FROM
FORT WORTH, TX US

TO
NM US

Shipment Facts

TRACKING NUMBER
814697708020

DELIVERED TO
Receptionist/Front Desk

TERMS
Shipper

SPECIAL HANDLING SECTION
Deliver Weekday

SERVICE
FedEx Standard Overnight

TOTAL PIECES
1

SHIPPER REFERENCE
ADDITIONAL INFO-16AUG LG

STANDARD TRANSIT
8/30/2019 by 3:00 pm

ACTUAL DELIVERY
Fri 8/30/2019 10:11 am

WEIGHT
0.5 lbs / 0.23 kgs

TOTAL SHIPMENT WEIGHT
0.5 lbs / 0.23 kgs

PACKAGING
FedEx Envelope

SHIP DATE
Thu 8/29/2019

Travel History

Local Scan Time

Friday, 8/30/2019
10:11 am  NM  Delivered
9:10 am  SANTA FE, NM  On FedEx vehicle for delivery
8:18 am  SANTA FE, NM  At local FedEx facility
5:30 am  ALBUQUERQUE, NM  At destination sort facility