FW 95-1

Administrative Record

FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY, GALLUP, NEW MEXICO

Document No. 95-3

Fort Wingate Depot Activity, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting, February 7, 1995

Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters

February 1995

INQUIRIES REGARDING THIS DOCUMENT AND/OR THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FOR FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY SHOULD BE MADE TO:
COMMANDER, TOOELE ARMY DEPOT, TOOELE, UTAH 84074

FORT WINGATE DEPOT ACTIVITY

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD AGENDA

OCTAVIA FELLIN LIBRARY

February 7, 1995

7:00 p.m.

I N D E X

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. FISHER: I'd like to get started with the Advisory Board meeting tonight. I'd sure like to welcome everyone here and appreciate your coming. I see a lot of new faces, and we sure welcome you here.

The Restoration Advisory Board has been formed because, of course, Fort Wingate has closed out there, and we are required to clean up certain sites that have been dirtied out there, you might say, from past operations. And this is basically the meeting that we discuss what we're doing out there and what we're proposing to do to clean up these sites before it's actually turned over to anybody that leases the property or whatever.

So anyway, this is what the meeting is about tonight. Just to give you -- oh, another thing, if at all possible, if you have any questions or would like to speak, I have somebody taking, Margo up here, taking minutes of the meeting and everything will be recorded. So if you have a question or would like to make a statement, if you'd just state your name first if you will, please. That's going to be kind of hard to remember because I'm not used to it myself, but we'll try it.

What I'd like to do is I have an agenda here at

the table. I didn't make enough. This is amazing because we've never had this many people here before. So this is kind of poor planned. I don't have that many agendas, but I'll basically go down the agenda.

I'm just going to give an activity update myself. And I'm Larry Fisher. I work at Tooele Army Depot in Utah, and Fort Wingate is under Tooele Army Depot. We do have a caretaker for us out there, four gentlemen that basically take care of it and make sure the fences are mended and there is no other problems out there.

But I'm basically what they call a BRAC Environmental Coordinator for Fort Wingate, and I'm responsible to make sure that we work with the state and the EPA in cleaning up the sites out there at Wingate.

Now, I'll give you a little bit of an activity update. And then I was going to talk a little bit about a RAB charter. Just what I'll do is instead of spending a lot of time discussing that, I'll just pass it out to the members here of the board.

I am the co-chair for the Army side. The co-chair representing the public or everybody here in the Gallup area is Steve Foreman. And he was supposed to be here tonight, so I hope he will show up.

Then after myself, I'll turn the time over to Ms. Mary Jane Stell. She's a contractor, E.R.M., that's

doing a lot of work out there at the Army, Fort Wingate. And she'll be talking about the geology and hydrogeology of the Zuni Watershed.

And then we'll go into the Fort Wingate Feasibility Study, basically, the sites we've been looking at, and we'll discuss that a little bit and some other things.

We have the Army Huntsville Corps of Engineers with us here, and they're going to be talking about some work that they'll be doing off post up there on the west side of the depot just west of where they used to detonate a lot of their bombs and everything.

And then we'll have a -- you're welcome to ask questions as we go. Feel free to, you know, raise your hands and ask questions.

Okay, what I'd like to do is give a little bit of background here or activity update. From 1949 to 1967, Fort Wingate demilitarized munitions. Munitions transported to the installation had broken down and hot water was used to flush the contents of the munitions.

The wash water containing explosive compound was pumped into a storage and drying, tank and overflow from the tank was drained into a leaching bed. Soil from the bottom of the leaching bed was occasionally removed and burned in an open burn and open detonation areas.

Fort Wingate's mission to transport and manage explosives and ammunition ceased in January of '93. Past waste handling practices resulted in large volumes of operational residue and debris being deposited in on-site arroyos.

Areas of environmental concern at Fort Wingate include a former firing range; an unexplored ordinance area; PCB's and pesticides spill areas, these are small areas; And a former what we call TNT washout facility, which I just talked about just a few seconds ago; what we call open burning open detonation areas; and an old deactivated furnace area. And this furnace was used to destroy small articles, munitions, bullets, basically.

Soil samples taken in 1981 from the former TNT washout facility contained TNT explosives, basically, and metal cabochon. In addition, unexploded ordinance has been discovered both on the site and off site on an adjacent Indian land.

Residual contamination at the site has affected soil and surface water; however, the degree of environmental impact is minimal. To date, selected interim remedial actions have been conducted including the removal of six hundred ground storage tanks from a former fueling station at Fort Wingate and done in January of 1993.

An on-site investigation to determine the nature and extent of petroleum contamination at and around the former fueling station is still ongoing. And we're doing this to determine the extent of the contamination. We'll be doing some soil gas surveys out there to determine the location for future wells.

Our FY94 clean-up progress at Fort Wingate generally has taken a proactive approach to expediting the clean-up process. For example, in anticipation of the upcoming revision of what we call a BRAC Closure Clean-up Plan, the Army environmental personnel conducted a detailed review of the evacuation plan and prepared comments and recommendations.

Basically, it's a plan that's been put together to see, you know, what areas we're going to clean up and what the contamination was that was found and everything like that. And, also, this information will be included in what we call a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility study.

There has been a draft out, and I believe it's still located here in the library. There is a section in the library that has a lot of the plans and things that we're doing at Fort Wingate. And you're welcome to go check out and review and take a look at it.

Now, we have we call a BRAC clean-up team, and

that was formed February 23rd, 1994, and we basically meet every three months. The team kind of improves communication among the members and has -- it helped in accelerating the clean-up process by expediting a document to review with all these reports and studies and everything.

And, of course, this is the Restoration Advisory Board, and this was formed, this board was formed on August 9th, '94. And this is to insure the community representation on the RAB reflects the diversity of state -- state membership nominations are solicited through letters sent to various community leaders. Notice in the local newspaper is advertised, the RAB formation, and invited interested community members to participate.

And, of course, like I said earlier, the RAB will stress the environment and clean-up work in progress at Fort Wingate. The remedial investigation, when they looked at all these sites, has identified, working with the state and EPA, have indicated five of the forty-eight areas that were investigated will require remediation because of health concerns.

They do risk assessments and things like that. Five of these sites. There are other sites that we are going to clean up and we are taking a look at

investigating that didn't come out on this, out in the investigation as far as being areas that were really maybe of health risk to anyone.

Cultural resource investigations have also been going on at Fort Wingate, and they're continuing under the provision memorandum of agreement between the Army and the Department of Interior, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer, the Navajo Nation and the Zuni Tribe. To date, more than five hundred and twenty prehistoric and historic cultural properties have been discovered on Fort Wingate.

Environmental restoration activities are, of course, coordinated with cultural resource investigation activity which will continue through the year '95. The Army plans to prepare public notices and scheduled public meetings to address the proposed remedial actions; basically, the clean-up of these sites.

So when we get to that point and we work with the state EPA and how we're going to approach clean-up of these areas, all this information will be public and we will have public meetings on it.

We are still working on a draft version of what we call a remedial investigation identifying all these sites and a feasibility study, which is recommending how

these sites can be cleaned up. And we do have a draft copy, like I said, that's located in the library. And once the final copy comes out. it will also be put in the library and the draft copy taken out.

That kind of gives us a little bit of an update. As we go along in the meeting, we, of course, will talk about some other things that we are doing out there and give a little bit better insight.

I also have a sign-up sheet I'd like to pass around and have everybody sign. I didn't bring a pen. I do have one, but it's a gift and I don't want to lose it. I am very selfish. I'll pass this around, and if I could have everybody sign it. And everybody that does sign it, I will, if you leave your phone number and something, I can call you and get your address and give you a copy of the minutes, if you would like, so you will have a record of everything that goes on here tonight.

Also, what I'd like to do right now is I'd like go ahead with the meeting because we do have to be out of here at a quarter to nine. I want to make sure I don't get the librarian mad at me. They were nice enough to let us meet here.

So what I'd like to do now is to turn the time over to Mary Jane Stell, and she's going to talk about the geology and hydrogeology of the Zuni Watershed and

give us an update of what they found.

MS. STELL: I've got a handout that we want to give people to present some of the basic information that I'm going to talk about and then what Steve Egnaczyk will talk about next for the feasibility study.

We were thinking that we might have an overhead here, but what I have got is -- some of them won't be clear without having an overhead, so you'll want to look at some of these figures while I'm talking to you, and it will make some of what I say make more sense to you, I think.

Included in your handout first is a two-page write-up that presents what I'm going to tell you, so you can take it back and take a look at it, digest it a little bit more; but I'll hit the highlights for you here.

And in a past RAB meeting, there was concerns expressed that some of the past activities at Fort Wingate could potentially impact the water supply of the Zuni Tribal land. So I am the project geologist, and they asked me to come and present this information to you about the geology of the site which is included in the remedial investigation report that Larry Fisher just mentioned. It's here in the library.

And I'm going to talk to you more particularly

about the geology of the Zuni Tribal land and the relationship between Fort Wingate and the tribal land.

So if you look at the first figure in the handout that we just passed out, it is entitled "Locations of Fort Wingate Depot Activity and Zuni Tribal Lands." And there you can see that we have the State of New Mexico up on the left, the two-county area, and then the location of Fort Wingate and the Zuni Tribal land within there.

And just for your reference, we put on some of the major roads, the major routes. And the little orange dot is the Zuni Pueblo. They are approximately five and a half miles apart, Fort Wingate and the Zuni Tribal land, at the nearest point. So they're not in real adjacent locations. There is a considerable distance between them.

The next thing I'm going to talk about is the basic principles of geology, surface water and hydrogeology. If you look at the next figure, it's a block diagram. This is the hydrologic cycle, how water moves from the atmosphere to rain to surface water and ground water and then back up into the atmosphere.

This describes the basic process of how we get surface water and ground water. Rain falls on the land, and a certain amount of it runs off the surface below, turns into streams. Streams flow to the ocean, back by

evaporation into the atmosphere.

There is a portion of that water that infiltrates or seeps into the ground. When there is a sufficient volume of that that is pulled down by gravity, saturates the ground, that's what we call ground water.

And there are what we call unsaturated or unconfined ground water, which is ground water that is basically just right down beneath the ground surface. There is no less permeable bed that is what we call confining that layer of ground water.

And a lot of these terms are defined in the back of that handout when you get a chance to take that home and look at it. And it's this lower aquifer in this little diagram. It's called a confined aquifer, that is a body of water that has a less permeable layer on top of it. And we call that a confined aquifer.

Many of the aquifers out in this region are confined. They're in sandstone and limestone units within a rock unit within the ground. And there is often a shale over top of it, which is a much less permeable unit, and that is the access to that confining layer.

So those are the basic principles about ground water and where it is occurring in this area. Now, if you look at the next figure, this one shows you again the same location of Fort Wingate and the Zuni Tribal land.

And the blue line on here is the boundary of the Zuni River Drainage Basin. That is all of the area that drains into the Zuni River. And this is divided by topographically or high elevation areas which are called drainage divides.

From that high point, drainage moves in two directions away from that location. And on the inside of this blue line, all of the drainage would come into the Zuni River. And on the outside of it, it would flow the other direction.

And you can see based upon this line that any surface water flow from Fort Wingate would go away from the Zuni Tribal land and not towards it. So surface water flow from the base could not impact the Zuni Tribal land. It's in a different drainage basin.

And then when you look at the next figure, this is one of the geologic beds or formations that is a major source of ground water in this area. And what the blue-shaded area here is is what's called an outcrop area or an area where the rocks are exposed at the surface.

Rainfall, snow melt get into the aquifer in this location. They seep in here, and then the water moves through this bed or this aquifer in the direction of the -- that the beds are laid down in. And that's what these arrows show you here.

The purple lines are based upon wells that have been drilled into this aquifer. We've gotten known water levels from them. And from that, we can estimate the direction of ground water flow.

So the ground water flow follows these arrows, and it is basically in a westerly and then northwesterly location throughout the Zuni Tribal lands. And if the flow off of Wingate follows in a similar pattern, it would not come down into the region of the Zuni Tribal land.

This blue area is where the water is generated. This is the recharge area or the area where the water gets into the aquifer. And there is a minor portion of that on the Fort Wingate facility, but this is in the very southern portion of the property where none of the depot's activities were conducted.

So based upon the surface water map that I just showed you and the drainage basins being they're different drainage basins and the recharge area being the majority off of the base in a portion of the base where there was no activity conducted, we feel that there is no way that the activities at Fort Wingate could impact either the surface water or the ground water on the Zuni Tribal land. Okay?

MR. SHELTON: The blue outcropping, that's the

outcropping in the San Andreas-Glorieta?

MS. STELL: Yes.

MR. SHELTON: What kind of drift or what kinds of dip does it take after that direction? Is it in fairly rapid access of three or four degrees?

MS. STELL: I really wish I had an overhead because I have a -- what I have, and I will have to -- I'll just come up here in front of the group, here I have a -- this is from one of the geologic documents of the area.

This cross section line, if you can cut a knife through the earth and you could look at the side view, what he's talking is what is the dip or what is the angle that the bed goes down from the surface of the ground. And this line A to A Prime is what this cross section is.

So here at the boundary of the Zuni Tribal land, at this point is where he's talking about. And this is the hogback. I'm sure you're familiar with it. It's a very upturned bed. That is right here.

And there is a very steeply dipping or steeply angled bed coming off of the area of the hogback. And this PS and the TRC here, that is the San Andreas-Glorieta Aquifer.

And that is what it would look like if you could cut a knife through this portion of the Zuni Tribal

land and look at the side and the bed. There's quite a steeply dipping bed, and then it comes out and it's fairly flat.

And ground water flow does generally follow the direction of these beds in the ground. And again, as I think I mentioned initially, there is a confining shale bed over it that doesn't allow the water to just come up through. It confines it and flows down along these beds.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All this information was taken from the U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply paper that was referenced in this document that you all used for this information?

MS. STELL: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So all the information that's been published by the Federal Government is based upon evaluations that were done in the area.

MS. STELL: Right. And I believe we're putting one here in the library tonight. I have an extra one for you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: From the U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Report?

MS. STELL: Right. This was from the U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Report.

MR. WINKLER: Joe Winkler, New Mexico Environment Department. Would you say your research then

was more in terms of looking at documents as opposed to going out and doing a physical boring?

MS. STELL: Yes. Yes, at this point, that's true though we did have some boring data from on the facility, but none from this area.

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mary Jane. Now, we'd like to hear from Tim Alexander from the Army Environmental Center and Steven Egnaczyk from ERM. They are going to discuss the Fort Wingate Feasibilty Study. It's a work we've been doing out there at Fort Wingate. I'll just introduce them real quick.

MR. ALEXANDER: I am Tim Alexander, and I'm with the Army Environmental Center. We've only got about an hour or so left that we can occupy the room, so I don't want to take up much time. So I'll introduce Steve.

We talked about a Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study that came up again and again and again tonight. And what that's all about, and we talked about it in our previous RAB meeting. We went into a lot of detail about the process, the clean-up process.

And it's essentially driven by the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act. It's a mouthful. That pretty much directs all the work that we do.

Where are we with that particular process? There was a draft document that came up about a year, came out about a year ago. It was put on file here at the library, and folks were given the opportunity to review it.

In the past year, we've been gathering actually more information and gone back and even re-evaluated some of the work that was done. And perhaps we evaluated some of our conclusions. And that's what Steve Egnaczyk is going to talk about tonight.

So our intent is to get this information out to the RAB and the members of the community, make them sensitive to, you know, where we are in the process, when documents will be made available, give an opportunity to ask questions in a formal way like this tonight because what we want to do in the near future is to finalize this document.

So now's the time we are going to crank it up so we bring the whole process to a conclusion hopefully within the next four or five months. What that means is that the government must generate what we call a -- it's a Record of Decision. And that is a decision about what sites we're going to clean up and how we're going to go about doing it.

So if you missed the last RAB meeting, probably

this is a good one to be present at. It's going to be moving pretty quickly for the next few months or so. With that I'll pass it onto Steve Egnaczyk. Steve Egnaczyk is our Project Manager from ERM out of Exton, Pennsylvania.

MR. EGNACZYK: Thank you, Tim. Just to regroup a little bit, and I won't take a lot of time, also, is basically the way the closure of Fort Wingate is being done under BRAC, we're following a CIRCLA process. Many of you may be familiar with the Super Fund Program or the Hazardous Waste Program that gets in the news a lot. Well, even though this isn't a Super Fund site, the Army follows the same process that we would under a federal Super Fund site.

So the buzz words that we're throwing around today and the acronyms, the RIFS, Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study, were all the same documents that would be prepared as part of the Super Fund site that was undergoing clean-up.

So what Tim mentioned before is the NCP process basically dictates for us the procedures that we do follow in evaluating a site. And two parts of that document, the remedial investigation, is basically going out and evaluating or characterizing all the areas that have been identified on Fort Wingate as possibly having

environmental contamination.

Once all that information is gathered, we then go back, analyze the data, summarize the data and then go into a RIFS assessment process, which is the process of evaluating the data against known RIFS issues and RIFS numbers.

The part that then comes is called a feasibility study, which is the engineering evaluation of these remaining sites. Basically, you know, there is an ongoing discussion between scientists and engineers.

We basically feel we can go out and solve the problems on the site when we look at it, and a geologist will tell us or a scientist will tell us that they probably need to study it five times longer than I ever think we would need to.

So that's the balance that happens in that, and that's the balance that happens in any site like this is it is from two different perspectives. And that's why there is kind of a unique balance in this kind of a document format.

So the feasibility study has been summarized in the handout you have. There was a little colored breaker page at the end of Mary Jane's presentation. And then on the back half of that, we have a little bit of just a summarization of the three key points.

No. 1, the objective of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study is to gather information sufficient to support an informed RIFS management decision regarding the most appropriate remedy for a given site. Basically, to gather information, look at what contamination may or may not be there, look at what alternatives that are available to deal with that contamination if there is any, and then recommend to the public and to the government what approach should be taken on that site.

The feasibility study then serves as a mechanism to develop and screen potential remedial alternatives. For example, should we just leave the site as is? A classic site back east, just to throw a back east scenario at all of you, is that we have a large industrialized area and that we have a site that we are evaluating in a large industrial area, does it make sense to clean that site up to a more -- to a cleaner level than what might be existing around that site? That's certainly not the case we have here, but it's just an example of the kind of balance that you take in looking at different alternatives.

A remedial action is then recommended for each site that is then documented in a Record of Decision. And as Tim and Mary Jane have all said, a Remedial

Investigation Feasibility Study report, the draft document that now exists, is available in the public information library here on site and will be updated as we go through each step of the CIRCLA process.

Two areas were identified in the FS for evaluation, a pistol range that was a former firing area on the northeastern location of the facility. It basically was a bermed area they used for target practice and would fire into the side of the berm. And, basically, the lead shot from that firing basically created a situation where lead contamination levels were above acceptable levels and required evaluation.

Now, the secondary was mentioned by Larry a little bit earlier, the TNT leaching bed, a washout area where washouts from the demilitarization operation were discharged into a leaching bed that over time had residual explosive concentrations that required us to perform an evaluation of that area.

So those are the two areas that were evaluated distinctly within the feasibility study. We had several other areas that pretty much didn't require any evaluation. One was a small soil area of PCB contamination.

Basically, there was a set of -- there was a transformer up on poles that basically had leaked a

little bit down on the ground. And that area was identified as such a small area, and under the regulations, it was just required to excavate and remove that soil.

There was really no evaluation required there. It's above the regulatory limit. It's a small amount of soil. We clean it up. We move it off the site. That really wasn't evaluated in detail in the feasibility study.

The next sheet kind of summarizes the range of alternatives that we looked at briefly in the few areas. For the pistol range, we looked at three alternatives. We looked at no action. In other words, if we left that soil there, what would be the hazard or the risk to the environment, to the public and to the ecology if that was left as is?

The second one is to excavate the soil, to do solidification and stabilization of the soil to control the lead, and then to remove the soil to an off-site disposal facility. The reason we are doing the solidification and stabilization there is there are certain regulatory requirements that if lead is above a certain concentration or is leachable, it's not allowed for land disposal directly.

The land disposal restriction, as some of you

might hear about, is just getting rid of some waste impacting this area. So we would be required to do some treatment to control that lead to make sure it's not leachable, that it can't get out of the soil before it's allowed to go in the landfill.

The third option then would be off-site disposal reclamation. In other words, take it to a disposal facility that would then do some reclamation of the lead shot, which is one standard alternative that is being implemented in a lot of the old pistol ranges and firing ranges now, and then disposing of residual soils after that.

On the next page, we have the alternative TNT leaching beds. This is a little bit more of a complex area because of the size of the soil. For example, the TNT leaching bed area, I believe, or the pistol range area, I believe, is about seven hundred and fifty cubic yards while the TNT leaching bed areas are about forty thousand cubic yards.

So a lot of times the alternatives you look at are all going to be dependent on the volume of soil that's there as well as the contaminants that might be present.

The five alternatives that made it through the screening process and the feasibility study for this area

include no action. Once again, what would be the impact of the area if that was left as is; in-place capping, covering the whole area over right now and minimizing any potential surface water infiltration into the soil; excavation and on-site disposal, removing that soil and placing it in some kind of an on-site disposal facility that meets the technology requirements and the regulatory requirements for a landfill for that waste as it's categorized; excavation and on-site low temperature thermal desorption.

What this is is a form of thermal treatment. It's not an incinerator. It's a form of heating the soil up to volatilize any contaminants in a controlled environment and then breaking down those contaminants, and then you can return the soil either to the surface at that location or to an on-site or off-site disposal facility depending on what residual contaminant levels are left.

The key point there is to try -- it's much more applicable in a volatile situation, for example, an underground storage tank area with hydrocarbons where you could get rid of the volatile organics that are within the soil. We think that might also be applicable to explosives.

That might work in this kind of a site, but in

this case, we'd have to do some pilot studies of this technology to see if it would work. The last alternative is once again excavating all that soil and then removing it to an off-site disposal facility that's permitted for that characterized nature of soil.

So those are the alternatives that are currently under evaluation for the two areas in the feasibility study.

We are also looking at two other areas of concern that add up to the five areas that Larry mentioned earlier in his presentation, Building 5 of the former vehicle maintenance building area has pesticides in certain locations in the front of the building principally from the use of control of weeds over time.

There is also the former deactivation furnace area that was -- had some kind of a metal finishing process that was basically decommissioned before we started doing the investigation activities that resulted in cadmium metal being in concentrations that required further evaluation.

That in a nutshell is where we stand right now in the feasibility study. These areas all now are currently undergoing final evaluation. And at the point in time that we come to concurrence with both the regulatory agencies and the folks within the Army, then the document

will be finalized.

And the next stage of that document will then be presented in the public information library here. Are there any questions that I can answer for anyone?

MR. WINKLER: Joe Winkler, Environmental Deparment. When would you project that, from where you are right now, that action would actually start on the selected actions?

MR. EGNACZYK: I hate to put that over to Tim, but I believe that should be an Army answer in the schedule right now.

MR. ANDERSON: What we're doing, I'm with the Army Environmental Center, and what we're doing now and what we've been doing, we actually started doing some pre-design work on some of the areas that Steve identified.

And it was actually, some of that pre-design work and the results that, you know, there was actual chemical analyses taken at Building No. 5, the pesticides and the deactivated furnace, which basically warranted us going back and revisiting our conclusion about some action needed to be done at those areas.

On the other areas, for example, the pistol range, we've also gone out there most recently and taken additionally soil samples basically to get a better

handle on the volume that we're talking about removing.

So we're starting to move out on designs right now. We're hoping we can get a Record of Decision designed this spring. We have actually programmed into our budget activities this year design, and hopefully the jobs will be done, I guess, at the latest, the beginning of the next federal fiscal year to be in '96. That's what we're shooting for.

MS. NOE: On this soil removal, where will it go?

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, that would be -- I guess what happens is that if the design required a project, I guess a removal project, what we do is put that out for bid, okay? Any facility, basically, that had the permit to accept that waste could actually bid on receiving that material.

So, really, it's a competitive process, and we couldn't identify at this point in time where that soil would go.

MS. NOE: Where do they take it now?

MR. ALEXANDER: There is a lot of facilities, frankly.

MS. NOE: Are there any in the state?

MR. ALEXANDER: I don't think there are any -- actually, what happens is -- okay, that's a tricky

question because, for example, the pistol range, okay? Once you treat that -- Steve talked about treating that soil below a certain standard.

In New Mexico, once that waste is treated, and that waste being lead-contaminated soil, is treated below certain thresholds, regulatory thresholds, the waste is no longer hazardous.

In New Mexico they call lead contaminated soil that's been treated as special waste. So, frankly, the law wouldn't even require that that go to a hazardous waste facility.

So, you know, there is a lot of places it could go, but any place that it would go would be required to be, No. 1, in compliance with the state and federal laws and would have to have a permit to receive that waste.

MS. NOE: Well, once it's treated, it won't stay out there? I mean, I'm not saying the soil is sacred, but it won't stay out there at all or will it be removed for treatment?

MR. ALEXANDER: That's a possibility. But, really, what we're talking now, what Steve has done is he's outlined a number of alternatives or, talking about the pistol range soil, the lead-contaminated soil, Steve outlined a number of alternatives for that soil.

We haven't selected an alternative yet. We will

not select an alternative until we go through a process where we'll finalize a document, okay, put it out to the public for review, okay, and the public can then comment on it. Once we receive all the public comments, et cetera, then a decision will be made as to what exactly will happen to that soil.

So it's certainly premature to say what's going to happen at this point, but I think Steve has outlined the alternatives that have passed through the screening. And again, one of the alternatives is the no action alternative. And the reason you consider a no action alternative is because the law says you have to consider a no action alternative. That's part of the law.

The second alternative that passed through screening is to excavate it, stabilize it or maybe not stabilize it, but essentially it was an on-site disposal scenario.

And the third alternative was to treat it and leave it on site, okay? And there is a lot of requirements that go along with that particular alternative.

MS. NOE: Have you come up with the figures parts per million contaminants?

MR. EGNACZYK: Right. What we have right now is the area that is defined for excavation if it's activated

is dependent on a certain agreed-upon or negotiated or level or clean-up level, the infamous clean-up level that is basically the crux of all these decisions, how far you clean up the soil or at what point do you stop. So basically that would define how much soil is then cleaned up and removed from that area.

And then depending on the waste classification it's dependent on where the soil would go. For example, if it's classified as a special waste, it would then go to a special waste landfill right in the State of New Mexico, a permitted landfill for the special waste landfill.

It may go off as a hazardous waste. Then it would go to a RICRA permanent facility for hazardous waste. Depending on what the waste classification of the soil is would also dictate the type of disposal and if it would be on site. If it was special waste, it would have to meet a -- the landfill would have to meet the special waste requirements for the State of New Mexico.

So it's dependent on the characterization of the soil that was excavated and then where are you going to go put it on the site.

MS. NOE: And how far do you go down?

MR. EGNACZYK: That's all dependent on what is the agreed-upon clean-up. We would go down until we can

sample that soil and confirm that we met the agreed-upon clean-up level. And that would be part of the remedial action design is to then confirm that.

MR. ALEXANDER: In this case, we're looking to the national standard almost.

MS. NOE: Okay.

MR. ALEXANDER: That's what's being proposed at this time as a clean-up level.

MS. NOE: What is the national standard for the people here?

MR. EGNACZYK: Well, it varies for different contaminants, but the lead, I think, is --

MR. ALEXANDER: Let me interrupt. It's five hundred parts per million.

MS. NOE: There is a document that says four hundred parts per million, so basically that's up there.

MR. EGNACZYK: It's a continual state of flux, and like I said, it will all be dependent on the --

MR. SING CHIA: Sing Chia, EPA. One site in the City of Dallas, which we call West Dallas Lead Site, the clean-up level is five hundred PPM for the residential areas.

MR. EGNACZYK: I'm sorry, the gentlemen in the red shirt.

MR. HALE: I'm David Hale, Navajo EPA. I have a

question. You identified five areas of concern. And I was wondering if there were other areas of concern.

Three areas I'd like to point out, one being the demill range, the other being the missile launch site, the formal missile launch site. And I'm sure there were other illegal dumps out there. We know how the military is about stuff like that.

MR. EGNACZYK: Well, yeah, like I said, unfortunately, we're here for a last RAB meeting where we reiterated the work in the areas that had been done, but basically, we evaluated forty-five areas within the installation at the RI or the remedial investigation or site characterization phase that he talked about earlier on.

So these sites are the sites that after that evaluation and after evaluation of the data are the ones that warranted further evaluation in the feasibility study. So we basically collected over a hundred thousand analytical data points as part of the remedial investigation and analyzed and investigated forty-five areas including all three of the -- what, two of the three missile firing ranges that were actually used and also a third range that had been identified but never used in the southern property. And that also includes the -- I'm not sure if by the demill area you mean the

functional test ranges.

MR. HALE: No, the actual site where they detonated the mills.

MR. EGNACZYK: Right. That area is still undergoing evaluation right now under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Tim, I don't know if you want to pick up on that area or --

MR. ALEXANDER: I'll just explain that basically that had not been included in the remedial investigation feasibility study because that area once had interim status, almost permanent status, to conduct the Army's activities of demilitarization of those munitions.

Because we're now closing out the surface, we're required by law to work with the New Mexico Environmental Department records range to close that area out.

MR. EGNACZYK: So that area is undergoing evaluation and closure under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Okay?

MR. ALEXANDER: Does that answer your question, sir?

MR. HALE: I think so.

MR. ALEXANDER: Okay.

MR. PFEIL: Excuse me. I'm John Pfeil with the New Mexico Environment Department. To follow-up a little bit, I think that the state also recognized there was

some areas on the installation that were not specifically looked at in the RIFS.

Some of them were small dump sites up at the southern property. For instance, there was a number of more or less basically landfill type sites that were basically located in the vicinity of an arroyo, which concerned us. And, you know, we have asked, asked the Army to look at those sites and to present some sort of solutions to deal with those as well.

MR. ALEXANDER: And in response to those concerns, we are. And, you know, there is a master document. And it's going to be updated, and it is confusing. There is not only one path to success here.

And, obviously, the end point is recognizing what problems we have at Fort Wingate and addressing them. One mechanism is through CIRCLA and RIFS. And as Steve said, it's a grand undertaking.

You know, they went out there with the notion that we are going to investigate everything and basically bring into a pool those sites which then would be processed for some type of action. What happened is, you know, yes, some issues were brought up relative to a couple of landfills.

You know, these sites never were included in the RIFS. Well, documents were passed around, areas were

identified. When does this information come into play? Well, it's kind of late. Okay. Fine. Do we stick it in the RIFS now and hold up the process and basically delay clean-up at these sites?

Now, we don't want to do that. What we're doing is we will be giving the state and EPA, and they understand that, work plans this spring to investigate these areas which John just referred to, a couple of small dumps out there that I think were actually used when they closed out the facility. But we're going to go out there and we're going to take a backhoe through the areas and investigate and take samples, et cetera, of those areas.

Now, how do we address this through the process? What we're doing is -- what drives everything, really, is the BRAC closure plant, okay? And that's the ultimate clean-up document for the site. These areas will be identified in that plan, and it's this plan that is available to you all.

And it will describe what our plans are for investigating and bringing those sites to some resolution. So we got those areas. We got the RICRA area, and we have the CIRCLA area. And then, frankly, we have another area of interest, and I think we're going to get into that a little bit later and talk about that with

you.

MR. HALE: One more question, I guess this is a rumor and stuff like that that out there that Fort Wingate was a site where they stored chemical munitions before. Is that true or was it mainly conventional ammo that was stored out there?

MR. EGNACZYK: Once again, the Army probably should be the one to answer. We basically looked at that several times. As far as the records show, there was only at one point in time back around World War II a train that just stopped temporarily on their way to a disposal facility outside of the State of New Mexico as far as the records show is the only time any chemical weapons or any kind of materials like that might have even been in this place, but they most certainly were not treated on the installation. That's the only time they were referred to in any of the records that we identified.

MR. SHELTON: Mustard gas?

MR. EGNACZYK: Mustard gas, right.

MR. ALEXANDER: In addition to that, what we know now, the Army requires before we dispose of the property at a land disposal site, what they do is they go back and do an archive search.

Really, this effort is relevant to munitions

handling on the facility. Going back and doing an archives search and seeing if there was or wasn't chemical munitions handled at the site. But to our knowledge, and we do a pretty thorough evaluation of that issue, the only thing that we can turn up was this train going through.

MR. EGNACZYK: And that just stayed temporary. I think it was Dougway.

MR. ALEXANDER: But we what we're looking at is the --

MR. EGNACZYK: Right. The information we did look at is all summarized in the remedial investigation report that is in the library.

Just to summarize kind of what Tim said, it's been an evolving process since we started the investigation process on Fort Wingate. I certainly don't want to lead anyone to think that we picked these sites and these are the only sites we looked at, and that's all we did.

It's been an evolving process. We started with around thirty sides in the initial work plans. And as we've evaluated areas and as the state has identified areas, we've done, you know, reviews of the historical area photos, historical records of past disposal operations. We've interviewed employees. So we've done

a fairly comprehensive search to try to identify any area on the installation that might have been used in some past activity.

And as we started with around thirty or thirty-four, we're now up to thirty-five areas and any additional areas that the state has requested us to look at. So it's been an evolving process as we move through the characterization. Do you have a question, sir?

MR. SHELTON: Lynn Shelton, Wingate for Wildlife. I notice that a lot of your alternatives for some of the different areas range from very expensive to very, very expensive. Have we looked into recycling like in the lead? I'm assuming that the lead contamination comes from actually the shot.

MR. EGNACZYK: Shot.

MR. SHELTON: The bullets and the shot, right. Did that come from observation from the presence of the lead itself and if it is lead, why weren't we looking at recycling? That is a natural resource that we can reuse.

MR. EGNACZYK: Well, there have been quite a few projects done to date, and I certainly can't list all those accurately. The problem with lead shot is exactly like you said, there is large pieces of shot that you do see visually as you walk along the ground.

And then there is an oxidation process that

occurs that concentrations of lead can then get into the soil. There are various mechanisms you can use as screening mechanisms to try to -- a screening mechanism or spinning mechanism to get the lead shot out of the soil.

The problem is that there are certain regulatory concentrations of lead we need to meet so that it is no longer hazardous. Some of the previous work that's been done at other sites, they weren't able, even after that screening process, to pass the regulatory requirements for lead-contaminated soil that made it nonhazardous.

So while we've proposed that as part of a reduction in soil volume on what would require landfilling, our concern now is, and the treatability test would confirm this, that the soil would still be hazardous and would still require off-site disposal.

MR. SHELTON: Or capping to immobilize the place?

MR. EGNACZYK: Well, unfortunately, there you have to start looking at the potential future use alternatives for the site. And, obviously, if you cap soil and leave it in place, there are institutional controls that come into play.

So if you look at a small sized area, and the fact that you have to fence that and have someone come

out and look at that fence and maintain it for the next thirty years, you know, you not only have to look at the immediate impact of an alternative on the site, you also have to look at the long-term impact.

It basically would require you monitor that area for thirty years. So then you fall into the cost balance. You talk about real expensive. Is it less expensive to take seven hundred and fifty yards and get it out of there or how much is it going to cost to have someone go back and look at that fence and look at that area on a regular basis and sample it for the next thirty years?

Now, in the case of the TNT washout, that's where we have more alternatives there. There was certainly more soil there. There was about forty thousand cubic yards there or more. That then necessitates us to look at more alternatives rather than just digging it up and moving it off site or somewhere else.

MR. SHELTON: I had one last thing about that. In the course of doing this excavation and removal, whatever way you decide to do, whatever method you choose, will this involve destruction of any existing structures?

MR. EGNACZYK: Actually, no.

MR. SHELTON: Are we going to be tearing any

part of the, say, firing range out? That's a public property thing, and if that decision is made to remove such facility, who makes that decision?

MR. EGNACZYK: By "firing range," I'm not sure what you mean by "firing range."

MR. SHELTON: Well, the pistol firing range.

MR. EGNACZYK: Well, there is a backstop there right now, a wooden backstop.

MR. SHELTON: So all of that will be removed?

MR. EGNACZYK: The backstop, I'm assuming, and I certainly can't predict ahead how the work will be done. I'm assuming that could be picked up and moved off to the side because what we would be concerned with is the soil. And what the future use of that site would be after then really is up to the Army and the public and all that.

MR. SHELTON: I was just concerned with destruction of the buildings and such.

MR. EGNACZYK: There are no buildings in any of the areas we're evaluating right now. The pistol range area does have the backstop from the firing range that is up there, the wooden structure. And that is basically on an earthen berm. It sits behind that.

The TNT leaching beds are basically just lagoon areas. They're all flat areas that basically the buffalo roll around in.

MR. FISHER: If we do clean up that site, we certainly don't want to come in and use them again and then, you know, in a few years have to turn around and spend a lot of money cleaning them up again. So once we stop using it, it won't be used again as a pistol range.

MR. SHELTON: By the military?

MR. FISHER: By the military.

MS. STAHN: Elvira Stahn. I work in Building 12 and 13 in Fort Wingate. I have a question here for Mr. Fisher. Do you know if the memorandum of agreement for Building 12, 13 and 5 is approved?

MR. FISHER: I'm sorry, I can't answer that. There is a gentlemen, he was hoping to be here tonight, but he had another meeting back in D.C., Malcolm Walden. I can give you his name and phone number.

MS. STAHN: I know him. The reason why I'm concerned about it is because if we're saying that Building No. 5 has those problems and also the burner or the boiler system, I'm just wondering who's going to take care of that? Is that the USDA or Tooele or is it going to be the Navajo Nation's responsibility?

MR. FISHER: If there is contamination, it will be the Army's responsibility to clean that up. But, you know, that's all negotiable in the lease or in the contract that you signed, and I really don't -- I'm

sorry, I really don't get into that portion of it. We basically are involved in cleaning, you know, these areas, but I see your concern there. But we were responsible for any contamination that exists there.

MS. STAHN: Another question is have you checked for contamination around those buildings?

MR. EGNACZYK: Those buildings weren't identified in some of our initial assessments for our investigation.

MS. STAHN: The reason why I'm concerned about that is it seems like about within a year we've been having problems with water lines, the water being corroded and water draining. And it's caused some problems for us. And I'm concerned about that.

MR. FISHER: I know the water lines have been out there for a long time, you know, since Fort Wingate was established out there, I guess. And they haven't really been upgraded, and there are problems with that, but I don't think -- I don't know. We can have that, we can discuss that, you know, a little bit later.

We don't want to cause any -- the contamination generally isn't that deep around those buildings out there. And there was never anything done in those buildings, really, to contaminate that area. And that's why they weren't really investigated.

But the water lines will eventually break, and

then they will be repaired. But I don't know. I don't see where you are picking up any contamination.

MS. STAHN: If I go to a staff meeting tomorrow, I can tell them that your buildings are pretty safe for right now?

MR. EGNACZYK: And what we're talking about at Building 5 is a grassy area outside the building where there was -- not inside the building.

MS. STAHN: Well, the boiler system is in the bottom of that building.

MR. EGNACZYK: Uh-huh, uh-huh. There shouldn't be a problem with the boiler. Maybe I can ask, I guess I don't quite know where you are, so I don't know -- I know where 5 is.

MS. STAHN: What we're waiting for, as I understand it, is the boiler system. And then also we're supposed to have our meter, electrical meter, hooked up before they let us use Building No. 5. So Building 5 has been vacant for over a year.

MR. PFEIL: What's the use for 12 and 13?

MS. STAHN: We store food in those two buildings.

MR. PFEIL: And that's been happening for many years, hasn't it?

MS. STAHN: For, I think, twenty years.

MR. PFEIL: I see, okay. Okay.

MR. FISHER: It's been a long time, and Building 5, I believe, they want the vehicle --

MS. STAHN: Maintenance shop.

MR. FISHER: That's what they used to have, but the area that is contaminated is the grassy area.

MS. STAHN: But that's very close to Building 13.

MR. ALEXANDER: What we're talking about here, what we're talking about is, I hate to use the term, but I think over the years people apply pesticides to control pests.

Now, Steve talked earlier about how do you go about making the decision about what sites to clean up. And the way we do that is we gather our data, our chemical data, and we subject that data to a RIFS assessment.

Well, the way the RIFS assessment came out, it said that in a residential exposure scenario, you know, if somebody's living in that area, I mean, that's the hypothetical exposure scenario that the RIFS assessment employs.

And what we came up with was a risk of someone contracting cancer because there are some carcinogens. Some of the pesticides have carcinogens. And there was

one times ten to the minus fifth risk. What that means is one in one hundred thousand, if they were to live there for thirty years and eat the soil, they'd have to eat the soil.

And what they did is they used a maximum concentration. So there was a hot spot. There was one sample that came up higher than the rest. That was the sample that actually shows that concentration. They put that into their risk assessment.

So, you know, even at that, we're looking at -- what the statute says is with the thresholds for action or what Congress said is unsafe, they said what is safe is anything between a ten to a minus fourth and ten to the minus sixth risk. And we're talking about carcinogens.

MR. PFEIL: Explain those numbers, Tim.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, I've already said it's one in one hundred thousand. One times ten to the fourth is one in ten thousand. And one times ten to the minus six is one in a million risk that someone would contract cancer in this case living, you know, at that site and eating soil from the hot spot over a thirty-year period.

And we only have one sample that came up with contamination there. And, frankly, that's what's causing us to go back and re-evaluate what do we really have to

do here right now because it doesn't make sense to go up and dig up that whole area.

So, frankly, we've taken back the information to the Army RIFS assessors, and these folks actually represent the Surgeon General of the United States, and said, "Look, guys, these are really some conservative assumptions that were made here. We've got some additional sample data, and we're trying to figure out exactly what we have to do there. And maybe our original shot of what the action should be was a little too conservative."

So our concern was about people who, No. 1, don't live at the site, spend eight hours a day there. This is an entirely different risk scenario, okay? And, therefore, you know, you know, what's the concern about their health?

Well, we'd have to ask a toxicologist to give you something definitive, but if you take what I say into consideration and understand that, No. 1, we use maximum concentrations. We used the exposure theory, which we talked about, residential, somebody living there at the site. Now we're talking about workers who are there eight hours a day, and hopefully they're not eating the soil.

So you know, that's the contrast. We're working

that issue to determine whether we need to do anything there at all. Okay?

So that's not definite. That doesn't give any explicit answer to say, "Oh, it's safe for your workers." And, frankly, we can be responsible enough to get back to you on that and get you some information, okay, because we are waiting on the RIFS assessors, we'll do something in a couple of weeks. They're going to tell us whether or not we have to do anything at all.

MR. WINKLER: Joe Winkler, New Mexico Environment. Would you describe the RIFS assessors to us and where they're located and who they report to?

MR. ALEXANDER: All right. Well, our risk assessors work for an agency within the United States Army, the Army Environment and Hygiene Agency. And they are the ones we currently consult with in regards to these matters.

And in addition to that, obviously, our data and our risk assessments go to the regulatory agency, who also evaluate that information. So, you know, this isn't carte blanche. There are, you know, checks.

MR. SHELTON: One quick question. I've been operating under the assumption that the Department of Defense was going to be funding the clean-up for all of this. Is that correct? The reason I asked is this lady

just mentioned if there was any apparent liability of the Navajo Nation to pay for clean-up around certain buildings. I was curious as to why she would be concerned about that.

MR. FISHER: The Army is responsible, like I said, for cleaning up any past sins, you might say. And the Department of Defense will pay for those, you know, for the clean-up. The money is coming for that.

MR. ALEXANDER: The law is written so rigorously that it says you will not only clean up for your past sins, but even after we dispose of the property, transfer the property, if there are new findings and, obviously, it's demonstrated that the Army is associated with the findings, then the Army has some liability there as well.

MR. EGNACZYK: I hate to defer to Army issues, but when it's their money, I can't answer on any questions. All we did was the feasibility study. Yes?

MR. HALE: Frank Hale. You have those remedial alternatives of one, two and three like in the pistol range. Now, I understand that these remedial alternatives are being summarized. They're to be put out for public comment and review.

Who makes the final decision as to which alternative is to be utilized and does this -- I guess it's called a Resource Advisory Board. Do they have any

input or say as to the decision that is made to go with two, but the feeling is that you should really go with three? Is there any room for compromise or discretion in the area?

MR. EGNACZYK: Right. There certainly is. I don't know, Larry or Tim, if you want to answer that when you've got that, again, the Army dollar here.

But during the evaluation process that does occur that the public does have involvement with, when the decision is made about what alternative will be selected, that then goes into what's called the Record of Decision or ROD for the site. And that is put out for public comment.

And the public does have the ability to respond to the alternative or alternatives that are selected for the site, and it is a public involvement process that then is agreed upon with EPA in the State of New Mexico as well as the Army and the public. So it is an evolving process that the public has input to.

MR. HALE: Once the Record of Decision is made, is it pretty much set that whatever that decision is made, that the Army will implement it or will there be some deviation depending on the public input and comments?

MR. ALEXANDER: Before we generate a ROD, what

really happens is that we finish up this feasibility study, okay? It comes back to you all for comment.

And one purpose of the Restoration Advisory Board is they have input along the way. Okay? They facilitate communication with people outside the reservation and in the community. So, hopefully, we're garnering their concerns and whatever. And we're instituting those and we're putting them into writing in the feasibility study, itself.

Now, there is a formal hearing that's offered. "Hey, guys, you know, we're going to hold a public meeting. You want to have a meeting." We come and we have a meeting. People actually -- you know, they'll issue comments where we have to respond to those comments in writing. After that's done, then the ROD is written, okay?

MR. HALE: When is the ROD due out?

MR. ALEXANDER: We're hoping we get it done by late spring.

MR. WINKLER: Could you describe the ROD?

MR. ALEXANDER: It is actually a Record of Decision. That's what the acronym stands for. And the process is outlined in the National Contingency Plan. Those are the regulations, which, basically, you know, drive this stuff.

MR. EGNACZYK: And I think if you do any reading of your newspaper or any magazines, you'll understand it's a very interactive process as the ROD is being developed and even after it's agreed upon with the public specially regarding future use of any property. Anything else I can answer? Thank you very much.

MR. FISHER: Thank you. We'd like to hear from Huntsville Corps of Engineers, and the representative here is Mr. Karl Blankinship. And he'll be talking with us.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Just quickly, I am Karl Blankinship of Huntsville, Alabama. Mr. Ron Roberts is here from our office. And like I said, I know we're running on very short time. I'll introduce Ron. And from here on, he or I will be very happy to answer any questions.

MR. ROBERTS: Like Karl said, I work with the Corps of Engineers, Huntsville, Alabama. And hopefully we'll get through this little brief that I've got. You might be able to understand what our job will be here during the clean-up or during the waste clean-up.

First I'd like to provide a little background information about the establishment of the Huntsville Division.

Under the Defense and Environmental Restoration

Program which was drafted in 1986, the Defense Department's goal is remediation of environmental problems on current and formally used defense sites.

As a result of this program, the Huntsville Division was designated as a mandatory center of the expertise and design center of unexploded ordinance. The division is now responsible for the remediation of environmental waste and for ordinance and explosive waste.

Engineers and other specialists from the division investigate sites where ordinance and explosive waste has been confirmed or is suspected. Division personnel determine the potential danger as a result of this contamination and develop plans to remediate the ordinance problem.

The Huntsville Division functions as a technical manager for the execution of ordinance and explosive waste remediation plans. The primary goal is to render a designated site as safe as possible with a minimum risk to all.

The division has established rigid safety standards and uses contracted personnel highly qualified in explosive ordinance removal. The Corps personnel who oversee the remediation work of contractors also have extensive experience in the removal of ordinance and

explosive waste.

The Huntsville Division executes site remediation in various phases. This usually begins with an archive search, which was mentioned before. An archive search consists of interviews with local residents and former employees of the defense activity, also a document research and numerous site visits.

If the archive search identifies and confirms an ordinance problem, the next phase is the site investigation. With the site investigation complete, the Huntsville Division explores alternate methods for disposing of ordinance and explosive waste and then selects the best possible method.

The selected method is then reviewed by appropriate governmental agencies before the final approval is received. Once final approval has been received, the remedial design and removal phases of the project can begin. And all this, of course, is done in accordance with the environmental regulations, both federal and state.

Now, what I'd like to do is just give you a little quick update or current status of what we're doing out here at Fort Wingate. Currently, the only ordinance and explosive waste investigation action that is being conducted in this area is associated with approximately

two hundred and fifty acres of Navajo Indian Tribal lands which lie adjacent to the installation's southwestern boundary.

The contaminated area extends from the boundary fence of the installation demolition area in a westerly direction approximately twelve hundred feet and extends north nine thousand feet paralleling the installation boundary. A contract delivery order has been awarded to a qualified unexploded ordinance contractor to perform a one hundred percent surface sweep of the area and to conduct representative subsurface investigation.

This subsurface investigation should identify to what extent the site may be contaminated. This will assist the Huntsville Division and develop a scope of work to complete the ordinance and waste removal action on the Navajo and tribal land.

The initial removal investigative action for all such contaminated areas should be commenced mid April and hopefully be completed by early July. As of today, we have personnel in the Huntsville Division gathering supporting data to assist in development of the scope of work and cost estimate in order to begin surface sweeps and subsurface investigations of all suspect areas.

The date scheduled to award a contract delivery order for this action late summer or early fall. This

concludes a little short brief, but that's about all I've got for you. Are there any questions?

MR. PFEIL: I'm John Pfeil with the New Mexico Environment Department. It might be worthwhile, and maybe I'm tired enough not to have heard it, but to tell the folks here what sort of activities on the base actually resulted in this contamination on tribal land. I'm not sure it's obvious. Maybe it is.

MR. ROBERTS: I've got notes in here. Let me go through them rather quick if you could bear with me one minute. Okay?

MR. PFEIL: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: I take that back. I left it back in the room. What I'd like, if I could get Karl to stand up and kind of --

MR. BLANKINSHIP: If I could, Ron doesn't have as much background as some of us here, and especially the ADC people. The primary reasons for going and cleaning up these areas is that munitions were demilled on the site, mostly in the OBLD areas.

What they did was take ammunition that was either outdated or had some problem with it or something that they just needed to get rid of, and they would explode it on the site. What we're doing is going back to confirm that everything they did detonate on site has been

detonated. If there is anything live, we want to get it out of the ground so, of course, there is not anything left there when we leave the base.

MR. WINKLER: Are you both experts in that field or do you hire the experts?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Let me try to address it as best I can. We are both project managers. We have in Huntsville approximately eighteen explosive ordinance folks who are retired military, all with over twenty years, most of them with over twenty-five years of active duty EOD experience. They actually oversee the work.

We help get the contracts in place, and we actually put one of those people on site with our contractor who are all EOD, ex-EOD people. And we will -- we officially do the paperwork. They do the ordinance removal.

MR. PFEIL: What's the status of gaining access to those lands to do this work?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: The last time that I talked with the Albuquerque District, right now, to my understanding, everything is go. I haven't seen it. Maybe Mr. Fisher might know a little bit more about it than I do.

MR. FISHER: No, I don't. I'm sorry to say I don't. Last time I checked, they were still working on a

couple of issues there. Real estate people were trying to get -- I forget what it's called.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Right of entry.

MR. FISHER: Right of entry, you know, so the people who have the responsibility to roam the land out there will sign documents allowing them to go on their property and do this type of work and basically cleaning up what they find out there.

And, of course, this is very important. We don't want to leave anything out there or have anything out there that's going to cause us any problems.

We have kind of walked the area a little bit, and mostly what we found is what we call shrapnel or pieces of scrap metal that was blown out that far and some other items that haven't been that serious. So that's why we decided to have -- off-post contamination is what we call it, and the Army is funding that to get it cleaned up so nobody will have any problems on the property.

MR. HALE: Yes, I do have a question. What's this contract for? Is this to investigate the -- so they can develop a scope of work or is it to actually do the actual clean-up, I guess, of the shrapnel, and if they find any, to take those out of the ground? And what's the scope of work there?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Right now the contract that we've got out, the delivery order, is to go out and do a one hundred percent surface sweep of the area. Then they're going to go back and they're going to do magnatome, metal detectors, and they're going to do a subsurface investigation to find out what the concentration of the metal contents are underneath.

MR. FISHER: And how deep is that?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Right now we're looking at a foot deep because this is nothing but grazing land. So once it has been determined as to how much contamination is there, that information will be sent back to Huntsville where they will develop a scope of work to go back in and complete the clean-up of that area that's contaminated.

MR. ALEXANDER: What relationship does that off-site ground have to the actual area where you actually burn the ordinance? I guess what I'm getting at is, basically this is stuff that basically they call it kick-out.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Right.

MR. ALEXANDER: So what's your suspicion that you're actually going to find a lot of ordinance subsurface?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Well, like Larry said, right

now we believe what we're going to find most of is what we saw in the walk-around, nothing but metal, empty casings, busted casings. Just scrap melt.

MR. ALEXANDER: At the surface?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Or very close to the surface. There wouldn't be any force to cause it to penetrate very deeply because it would all be thrown out of the LBLD ground as a result of a detonation several hundred feet away.

MR. FISHER: All the scrap metal and everything that will be found out there will be brought onto the depot and we will have our people basically determine if it's contaminated. If it's free of contamination, it will be sold as scrap metal.

Anything that we may find out there that may be, oh, you know, exploded ordinance or anything like that, these experts will determine if it can be moved on post. If it can't, then it will have to be detonated in place. If it's brought on post, then it will be brought into the area that we've done detonation in before and be blown there.

MR. WINKLER: Joe Winkler, New Mexico Environment Department. What might you expect to find subsurface? Like Howitzer shell that penetrated?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: That's kind of hard to answer.

Like I said, from what we saw when we were walking around, it's primarily debris. Just guessing, and like I said, I am just guessing, the Howitzer shell, I can't quite see a kick-out that far, that kind of weight.

Now, it's possible, but with the size of it, you would figure that it would at least stay surface, on the surface of the ground. It wouldn't penetrate. But we saw no evidence of anything like that. We did see split casings and debris.

MR. PFEIL: What's the distance we're talking between the OBOD and this area?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: That I'm not too sure of.

MR. EGNACZYK: I'd say about a hundred yards in the OBOD area.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: I was looking at primarily the new one.

MR. EGNACZYK: That's over the hogback there, so, yeah.

MR. PFEIL: Is it clear? Has it been determined that this material came from the old or the new or maybe a little of both or it's unclear?

MR. EGNACZYK: Preliminary indications, if I can just answer just from our previous contractor, just by dating the ordinance, it looked like it had been in the old area, not from the new area. That's just what a

visual indication showed.

MR. SIDES: Marc Sides with EPA. So after this clean-up, do you anticipate a hundred per cent clearance of any explosive waste that might be there or --

MR. BLANKINSHIP: That's being -- I guess I need to ask a bit of a clarification from you. As far as explosive waste, could you help me there?

MR. SIDES: Just of the explosive.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Of the ordinance?

MR. SIDES: To certify that there is not anything there that would be harmful. Would it be cleared for grazing lands or whatever the land use would be?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yes, it will be cleared. The area outside will definitely be cleared to the standards that is agreed upon between the Army and the local environmental community for the land use that will be agreed upon, also. The depth to which we clear is dependent upon the future land use there. So it will be cleared, yes.

MR. PFEIL: So I trust going into the process, you have an idea about what the future land use is, which is grazing?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Well, right now, that's what it appears the land outside the installation boundary is

going to be used for.

MR. PFEIL: And I guess it's safe to assume that that's what it would because the terrain is extremely hilly, very hard soil, rocky. And, of course, there are arroyos there, also.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. FISHER: Well, if there aren't any other questions, we really appreciate everyone coming. This is the largest crowd we've have. I hadn't expected it to be this large, and with so many new people, we didn't really come prepared to talk about -- I mean we discussed some things last time that we weren't prepared to talk about this time, but we're glad you're here and participating.

If you'd like to have additional information about what we're doing here, it is in the library here, and you're welcome to check that out and read up on that.

MR. WINKLER: What would it be under? What documents?

MS. STELL: Fort Wingate.

MR. FISHER: It's under Fort Wingate. Do you remember what it was called? Administrative record?

MR. ALEXANDER: I think it's administrative record. They have it on file.

MR. FISHER: If you ask for the Fort Wingate

file.

MR. ALEXANDER: They should know what you're talking about. In fact, in follow-up to the discussion with Mary Jane's discussion, there is a document that's going to be put on file that's published by the United States Geological Survey that's pretty much on the Zuni watershed issue, so if folks want to dig into that a little further, they can grab it and give it a shot.

MR. HALE: Going back to the figure three on the Zuni River Basin again, I'm just wondering why there isn't a similar type of graft for those waters that flow off where the depot activity is located. Why is there a concentrated effort to go in the Zuni River Drainage Basin? It seems to me like most of the activity is in the depot proper, itself.

MS. STELL: Well, there is two reasons for that. One was the concern that was expressed in this last meeting that there was some way that the activities at the base would affect the Zuni Tribal land. So that was the focus of the research I did in that presentation and why that figure actually comes right out of that document we referenced.

The other reason is there is not a lot of geological data about the area of the base, itself. And I didn't find a similar figure like that that just

defined the area that the drainage of the base contributes to. So it was, one, the answer to the question and, two, that I have not found that particular information for that area.

MR. HALE: Well, will you be doing something similar like this collection data and making drafts?

MS. STELL: As part of the record closure that we mentioned we're going to be doing, we're going to have to be doing some much more detailed ground water studies, so we will be doing some research.

MR. FISHER: Are there any additional questions? We really appreciate the attendance here. We will be having another meeting in May. I haven't chosen a date yet, but we'll put a notice in the paper and send letters out. We'll send letters out to the people that signed up tonight. Also, look for it in the paper about May, the May time frame. And we hope to be able to use the same area here. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the taking of the meeting was concluded.)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
: ss

COUNTY OF McKINLEY)

I, Margo Manaraze, Certified Court Reporter No. 18 in the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Proceedings was reported by me in Stenotype and reduced to typewritten transcript by me and that the same is a true and correct record of said proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

Dated at Gallup, New Mexico, this the 17th day of February, 1995.