

Camp Bonneville Citizens Advisory Group
Meeting #8 - **DRAFT** Summary
6-8 p.m. Wednesday, February 18, 2009
Fire Station 88, 6701 NE 147th Ave.

Group Members:

Dennis Benson
Gary Boldt
George Brereton
Don Chapman
David Hurt
Nathan Reynolds
Pam Rigby
Bud Van Cleve
Jan Wojciechowski

Members Absent:

Bob Pitman
Dave Shepard

Staff Members:

County:
Jeroen Kok
Jerry Barnett
Jim Gladson
Jeanne Lawson
Kalin Schmoltd

Ecology:
Barry Rogowski
Greg Johnson
Ben Forson
Dawn Hooper

BCRRT:

Mike Gage
Lacy Gage

Others:

Jim Anderson
Pete Capell
Gary Collins
Chuck Mason
Iloba Odum
Rick Spitaler
Tom Yssel

Welcome and Committee Business

Introductions – Jeanne Lawson welcomed the group and led introductions. Gary Boldt is one of the founding members of the Proebstel Neighborhood Association and has replaced Don Wastler. Dave Shepard has replaced Rich Kolb.

Agenda review – The meeting is intended to provide updates on the developments and process to date. The status update will be made jointly by Mike Gage and Barry Rogowski from Ecology. Jerry Barnett will provide a contract progress report. There will be time at the end of the meeting to discuss recent issues raised in local news.

Meeting #7 Summary – There were no comments.

Overall Status

Barry Rogowski noted that the cleanup has progressed significantly since the last meeting. The small arms ranges have been cleaned and lead removal is nearly complete. Remaining lead will be removed after the weather improves. Munitions clearance on the Central Valley Floor (CVF) is now 80-90% complete. Around 500 munitions items were located and destroyed onsite. He noted that additional anomalies have been detected on the CVF.

Mike Gage summarized the progress for each Remedial Action Unit (RAU). RAU 1 requires no further action. Material excavation for RAU 2A, including nine small arms ranges, is substantially completed. The

process involved sifting large quantities of dirt to remove lead fragments and to monitor for cultural artifacts.

An Additional Area of Concern (AAOC) was discovered at the site of a "1,000 inch" rifle range. The site included 23 munitions of explosive concern (MEC) items and 20 munitions debris (MD) items that were removed. The fill in the range floor has high levels of lead contamination. Original source of fill is unknown. Erosion control activities have followed each excavation. Over 678 tons of non-hazardous waste was removed in the fall and the removal will continue after the soil dries and is less costly to move.

A letter of no further action has been sought from Ecology for RAU 2B. Groundwater sampling of RAU 2C (Landfill 4/Demolition Area 1) continues and drafts of that work have been submitted to Ecology for comment.

RAU 3 covers the entire site and over 600 MEC items have been detonated on the site to date.

Emergency actions have included restoring signs and fencing, and creating a 10-foot clearance within the Central Impact Target Area (CITA) and along the perimeter fence. Interim actions included establishing a buffer along the forty-six miles of roads and trails as well as surface clearance of the small-arms ranges. Based on recommendations from Ecology, additional Interim Actions have included subsurface clearance conducted on the 2.36" rocket range and anomaly avoidance, brush clearance and MEC surface clearance was conducted on the Environmental Study Area (ESA) and the Central Valley Floor (CVF).

Roads and trails have been cleared although the Anomaly Selection Board (ASB) has determined the need for additional step out work. Work is complete in the environmental study areas and they have been reseeded. Work continues in the CVF and anomaly avoidance and brush clearance is 97% complete at 75% of the cost of that action. MEC surface clearance was 78% complete as of the end of January, and 82% as of today. Transects have been used on dense vegetation, moderate slope areas using anomaly avoidance, brush clearance, and MEC surface clearance in October and November.

Site and structural maintenance continues. Transect lines have been reseeded. Winter storms brought down many trees over the site and the fence needed to be restored in more than 30 areas.

Weed and invasive plant eradication had been progressing well although it has been suspended until the rain lightens up.

The fence line is patrolled daily by team members during hunting season although poaching still occurs from time to time. There appears to be a marked decrease in trespassing over the last two years.

Thirty-four MEC items were found in January 2009. Many of the munitions and debris items were found in locations on the CVF where the Army had previously indicated a low probability of finding MEC items.

Work within wetland areas has been suspended until the summer in order to avoid causing damage with equipment during the wet season.

The Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) outlines recommended cleanup actions for specific areas. Medium intensity reuse areas will receive additional transects, step-outs as needed, and further assessment from the ASB. High intensity reuse areas will also include subsurface clearance for intrusive activities such as future camping areas. A revised AAOC map now shows the entire CVF as needing to be subsurface cleared to 14-inches. Mike noted other proposed AAOC clearance changes that have been submitted to Ecology for approval.

Onsite roads continue to pose maintenance challenges.

The site continues to support wildlife habitat. Mike showed a variety of pictures taken by Tom Yssel.

Barry Rogowski noted that while surface clearance of the CVF was originally felt to be adequate, the increased number of munitions and subsurface metal detections has caused Ecology to require subsurface clearance in order to provide the protection necessary for reuse as a county park. A final CAP is underway and will ideally be circulated for public comment later this year.

David Hurt asked whether the new clearance requirements involve a change in the original contract scope. Mike explained that the change affects the anticipated scope but not the Proposed Purchaser Consent Decree (PPCD). Mike said that BCRRT had entered into the PPCD based on inadequate information about the conditions on site and conversations about those conditions will continue with the Army.

Dennis Benson asked how much additional time would be needed for the additional clearance. Mike said that it was too early to say, though it could extend the length of the cleanup from four years to five. Approximately \$13 million in additional funds will be needed and Mike estimated that about 90+% of that is out of the current project scope.

Gary Boldt asked whether BCRRT expects to find anything through the additional clearance. Mike said that the site will be made safer by the additional actions. Barry noted that 75% of detonations have occurred in the CVF and thousands of subsurface metal detections have been found there. A small percentage will almost certainly be munitions that need to be removed and destroyed. Geological activity, flooding and frost heave will eventually bring those items to the surface and they will need to be addressed. The county prefers to take the extra time now. Barry noted that the Army is the entity that is ultimately responsible for paying for the site cleanup.

George Brereton noted the difficulty with working in wetlands and asked whether hovercraft had been considered as a strategy to carry out the work with less environmental impact. Mike explained that the challenge comes primarily from cutting vegetation under 2-inches. Suspending the work until early summer will not greatly affect the schedule and allowing the land to dry will allow the work to proceed with minimal damage. He noted that readings are not possible in areas with standing water. Barry noted the challenge of effectively removing munitions while avoiding long-term impacts on the wetlands.

Rand Harris asked whether the additional findings have led Ecology to support BCRRT in their bid for additional funding from the Army. Barry explained that the Environmental Services Consent Agreement (ESCA) had anticipated that there would be some unexpected findings, though the initial reconnaissance that informed that assessment was not nearly as detailed as the work performed to date by BCRRT. Additional funding will come either from the Army or an insurance contingency. Mike is primarily responsible for resolving claims for additional funding although Ecology can make supporting statements about what has been found on the site and the additional costs.

Contract Progress Report

Jerry Barnett noted recent news coverage that has focused on the fixed price contract with BCRRT. The fixed price contract means that payment is issued based on percentage progress towards the end goal. To date, the progress claims and work carried out by BCRRT has satisfied expectations. A fixed price contract can also mean that money is made on one task and lost on another. The Army had been in the process of reviewing BCRRT finances and had raised questions about spending which the newspaper picked up on in mid-discussion.

David Hurt asked how the current cleanup is being funded. Jerry explained that the County receives funding from the Army before compensating BCRRT. BCRRT keeps receipts on site. The County makes quarterly requests based on verifying BCRRT's progress.

Pam Rigby asked what would happen if the Army doesn't pay. Jerry said that BCRRT would not receive payment and would likely suspend working. Pete Capell noted that the insurance contingency is intended to cover unanticipated findings and that the magnitude of this claim is likely to result in the insurer claiming that the Army is responsible. Consequently, there will likely be some disagreement about how

the remaining work will be funded. Barry noted that the work is not supposed to stop even if time or money runs out. Significant contingencies were put in place to allow for work to continue.

Jeanne Lawson asked why a fixed fee contract was selected. Jerry said that a time and materials contract is usually used, though the fixed fee contract is simpler to administer.

Mike noted that a line-item application of funds document is available on the project website. Each item was negotiated by the Army with the County and BCRRT before the began work. Mike explained that the Army Contingent Funding (insurance) is for addressing variances in *known* conditions, such as the need to expand the clearance at the 2.36 range from 0.3 acres to 3 acres and perform subsurface clearance. The Army Contingent Funding is not for *unknown* conditions that remain Army retained conditions under the BCRRT contract.

Questions & Discussion

David Hurt asked whether the additional work would affect the percentage of work complete. Mike explained that the new "Out of Scope" work would be considered a new line item.

Gary Boldt asked why the additional needs were not known prior to being 90% complete with the CVF work. Mike said that the extent of the additional work was not known until this past summer when there were significant findings in the CVF. Jeanne noted that much of the work that Ecology needs in order make an assessment is based on work performed by BCRRT.

Gary Boldt asked whether the other AAOCs are included in the \$13 million additional cost estimate by BCRRT. Mike said they were and noted that the costs could range from \$10-15 million or more. Those costs should be refined by the next meeting. Gary asked about the treatment for the adjacent AAOCs. Mike said that they believe that surface clearance will be adequate for those areas because they will not have as high intensity uses. Some areas may need to be fenced based on the results of additional transects.

Barry noted that discussions about the need for subsurface clearance began when the CVF was about 60% cleared. Mike clarified that the actual surface clearance of the CVF is at about 80%. The 90% figure comes from the inclusion of other billable items.

Rand Harris noted that the news coverage seemed to indicate infighting between BCRRT and the Ecology. Barry said that there had been some healthy debates but both groups were more or less on the same page.

Nathan Reynolds asked about a previous RI/FS that had recommended frost-depth clearance of the CVF. Greg Johnson confirmed that the RI/FS had called for the clearance and said that a site specific fact sheet prepared by the Army had resulted in the determination that subsurface clearance was unnecessary based on a previous contractor study. Greg noted that the study was designed to find release mechanisms and not MEC, but resulted in the maps that the Army used to describe the site related to MEC. Barry noted that the original PPCD was based on that information and Ecology has always claimed to be able to modify the conceptual plan based on the outcome of further investigation.

Mike encouraged the group to ask him questions about his expenses. He read from a prepared statement: *1) I have said before, we firmly believe the Army has erred in its review and comments. (A copy of our Attorney's letter is at the back of the room.) 2) Please also remember that none of the alcohol costs were billed to either the County or the Army. They came from money we earned doing our work, like your take home pay. 3) However, I truly can see that I erred as well, because there is now a false perception that I spent project money on alcohol. It left a bad image. 4) Gage Group did not do that, but I am deeply sorry for the distraction and perception. So to make amends and to end any misconception, the Gage Group will be reimbursing BCRRT for all the alcohol costs at those business meetings. In addition, in talking to my BCRRT Board of Directors, we also plan to change our internal rules to no longer reimburse from internal company dollars any alcohol related expenses. 6) If there are any errors*

on our part we will correct: we very much stand by our work. Hopefully we can return focus to the outstanding working accomplished on this project and the mission it represents for us.

Don Chapman noted the recent project newsletter and suggested that greater distribution might have alleviated some of the concerns raised in the media. Jerry noted that he was working with Mike to take the reporters on a tour of the site. Bud VanCleve suggested also sending notices to local neighborhood newsletters as well. David Hurt expressed surprise that no one from The Columbian showed up today. Jim Gladson noted that the Columbian had been invited to attend.

Jeanne said that while the group should direct media inquires to project staff, CAG members are welcome to share what they know and participate in public discussions of the project from the perspective of their own constituencies. George Brereton noted that The Columbian had contacted him but seemed more interested in Mike Gage than in the process.

Public Comment

Chuck Mason, Veterans of Foreign Wars noted that he has been following the restoration process for eight years and has experience as a farmer and contractor. He expressed skepticism of how an agricultural fence repair could cost \$400,000 and he said that he felt it was a conflict of interest for contractors to dine with county officials.

Chuck Mason explained that he was referring to costs listed as \$385,000-\$400,000 for fence repair that he perceived as poorly constructed. Mike said that the fence work was performed by a subcontractor and that the price was negotiated with the Army prior to the start of the project. He also noted that while he was not an expert in fence repair, a significant number of miles of fence needed to be replaced and 15 miles, some in very difficult topography needed to be repaired. Mike suggested that Mr. Mason was referring to a meal with a friend from the county where they had divided the cost of dinner.

Jim Anderson asked for the size of the CVF. Mike said that the CVF was 400 acres and includes 80 acres of wetlands and 322 acres that are not small arms ranges.

Next Steps

Jim Gladson distributed a letter from Lynelle Hatton that she had requested be submitted to the CAG. Jim asked for further indulgence as he continued to work on the annual report. A survey has been created regarding the process to date and will be issued to the group.

Jim explained that the newsletter had gone to around 5,000 people including the media. Newsletters cost around \$0.50 each to distribute, but Jim encouraged suggestions on how to stretch outreach dollars. He noted that the project website is up to date and receives about 400-500 hits per month. Notices about meetings go out on to the project listserv though it only has 25 people at this time. Jim encouraged the group to refer interested parties to the website (www.campbonneville.org) as a resource for more information. Don Chapman suggested using *FYI*, the County newsletter.

David Hurt commented that \$10-20 per installed foot of fencing could easily amount to \$400,000. Mike noted that at least 2 miles of fence had been recently flattened and 11 miles of fence was necessary around the perimeter.

Jim Gladson noted that the next newsworthy event will probably be the public release of the draft Cleanup Action Plan sometime in late spring at which time Ecology will hold a public comment period on the draft. The next CAG meeting will probably be on May 20. Confirmation will be sent out in mid-April.

Close