



**POINT LONELY SRRS  
ALASKA**

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD  
COVER SHEET**

AR File Number 415



45 1  
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
HEADQUARTERS HUMAN SYSTEMS DIVISION (AFSC)  
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235-5000

Cathy 45

File: 17F-35-01  
S.H.

REPLY TO  
ATTN OF

YAQB

17 MAY 1990

SUBJECT

F33615-85-D-4544, Order 08 (DEW Line) Report Finalization

TO

WOODWARD-CLYDE CONSULTANTS  
Attn: Joel Kushins  
500 12th Street, Suite 100  
Oakland, CA 94607

1. Finalize the DEW Line IRP RI/FS Stage 3 report in accordance with the Air Force review comments (Attachment 1) and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) and EPA comments (Attachment 2). ADEC and EPA comments will not be addressed completely; use the Air Force response to the regulator comments (Attachment 3) as guidance in making report modifications based on the input from ADEC.
2. Incorporate comments as directed and provide an advance copy of the DEW Line final report to this office by 11 June 1990.
3. If you have any questions while preparing the final report, please call me at 1-800-821-4528, extension 227.

*[Handwritten Signature]*

FRANZ J. SCHMIDT, Capt, USAF, BSC  
Technical Project Manager

- 3 Atch
1. Air Force Comments
  2. ADEC and EPA Comments
  3. Response to Regulator Comments

cc: HQ TAC/DEEV *[Handwritten initials]*

000098  
File: DEW  
Category #: 3.40  
Document Date: 5/17/90

Review Comments for DEW Line Second Draft IRP Stage 3 Report

---

The following comments from the first draft report were not addressed adequately enough:

No.	Page	Para	Line	Comment
8	GENERAL			Section 3 of the report should contain only the methods. Results and discussion of results should be in Section 4.
29	ES-9			For each site investigated, state why it was investigated, how (# SW/Sed samples, etc.), what was found, and what was recommended. For each site, give results of risk screening in one sentence only (e.g., "Results of the risk screening at this site determined risk to human health and the environment is insignificant."). Include tables of sampling scheme and parameters analyzed for at each site, tables of results, and table of recommendations.
52	1-12	1		See comment 49. Title and first sentence. Is the repeated table of continence necessary here? The handbook calls for identification of the field team in this section.
88	3-24	3		Looks like results and discussion have been included in the methods chapter.
151	5-28	4		Cite a reference for the statement regarding persistence of Arctic diesel spills.
157	6-3	4		Has safety equipment been considered in the excavation costing? Getting into landfill material of unknown makeup seems like a risky proposition for untrained villagers. Another point for comment 156.

---

Second Draft Comments:

No.	Page	Para	Line	Comment
1	Title Page			Delete "USAF, BSC, USAFOEHL/TS" after 1st Lt. Franz J. Schmidt
2	ES-3	2		The lagoon was investigated primarily because of its potential hydrologic impact on the new landfill. The coliform analyses were added because ADEC requested them.
3	ES-3	3		Detected in one of how many surface water samples?
4	ES-3	4	2	Trichloromethane is commonly known as chloroform.

No.	Page	Para	Line	Comment
5	ES-8			Center the site names over the sample identifiers. Line up the Aroclor row properly (it's shifted in my copy).
6	ES-12	4	1	Delete "s" from "TPHs".
7	1-1	2	4	"DOD IRP" should be "Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP)". IRP by definition is the USAF implementation of DERP. The other services don't call it the IRP.
8	2-30	2.11.2.1		Detection limit for lead was 0.01 mg/L. Recheck this reported lead value.
9	2-33	1		Line 3: Typo, "POW-1". Line 4: "..., except for the personnel stationed at POW-1."
10	3-6	5	8	Change "are" to "may be". Actually, pathogenic organisms are quite a bit less tolerant to environmental extremes than are coliforms. The use of coliforms as an indicator for pathogens is a hotly debated issue, and here especially since the cold environment would knock off a good portion of the bad bugs in short time.
11	3-7	1	1-3	Why have these metals been lost?
12	3-24	last		See correspondence concerning TPH in soils for Kotzebue and redetermine whether the holding time was exceeded.
13	3-25	2		If the sample in question here was the switch oil sample, then the holding time normally specified for SW8080 is probably not essential.
14	3-25	last	6	Change "fuels" to "oils".
15	3-37			Holding time for TPH in soils is 28 days to extraction, 40 days to analysis. Mercury has a holding time of 28 days. Recheck holding time for PCB in soils. Isn't it 14 days to extraction, 40 to analysis?
16	4-4	1		Actually, this is wrong. Action-specific ARARs have already been in force. All transportation and disposal of hazardous materials has been in compliance w/DOT and RCRA requirements. Location-specific requirements may not be ARARs because of the selected actions. All three types should be considered.
17	4-6			Typo in footnote.
18	4-10	3	6	Typo: "threshold".
19	5-17	1	4	Typo: "through".

RI/FS Bar-M, POW-3, POW-1 Alaska Second Draft

Comments: Cathy Port HQ TAC/DEEV

### Executive Summary

Check units for organics on Tables ES-2 and ES-5, ug/l

Page ES-3, line 9, change Interim to Initial.

### Section 1

Page 1-5, para 3, last sentence should read "Civil Engineering Management is provided on the Alaska DEW line segment from the 4700 OSS/DE, Langley AFB, VA."

### Section 2

Page 2-24, Sec 2.2.2.1, line 2: Restructure sentence.

Page 2-24, Sec 2.9.2.3, line 2: Confusing sentence, should be reworded.

Page 2-30, Sec 2.11.2.1: Why were oil & grease values not given, although analysis was performed?

Page 2-31, Sec 2.12.2, para 1: Figure 2-11 does not support statement that drainage from the POW-1 facility is generally to the north. Drainage appears to be radially away from the facility.

Page 2-33, Sec 2.12.4, para 1, line 3. Typo - OW-1 should read POW-1.

### Section 3

Page 3-6, Sec 3.2.2.3, point 2, line 7. time should be times.

Page 3-28, Sec 3.3.4, para 1, line 2. Sentence should read "The surfaces of the tanks are...".

### Section 4

Page 4-25, sec 4.5.1.4, para 3, line 3, insert "during" at end of line, and line 6, only one train, please.

Page 4-39, line 8, What are the other conditions?

### Section 5

Page 5-17, sec 5.3.2.3.2, line 4, "through"

General: When discussing remedial alternatives for the large fuel spill, give target cleanup levels and why they were chosen.

!Port/4430/DEEV/26 May 89/1928V!

**DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**

February 8, 1990

(907) 452-1714

Northern Regional Office  
1001 Noble Street  
Suite 350  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701Ms. Kathy Port  
HQ-TAC-DEEV  
Bldg. 681  
Langley AFB, VA 23665

Dear Ms. Port

Re: Installation Restoration Program, Remedial  
Investigation/Feasibility Study for Barter Island  
Bullen Point, and Point Lonely Air Force Stations.

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) has completed its review of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) prepared for Barter Island AFS (BAR-M), Bullen Point AFS (POW-3), and Point Lonely AFS (POW-1). The procedures followed to screen remedial actions for contaminated sites at these locations do not consider the State of Alaska Water Quality Standards (WQS) and in particular 18 AAC 70.010.(c). Surface water/leachate samples collected from some of the sites indicate that total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), and total aromatic hydrocarbons concentration exceed the allowable limits, therefore, necessitating determination of the source(s) and corrective actions. Our comments follow:

**BAR-M**Sewage Lagoon

Surface water/leachate samples collected at this site indicate the presence of coliform bacteria at 1100 and 4000 MPN/100 ml which represents a health hazard and is contrary to the State of Alaska WQS 18 AAC 70.020 and Waste Water Disposal Regulation 18 AAC 72.010(a). Woodward-Clyde consultants (WCC) classifies this site as category 1 which means no further IRP action is required. Furthermore, the department has issued a waste water disposal permit for this site (permit 8936-DB008), and the above leachate is not one of the provisions addressed in the permit. We disagree with the no action alternative based on the above regulations and recommend remedial action be explored and utilized.

New Landfill

According to the WCC report the average flow (seepage) out of the North side of the New Landfill due to precipitation is estimated at 1400 gallons/day (section 3-14). This seepage is about half the cumulative flow from the North berm. Surface water/leachate sample

results indicate presence of total aromatic hydrocarbons at concentrations higher than 10 ppb which is the standard set by the WQS. Again, the no remedial action alternative proposed for this site is not acceptable by the department. Since the waste in the landfill are the likely source of the water contamination, and surface water leaching through the wastes, effort should be made to rectify the problem.

#### Old Landfill

Per correspondence between the ADEC and the U.S. Air Force (USAF) dated April 29, 1988, the department expressed its concern over the fact that the Beaufort Sea is reclaiming portion of the Barter Island where the Old landfill is located. In the same letter, remedial action for stabilization of the eroding area and collection of material washed away from the landfill were recommended. Moreover, disposal of waste into the water of the state requires a permit per AS 46.03.100. The department would like to reiterate its recommendation of a remedial action.

#### POL Catchment and Contaminated Ditch

The surface water/leachate sample results reported for these two sites indicate that total hydrocarbons in the water column exceed the WQS. Soil/sediment samples result from these sites do not show TPH contamination, therefore, remedial action at other locations at BAR-M may eliminate the problem at the POL Catchment and Contaminated Ditch.

#### POW-3

#### POL Tanks

Visual inspection of the tanks as described in the RI/FS report indicate that the surface of the seven fuel tanks were severely deteriorated and the nearby soil surface showed some signs of rust stains (WCC report, March, 1988, and April, 1989). The exact content of the tanks is unknown and the liquid level gages indicate less than 4-6 inches of product is in the tanks. Since corrosion may eventually expose inside of the tanks, we believe that further actions are necessary to prevent future problems.

#### POW-1

#### Husky Landfill

The WCC report dated March 1988 indicates leachate of oily looking and discolored liquids from the west side of the landfill. The report also indicates that gas bubbles appeared when the effluent was disturbed. Surface water/leachate samples collected from this site on August 1988, demonstrate the presence of total aromatic hydrocarbons at concentrations in excess of 15 ppb. Moreover, one of the soil/sediment samples collected at this site shows the presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons at a concentration of 1300 mg/kg. The Husky Landfill apparently has received wastes such as

Ms. Port

-3-

February 8, 1990

solvents and waste oils (WCC report, March, 1988). The presence of sink holes on the landfill's gravel pad may contribute to the seepage contamination at the west side berm, since water drained through this sink holes may come in contact with the buried waste. Based on the facts indicated above the department does not accept the no action alternative and recommends a remedial action that will result in a permanent solution of this problem.

#### Old Landfill

The report dated March, 1988, indicate that this inactive landfill is eroding and the debris are exposed and it extends into the lagoon. The department in its correspondence with the USAF dated April 29, 1988, suggested stabilization of the landfill, if the material(waste) are being discharged into the lagoon. The ADEC would like the USAF to address the above issue.

#### Old Sewage Outfall

Surface water/leachate and soil/sediment sample results from this site indicate presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons at concentrations as high as 6000 ppb, and 1300 mg/kg. respectively. The department does not accept the no action alternative chosen for this site based on 18 ACC 70.010.(c) and 18 ACC .70.020., therefore corrective actions should be sought.

#### Large Fuel Spill

Soil/sediments and surface water/leachate results sample results indicate TPH concentrations as high as 25000 mg/kg and 3000 ppb respectively. The remedial action sought for the fuel spill area is acceptable, but in order to eliminate the water contamination, soil cleanup level up of 100 mg/kg should be attained. We also would like to remind you that state of Alaska considers surface waters within the state jurisdiction as a source of fresh water.

#### POL Storage Area

Surface water/leachate sample results show TPH concentration at 2000 ppb, which is again over the limits set by the WQS. Soil/sediment sample results indicate TPH levels in the range of 40 to 5400 mg/kg., again, we believe that soil cleanup level of 100 mg/kg should be achieved.

If you have any question regarding this matter please contact myself or Brad Fristoe at the telephone number listed on the previous page.

Sincerely,

Mehrdad Nadem  
Environmental Field Officer

mn/rg

cc: W. McGee ADEC/Fairbanks  
B. Fristoe ADEC/Fairbanks  
Captain Schmidt USAF/Brooks AFB



U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION 10

ALASKA OPERATIONS OFFICE  
ROOM 537, FEDERAL BUILDING  
222 W 7<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, #19  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99513

October 13, 1989

REPLY TO AOO/A  
ATTN OF:

Gilbert Burnet, Chief  
Environmental Planning Division  
HQ Tactical Air Command (HQ TAC/DEEV)  
Langley AFB, VA 23665-5542

Ref: IRP-RI/FS Barter Island AFS  
~~Bullen Point AFS; Point Lonely AFS~~  
April 25, 1989

Dear Mr. Burnet:

Please find the following comments regarding the RI/FS Stage 3 Report for Barter Island AFS (BAR-M), Bullen Point AFS (POW-3), and Point Lonely AFS (POW-2) Dew Line Sites, Alaska.

On September 7, 1989, representatives from the U.S. Air Force Occupational and Environmental Health Laboratory and contractor (Woodward Clyde) briefed members of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation and myself regarding the status of the above mentioned sites. Based on the results of the 1988 summer field surveys, the April 25, 1989 report, and the September 7, 1989 meeting, I concur with the decisions agreed to at the September meeting. The Tactical Air Command (TAC) should be aware that additional tank and pipeline testing are recommended to further verify the integrity of these systems at the two active sites.

Furthermore, I would highly recommend further internal discussions be held within TAC, Alaskan Air Command, Headquarters Air Force and the Defense Department regarding the future uses of the Bullen Point (POW-3) site. As long as this site remains under the ownership of the Air Force, the Air Force will be held responsible for all future unpermitted disposal activities that may occur at the abandoned site. These responsibilities may include excavation and offsite removal of contaminated materials and/or soil.

Please contact me at (907) 271-5083 if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Douglas W. Johnson, Acting Chief  
Air & Waste Section

cc: HQ AAC/DEEV  
OEHL/TS - Capt. Schmidt  
ADEC - NRO - L. Simmons

500 12th Street  
Suite 100  
Oakland CA 94607-4014  
(415) 893-3600

45 9  
**Woodward-Clyde Consultants**

April 10, 1990  
90275J

Captain Franz J. Schmidt  
USAFHSD/YAQUI  
Building 624 West  
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235-5000

Contract No.: F33615-85-D-4544

Order No.: 0006

Subject: Installation Restoration Program  
Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study  
Response to Comments  
DEW Line Stations, Alaska

Dear Captain Schmidt:

Attached are Woodward-Clyde Consultants' responses to comments received from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation and the Environmental Protection Agency for BAR-M, POW-3 and POW-1, DEW Line stations, Alaska. WCC responses consist of site-by-site discussions that address the regulatory agency comments.

The form of this submittal is intended to provide Captain Tim McLean with responses to comments written as if prepared by the Air Force, to which he could attach a transmittal letter and send to ADEC and EPA.

Sincerely,

*Joel R. Kushins*

Joel R. Kushins, P.E.  
Task Order Manager

*Ulrich Luscher*

Ulrich Luscher, Ph.D., P.E.  
Project Manager

JRK/UL:tt  
90275J-c/COT

cc: Ms. Cathy Port  
HQ TAC DEEV

Attachment

Consulting Engineers, Geologists  
and Environmental Scientists

Offices in Other Principal Cities



REGULATORY AGENCY COMMENTS AND  
USAF RESPONSES TO INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM  
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY  
STAGE 3  
DEW LINE STATIONS, ALASKA

1.0 BARTER ISLAND AIR FORCE STATION (BAR M)

1.1 Old Landfill (Site 1)

ADEC had requested remediation of the Old Landfill in a letter to the USAF dated April 29, 1988, and reiterated its request in the February 9, 1990 response to the BAR-M RI/FS report.

The WCC risk screening concluded that no significant risk was associated with the BAR-M Old Landfill. WCC did propose an interim remedial measure (IRM) for the Old Landfill. The preferred IRM is removal of the landfill material back from the bluff to prevent further erosion into the Beaufort Sea.

HQ TAC/DEEV has requested 4700 OSS to have its contractor investigate stabilization actions for the Old Landfill during the summer of 1990.

1.2 Sewage Lagoon (Site 2)

ADEC responded to the RI/FS Study for this location by stating that the "presence of coliform bacteria at 1100 and 4000 MPN/100 mL...represents a health hazard and is contrary to the State of Alaska WQS (water quality standards) 18 AAC 70.020 and Waste Water Disposal Regulation 18 AAC 72.010 (a)." ADEC disagreed with the recommended no further IRP action for this site. EPA's Alaska Operations Office concurred with the proposed no further IRP action combined with the IRM to repair sewage lagoon berm erosion by installing an inverted filter around the pipe in the northwest corner of the berm.

HQ TAC/DEEV responded that a permit was issued by ADEC to draw-down the lagoon. The permit required sampling to confirm meeting established ADEC effluent discharge levels before drawdown. Because the original and the followup samples did not meet established ADEC effluent discharge levels, the drawdown has been suspended. TAC's civil engineering section is considering raising the berm by 1 foot to prevent overflow. A new package treatment plant is scheduled to be installed in the spring of 1990. This new treatment plant should reduce the fecal coliform bacteria to an acceptable level. An additional factor is that residents of the neighboring village of Kaktovik dump their sewage-containing "honey buckets" into the sewage lagoon untreated. The village of Kaktovik has plans to construct its own sewage lagoon according to HQ TAC/DEEV.

In summary, the USAF considers the BAR-M Sewage Lagoon leakage to be an operations problem for which a number of related remedial measures are planned. Although the presence of coliform bacteria has been established, no chemical contamination has been detected, and therefore, no further IRP remedial activities are planned at this site.

### 1.3 POL Catchment Area (Site 3) and Contaminated Ditch (Site 8)

ADEC responded that although the surface water-leachate sample results from TPHs exceeded the Alaska WQS, soil-sediment sample results from these sites do not indicate TPHs contamination. ADEC concludes that therefore, remedial action at other BAR-M locations may resolve the contamination problem at the POL Catchment Area and Contaminated Ditch sites. All concur with ADECs conclusion.

EPA responded that contamination at these sites may be related to current tank and pipeline operations. EPA concluded that "additional tank and pipeline testing are recommended to further verify the integrity of these systems at the two active sites [BAR-M and POW-1]."

USAF, ADEC and WCC representatives, at the September 1989 DEW Line meeting in Fairbanks, concurred that tank and pipeline testing at BAR-M and POW-1 are recommended. Tank and pipeline testing is considered an operations and maintenance program, not an IRP issue.

#### 1.4 BAR-M New Landfill (Site 4)

ADEC concluded that because total aromatic hydrocarbons above the Alaska WQS were detected at the New Landfill, remediation is required.

WCC proposed an IRM for this site. WCC proposed to cap the inactive portion of the landfill with locally available sand and gravel mixed with imported bentonite. This method will effectively reduce leachate generation, at a moderate cost.

HQ TAC/DEEV concurs with WCCs' recommended IRM for the New Landfill.

## 2.0 BULLEN POINT AIR FORCE STATION (POW-3)

### POL Tanks

ADEC found that because corrosion may eventually cause leakage of the contents, further actions are necessary to prevent future problems.

EPA recommended a USAF decision on the future of Bullen Point AFS, a currently abandoned facility: "As long as this site remains under the ownership of the Air Force, the Air Force will be held responsible for all future unpermitted disposal activities that may occur at the abandoned site. These responsibilities may include excavation and offsite removal of contaminated materials and/or soil."

WCC has recommended, as an IRM, that remaining fuel be removed from the POL tanks to minimize the potential for future leakage and associated environmental contamination.

HQ TAC/DEEV indicates that this site will be the location of a new short range radar of the North Warning System after 1992. Excess POW-3 site facilities will be demolished at that time. The problem of the old fuel tanks would therefore be addressed.

### 3.0 POINT LONELY AIR FORCE STATION (POW-1)

#### 3.1 Old Sewage Outfall (Site 25/27)

ADEC stated that surface water-leachate and soil-sediment sample results indicate TPHs at concentrations as high as 6000 ppb and 1300 mg/kg, respectively. ADEC does not accept the no action alternative for this site because the Alaska water standards and soil cleanup guidelines have been exceeded.

WCC concluded that risk is insignificant at the Old Sewage Outfall based on an interpretation of the California LUFT Manual decision criteria, referred to by ADEC as the guidance standard in 1988. WCC recommended a cleanup level of 10,000 mg/kg for soils based on the LUFT evaluation procedure and an evaluation of the POW-1 site conditions.

HQ TAC/DEEV has determined that visibly contaminated soils from this site will be treated as a part of the planned Large Fuel Spill (Site 29-29A) remediation program at POW-3 (see below, Section 3.3). Pipe pressure testing should be performed at this site as a regular operations and maintenance procedure.

#### 3.2 POL Storage Area (Site 28)

ADEC stated that soil-sediment TPH concentrations from 40 to 5400 mg/kg require soil cleanup to the level of 100 mg/kg. Surface water-leachate TPHs at concentrations of 2000 ppb, greater than the WQS limit, are expected by ADEC to be reduced by the soil remediation.

WCC proposed no remediation for the POW-1 POL Storage Area because reported TPH values were not above 10,000 mg/kg. The risk screening based on the

California LUFT standards is a reasonable basis in this environment. HQ TAC/DEEV intends to maintain the 10,000 mg/kg cleanup level. If, however, at the POW-1 Large Fuel Spill, TPHs cleanup can be achieved below the levels currently detected at the POL Storage Area, then remediation of visibly contaminated soil will be attempted at this site as well.

### 3.3 Large Fuel Spill (Site 29/29A)

For the POW-1 Large Fuel Spill, WCC prepared a Feasibility Study (FS) based on a California Leaking Underground Fuel Tank (LUFT) Manual evaluation. WCC concluded that in this environment, a soil cleanup level of 10,000 mg/kg was a reasonable and achievable remediation goal.

EPA concurred with this proposed remediation and cleanup level.

ADEC agreed with the proposed selected remediation alternatives, but requested that the soil cleanup goal should be established at 100 mg/kg in order to reduce the sources of surface water contamination at the site.

HQ TAC/DEEV maintains that the LUFT manual evaluation of 10,000 mg/kg as the cleanup level is a reasonable and achievable goal at the POW-1 location. The severity of the arctic climate at POW-1 is expected to slow TPHs bioremediation cleanup. The isolated location of POW-1 is expected to complicate site remediation logistics. The cleanup, however, will continue as long as reductions of TPHs in soil are practically obtainable.

### 3.4 Old Landfill (Site 31)

ADEC cited an earlier WCC report indicating that the POW-1 Old Landfill is eroding and that the landfill debris is exposed and extends into the lagoon. ADEC requested landfill stabilization in April 1988 and reiterated its request in the February 1990 comment responses.

WCC risk screening results found no significant risk at this site. HQ TAC/DEEV tasked the 4700 OSS operations contractor to rectify the erosion problem.

### 3.5 Husky Landfill (Site 32)

ADEC stated that TPHs and benzene concentrations in excess of Alaska WQS have been identified at the POW-1 Husky Landfill. ADEC suggested that the presence of sink holes on the landfill's gravel pad may contribute to the seepage contamination at the west side berm because water draining through these sink holes may come into contact with the buried waste. ADEC concluded that a permanent solution to this problem is required.

WCC has recommended a three part IRM to minimize water flow through the Husky Landfill: (1) To control inflow from direct precipitation, sources creating snowpack accumulation could be removed, and the permeable gravel cover over the fill could be capped with less permeable materials and graded to divert drainage from the landfill. (2) Flow from the east side ponds could be eliminated by creating a positive surface drainage channel to the south into an existing drainage system that flows southwest away from the pad into the tidal flats. (3) Cutting off landfill main pad infiltration could be done by construction of a cutoff wall on the east side of the landfill. In addition, an innovative method of remediating this site, by the application of cover material to raise the permafrost surface up into the landfill, is also discussed in the RI/FS report.

HQ TAC/DEEV concurs with WCCs' recommended three part IRM for the Husky Landfill. In addition, HQ TAC/DEEV through 4700 OSS has tasked the operations contractor to revegetate the Husky Landfill, as a preliminary IRM, to reduce seepage out of the landfill.

**FINAL PAGE**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

**FINAL PAGE**