

0001

1 THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND
2 THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
3
4 Proposed Plan for Remedial)
Action at The Unalakleet)
5 Air Force Station)
Formerly Used Defense Site)
6 _____)
7

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

9 UNALAKLEET, ALASKA
10 July 7, 2008

11 APPEARANCES:

11

12 MR. TODD FICKLE
13 MR. TOMMIE BAKER
U.S. AIR FORCE

13

14

MS. JENNIFER ANDERSON

15

JACOB'S

16

MS. KIM DeRUYTER

17

MR. COLIN CRAVEN

18

STATE OF ALASKA

19

MR. RONALD PFLUM

20

MR. SCOTT MCKEAN

21

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

MR. MICHAEL JONES

MR. KYLE WALDRON

ENSR Corporation

* * * *

22

23

24

25

0002

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (On record)

3

4 MR. FICKLE: My name is Todd Fickle, I'm with
5 the Air Force. We're here to discuss our work at the North
6 River Site. This meeting will also be -- have two parts, the
7 Army Corps of Engineer has another site and they will be
8 discussing that. Let me do some quick introductions and see
9 who's representing which entity. Again, my name is Todd
10 Fickle, I'm the project manager for the North River Air Force
environmental clean up site.

11

12 MS. ANDERSON: I am Jennifer Anderson with
13 Jacob's, I am Todd's contractor.

14

15 MS. DeRUYTER: Kim DeRuyter with the State of
16 Alaska. We are going to be reviewing all the reports and
17 approving the work as it's done so if you have any concerns it
18 would be nice if you'd contact me.

19

20 MR. PFLUM: I'm Ron Pflum with the Core of
21 Engineers, the project manager. We're here to discuss the

19 FUD's site.

20 MR. W. IVANOFF: I'm Weaver Ivanoff the General
21 Manager for the Native Village of Unalakleet.

22 MR. L. IVANOFF: I'm Larry Ivanoff for the
23 Unalakleet Native Corporation Land Management.

24 MR. MCKEAN: I'm Scott McKean, I'm with U.S.
25 Army Corps of Engineers.

0003

1 MR. JONES: I'm Mike Jones, I'm with ENSR
2 Corporation and I'm supporting the Army Corps of Engineers in
3 their program here.

4 MR. WALDRON: I'm Kyle Waldron, I'm also with
5 ENSR who's also with the Army Corps of Engineers.

6 MS. PAMPTCHUK: Teri Pamptchuk. I'm on the
7 Native Village of Unalakleet Tribal Counsel.

8 MR. FICKLE: And also Teri is our new RAB co-
9 chair as well, so thanks for her support in this meeting.

10 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Dave Cunningham with Sluice
11 (ph) Construction.

12 MR. DEGNAN: Chuck Degnan, I'm with Unalakleet
13 Native Corporation.

14 MR. BAKER: Tommie Baker and I'm community
15 relations for the Air Force.

16 MS. DEGNAN: Frances Degnan and I'm with the
17 Coastal Land Change Program.

18 MR. CRAVEN: I'm Colin Craven and I also work
19 for the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, I work
20 with Kim in the Fairbanks Office.

21 COURT REPORTER: I'm Barbara Dilling and I'm
22 the court reporter.

23 MR. FICKLE: All right, thanks. Our first
24 segment will be a review of our 2007, just this last summer,
25 field work at the North River Site and Jennifer will be doing

0004

1 that presentation.

2 (Presentations given off record)

3 MR. WALDRON: So we will just briefly discuss
4 the proposed plan. There is copies of the full proposed plan
5 over there, if you guys haven't got one already please feel
6 free to take one. So it's -- it covers the Army Corps of
7 Engineers FUD's section for the Unalakleet Air Force Station
8 which includes the -- the main site is the aircraft control and
9 warning station and then it's associated sites with it. The
10 purpose of the proposed plan is to -- basically it describes
11 the history of the sites, what's gone on out there. It also
12 gives you the selected alternatives that have been identified
13 in the proposed plan and then the preferred remedial
14 alternative. But an actual decision on which -- what the --
15 what will actually be done at the sites won't be made until
16 everybody has a chance to make public comments and we can
17 address them and go through them and then make a final decision
18 with the state regulatory agencies.

19 So the clean up objectives for each of the sites is to
20 protect the human health and the environment by preventing
21 current and future exposure to contamination which exceeds
22 clean up criteria. For all constituents there's basically
23 three possible exposure pathways, there's the inhalation,

24 ingestion, and migration to groundwater. As you can see from
25 the map -- there are -- some of these sites are located along
0005

1 the water and a lot of these sites have been impacted by salt
2 water so the so the groundwater is not actually usable for
3 human consumption. Therefore at these sites we'll present the
4 data as if it's -- and compare it to the migration of
5 groundwater criteria, however as these sites we --
6 realistically it's based on the inhalation and ingestion
7 levels. And there's 13 total sites, the main site being the
8 former aircraft and control warning station and the rest of
9 these are just basically are sites associated with it where
10 drums have been found and additional contamination. So of
11 these sites there's been investigations in the mid '90's and
12 early 2000's and then removal actions in the mid -- in about
13 2005, 2006 time frame. Based on data collected from the sites
14 and remedial actions done up to date, we've recommended six
15 sites for no further action. So I'll go through each of the
16 six sites one by one and kind of discuss the history and what's
17 left. The first site is the Barrel Bluff, there has been
18 contamination related to fuel components DRO is diesel range
19 organics and in pesticide contamination and that was identified
20 in 2002, subsequent years in 2006 approximately 14 and a half
21 cubic yards of soil were excavated. So at this site based on
22 the fact that we've excavated the contaminated soil, we're
23 recommending no further action. The next site, the Gravel Pit
24 in 2002 it identified some DRO contamination, diesel
25 contamination, and SVOC, semi-volatile organic compounds which
0006

1 are also a component of fuel. They were identified in the soil
2 at this site in 2002, in 2005 and 2006 there was removal
3 actions or removal activities where soil was dug up. So
4 subsequent sampling showed diesel was less than state clean up
5 levels, so at this site again we recommend no further action is
6 necessary. Site 14 is the Drum Dump, at this site DRO and RO
7 contamination. DRO again diesel, RO is residual range organics
8 which consist of like motor oil, heavier oils, was identified
9 in the soil. 840 cubic yards of soil was removed from the site
10 based on this DRO -- following the excavation additional
11 samples were collected and DRO and benzene were again detected
12 in 2006, however they're detected above the migration of
13 groundwater clean up criteria and not the inhalation and
14 ingestion, so there is no risk to human health based on the
15 fact that migration of ground water is not applicable yet.

16 MS. DEGNAN: Well, if you get infiltration into
17 the groundwater then it affects the ocean and also the slough
18 where the smolt -- the salmon smolt rear.

19 MR. WALDRON: Right.

20 MS. DEGNAN: So that -- that is a -- what you
21 call it, an affect to us living here that depend on the fish
22 for subsistence and for commercial fishing.

23 MR. WALDRON: Right, but migration of
24 groundwater is based on drinking water for humans.

25 MS. DEGNAN: Uh-huh (affirmative).

0007

1 MR. WALDRON: And there's additional clean up
2 criteria for oceans and surface waters and those criteria are

3 much higher than drinking water. And so we'd have to go out --
4 we could test the salt water or the slough water, but based on
5 the fact that usually it's --

6 MS. DEGNAN: Moving all the time.

7 MR. WALDRON: Yeah, yeah, right. It's going to
8 dilute it and there's going to be very little risk.

9 MS. DEGNAN: But I would like that as a
10 comment.

11 MR. WALDRON: Okay.

12 MS. DEGNAN: From a person living here eating
13 the fish.

14 MR. WALDRON: Absolutely.

15 MS. DeRUYTER: One comment real quick.

16 MR. WALDRON: Sure.

17 MS. DeRUYTER: Well, we do compare some of
18 these levels to the surface water levels, right? Is that at
19 this site or --

20 MR. WALDRON: That was at the Slough Site.

21 MS. DeRUYTER: Okay.

22 MR. WALDRON: Where there was one drum
23 excavation where there was actually surface water in the
24 excavation.

25 MS. DeRUYTER: And that was below the clean up
0008

1 levels, correct?

2 MR. WALDRON: That was below clean up levels,
3 that's right.

4 MS. DeRUYTER: Yeah, okay.

5 MR. WALDRON: And this is actually -- to put in
6 perspective, this is one sample of numerous samples collected.
7 It's not as if the whole site had DRO and benzene levels above
8 the clean up criteria, it's just one tiny sample. These
9 weren't like at the other site where they combined a whole
10 bunch of samples, this is just discreet sampling so they just
11 chose one sample and another sample from a few locations around
12 the excavation. And of the other samples they were all below
13 all the clean up criteria including the migration of
14 groundwater.

15 The next site is the Landfill by Air Force Road, at
16 this site it was thought based on public comments that there
17 was possible ethylene glycol or antifreeze contamination. So
18 what was done was they dug a bunch of test pits in 2006 to look
19 for possible evidence of antifreeze and nothing was found and
20 so at this site they're again recommending no further action.
21 Site 18 is an Abandoned Fuel Truck, in the soil they detected
22 TCE which is trichloroethylene and it's basically a chlorinated
23 solvent used for cleaning equipment or piping. And based on
24 the TCE detection they excavated one and a half cubic yards of
25 contaminated soil, removing the contamination therefore the
0009

1 recommended action is no further action. Site 23, there was a
2 bunch of drums identified at this site, these drums were
3 removed. Based on the removal of the drums, they saw some
4 stained soil. The stained soil was excavated, samples were
5 collected and those samples were above clean up levels. So the
6 recommended action is again no further action.

7 The next sites are sites where additional investigation

8 or remedial action is necessary and these are the sites
9 identified, there's seven sites. We'll go through them one by
10 one. Site 7 includes a former drum location where sampling
11 took place, you can see the picture where they excavated
12 previously in 2006. Identified at the former location was DRO
13 contamination, again diesel range organics, SVOCs, semi-
14 volatile organic compounds and dioxins and furans. And here's
15 kind of a -- shows you the levels so of these you can see the
16 DRO is 63,000 parts per million and then you can see the
17 comparable clean up levels. So we've recommended additional
18 action at this based on these all being above all the clean up
19 levels. Additionally at this site there was brought to the
20 attention during a RAB meeting there's a lead shielded cable,
21 there's been no sampling done around this cable so it's --
22 we've just identified it as potential contamination because
23 based on lead cables there could be contamination of lead in
24 the soil or in any nearby surface water. So we've identified
25 the remedial actions are to prevent exposure to the

0010

1 contaminated soil at the former drum location and prevent
2 possible exposure in the vicinity of the lead shielded cable.
3 Now they did an extensive study on which alternatives could be
4 used to clean up the area, of these there's the no action
5 alternative which is identified just as a baseline for
6 comparing the rest of your alternatives. The second
7 alternatives was natural attenuation and long term monitoring.
8 Natural attenuation is just the natural process of the
9 chemicals biodegrading and then the long term monitoring would
10 confirm by collecting samples every few years that the
11 chemicals actually are biodegrading. The next one,
12 institutional controls, which could include just putting
13 restrictions on the land so that it couldn't be used to develop
14 a house or used to put in a water well or also just even
15 putting up a fence blocking it from the public. And then the
16 fourth is bolded because that's the alternative we're
17 recommending, is the offsite treatment and disposal which
18 includes just digging up the dirty soil and treating it at a
19 permitted landfill or disposing however is best. And we've
20 identified that there's probably one cubic yard of contaminated
21 soil at the site. The next site, Site 12 the Communications
22 Building in previous investigations DRO and benzene was
23 identified in the soil both constituents of fuel. You can see
24 the clean up levels here, DRO is above all three clean up
25 levels where as benzene again is above the migration of

0011

1 groundwater but not the inhalation or ingestion levels. And
2 this site, again, Site 12 is located adjacent to the Norton
3 Sound so it's again impacted by groundwater -- or the
4 groundwater is impacted by salt water and not usable so again
5 we feel that the benzene is probably not a constituent of
6 concern however it will be cleaned up as the DRO is cleaned up.

7 MR. PFLUM: You might want to mention that we
8 were out there today and we had a hard time finding the
9 location. Is this the same location that they're now -- a
10 company is using it for staging equipment?

11 MR. W. IVANOFF: Further north, just a little
12 bit north of there.

13 MR. PFLUM: Okay. You say that site is not it
14 then, because that -- we had a hard time with that.

15 MR. W. IVANOFF: A little further north than
16 that.

17 MR. PFLUM: So that's not the same site you're
18 saying, where they're staging all their equipment?

19 MR. W. IVANOFF: No, they're staging it to the
20 south of where the former (indiscernible).

21 MR. PFLUM: Further up we find an area where
22 it's just all -- you know, just blank area that was -- that's
23 it?

24 MR. W. IVANOFF: Not -- you know, the Alaska --
25 piled a bunch of wood up on it.

0012

1 MR. WALDRON: Okay. Yeah, because based on the
2 previous data there's -- here's the Beach Road and here's the
3 former Communications Building which as you guys know is now
4 demolished and gone. And the center of the previous sampling
5 was here and all these samples are now below clean up levels
6 and there was one sample identified with DRO contamination.
7 And so when we do our remedial action objective it's to prevent
8 exposure to this contaminated soil. And the alternatives
9 again, no action, natural attenuation long term monitoring,
10 institutional controls. Another possibility for fuel
11 components is bio-venting which includes just like pushing air
12 into the soil and pulling air out of it so that you're
13 circulating the contamination and it will biodegrade more
14 quickly. Thermal desorption which includes digging it up and
15 just burning the soil so it burns it off and then again they
16 have identified as the preferred alternative off-site treatment
17 and disposal. And it's a little deeper, it's not at the
18 surface so there's about 10 cubic yards that would have to be
19 dug up. The problems that's identified with this is that it's
20 one single location that's now not marked very well so it may
21 difficult to locate. As we move on to the next site, the
22 Unalakleet River and Trail Creek, up to date there's been over
23 a 1,000 drums removed from this site. However, at the last
24 investigation -- and there's been no contamination detected but
25 there is 25 drums that are remaining on site and so as a part

0013

1 of the remedial action alternative these drums will be removed
2 and based on visual evidence if necessary additional sampling
3 will be conducted. The next site Army Hill, they detected in
4 the -- one of the original investigations moving out there they
5 detected DRO in one soil sample at 4,900 part per million.
6 Subsequent investigations identified more contamination,
7 however they were all dug up. At this site the first sample
8 was never dug up so it still remains on site, so the objective
9 is to prevent exposure to the contaminated soil. Again here's
10 the remedial alternatives and again it's just going to be we
11 recommend off-site treatment and disposal which is dig it up
12 and dispose of it. And there's based on the evidence about one
13 cubic yard of contaminated soil. Here's a map showing the
14 location, most of the investigation/remediation revolved around
15 the drums. You can -- I mean you can't really see the map, but
16 these are drums and excavation locations. The old sample was
17 collected down near the road so it again may be difficult in

18 locating, but there's process where you can field screen the
19 soil and attempt to look for it. Site 22 Generator Hill, at
20 this site there's been DRO contaminated soil north of the
21 former generator building you can see the maximum concentration
22 in the soil is 7,100 parts per million well above the migration
23 of groundwater clean up level, but below inhalation and
24 ingestion level. This map kind of shows you the site, here's
25 the -- here's the road and then here's the former generator

0014

1 building and then here's the area of these samples, all of
2 these exceeded the migration of groundwater clean up standards
3 so this area would be needed to be remediated. The objective
4 again just prevent exposure to the contaminated soil. Remedial
5 alternatives are similar to the other sites and again the
6 preferred alternative is the off-site treatment and disposal.
7 You saw that it was a bigger area therefore there will be
8 approximately 100 cubic yards of soil needed to be excavated.
9 The next site the Former Musk Ox Farm, there's been no
10 contamination identified in the soil up to date. There is one
11 drum remaining on site, but it previously was identified that
12 it could not be safely removed due to it's location under a log
13 cabin. We did visit the site today and it did seem a little
14 strange, but it seems like the log cabin was on top of the drum
15 but they -- we can conduct some analytical sampling in the site
16 or remove the drum as necessary. Do you have something you
17 want to say about that site Ron?

18 MR. PFLUM: Well, I noticed the drum is blue in
19 color which is not an Army issue type drum. Chevron painted
20 their drums blue, so it would seem to me that (indiscernible)
21 probe that if that's what it is.

22 MR. WALDRON: And the last site is the big
23 site, is the Main Aircraft Control and Warning Station Complex.
24 It's composed of a whole bunch of separate facilities which in
25 the proposed plan were identified as 25a through 25n. This

0015

1 kind of shows you a map of the area, the former composite
2 building, there's the former above ground storage tanks, former
3 radar buildings and north going, south going towers and we'll
4 kind of go through each of the facilities. There was a water
5 pump house number one, no contaminants have been detected in
6 the soil at this site. The water pump house number two and no
7 contaminants have been detected at this site either above clean
8 up levels. 25c is the composite building, at eight locations
9 there's been fuel components detected in the soil above clean
10 up levels. Table kind of gives you a rough idea of their
11 levels above the clean up levels. So DRO, diesel range
12 organics and then two components of fuel. 25d is a transfer --
13 transformer storage area, at this one some fuel components and
14 TCE again, which is a chlorinated solvent used for cleaning
15 parts, were detected at three locations. The TCE was .046
16 above the .027 clean up level. 25e is the underground storage
17 or underground fuel storage tank and at three locations there's
18 been contamination identified in the soil again both fuel
19 components. Again this kind of gives you a summary of the
20 levels. The northern dome tower building, at this site there
21 was contamination identified at nine locations and here's the
22 levels. The south dome tower buildings, DRO is contamination

23 identified in two samples but of these two samples it was
24 identified that it consisted of road base material and the road
25 base, I guess in the past they -- to keep the dust down they

0016

1 used oil and spread it on the roads therefore -- so basically
2 it's made of the road base material -- let's see if it's
3 working, there we go. So it's made of the road base material
4 which again is from oil spreading on the road so it's not
5 really associated with past military activities.

6 MR. W. IVANOFF: What do you mean, that's what
7 the military put down on the roads.

8 MS. DEGNAN: They wouldn't need the road if the
9 military hadn't been there.

10 MR. PFLUM: The military built the roads.

11 MS. DEGNAN: They're military roads.

12 MR. WALDRON: Okay.

13 MR. W. IVANOFF: So they need to change that.

14 MR. WALDRON: Sure. Yeah, it's to locations so
15 they can.....

16 MS. DEGNAN: They're dumping trails.

17 MR. WALDRON: Right, okay. We'll get that in
18 the public record as a comment and address it. Then there's
19 the northern and southern radar buildings, in the past these
20 were investigated with the -- in conjunction with the north and
21 south dome towers and there's been no contamination identified
22 at these sites.

23 MS. DEGNAN: No ghosts.

24 MR. WALDRON: What's that?

25 MS. DEGNAN: No ghosts.

0017

1 MR. WALDRON: No ghosts? The former stock
2 pile, TCE again, a cleaning solvent, was identified at one
3 location above the clean up level. The northern above ground
4 storage tank and then the associated thermal diso- -- or
5 thermal treatment site. At this site DRO and SVOCs, fuel
6 components, were identified at six locations, gives you an idea
7 of the levels. The southern above ground storage tank DRO is
8 detected at five locations, maximum of 7,300 parts per million.
9 The fuel filling station, DRO is identified in one isolated
10 location. The sewage treatment plant and outfall DRO again was
11 identified in one soil sample at one location and again the
12 former landfill there was DRO identified in one location. And
13 these levels 360, 430 and 340 are just above the migration and
14 groundwater clean up levels but well below the inhalation and
15 ingestion levels. So there's not a big risk to human health
16 it's only to the ground water. The problem with these sites is
17 trying to find these one locations over again and dig them up.
18 All other samples collected from the sites were below the clean
19 up levels so it can be attempted to field screen the soil and
20 look for them but it will be difficult. So for all of site 25
21 this Aircraft Control and Warning Station the remedial
22 objectives are prevent exposure to the contaminated soil
23 including the fuel components and the cleaning components. The
24 remedial alternatives that were identified were similar to all
25 the other sites and again the way to address it -- the

0018

1 preferred way to address it was off-site treatment and

2 disposal. We estimated approximately 600 cubic yards of
3 contaminated soil that would have to be excavated and disposed
4 of.

5 Here's a brief summary of all the sites we just went
6 through and just kind of the proposed remedial action and the
7 proposed plan. You can see that most of these are either no
8 further action or off-site treatment and disposal which is
9 excavation. And then again this is a proposed plan that we
10 would like community participation, the comment period for it
11 does end July 20th. You can -- to submit comments you can
12 either mail them to the ENSR address given here, it's also on
13 the back of the proposed plan. There's a toll free line you
14 can call in and leave a recorded comment, and if you don't pick
15 up a proposed plan today or want to give it to somebody else to
16 review you can get a copy of it at this website. If you have
17 any additional questions please feel free to ask, if you want
18 to give a comment today for the record and haven't done so
19 already we can take some comments for the -- to get recorded by
20 the court reporter.

21 MS. DEGNAN: Now, my name is Frances Degnan and
22 I am a resident of Unalakleet. And I wanted to thank you all
23 for coming here and thank you for doing the clean up, it's
24 really important and the community feels much safer that these
25 contaminants are being cleaned up. And the emphasis is on

0019

1 anything protecting our subsistence way of life 'cause we
2 gather greens and we berry -- pick berries and get the animals
3 that feed off all of the tundra and trees and things in -- in
4 the river and the ocean and into the fish. So that makes it,
5 you know, for a little bit safer peace of mind when we're going
6 out getting our wild foods which we used all through and
7 continue to use. So anything affecting the -- like the Trail
8 Creek and the Kouwegok Slough that's where our king salmon rear
9 and you probably know that we're on a really low level of
10 return of king salmon and I think that might be related to what
11 goes on the slough up here. And I think that -- I think if we
12 get everything cleaned up and then get culverts in the roads
13 that are going into the hills we might see a better rearing of
14 the salmon smolts in our tidal areas. Those are my comments
15 and thank you very much.

16 MR. L. IVANOFF: I'd like to know when -- when
17 are your plans to start excavating the lands that they are
18 doing for the treatment and disposal?

19 MR. PFLUM: Right now the plan is for 2010,
20 that's because of funding restrictions. If we were to get
21 additional funding for next year above what we already have we
22 may move it back to 2009. Right now it's scheduled 2010, we
23 still have to go on with this because we have to do a decision
24 document and then we have to do design and all that takes a
25 little time too. So the best would be summer 2009, the worse

0020

1 2010.

2 MR. L. IVANOFF: And the only reason I'm asking
3 that is because of the corporation is waiting for that land to
4 get transferred over back to the corporation and then BLM is
5 waiting for you guy's report to get to them before they can
6 transfer the land once it get all cleaned up so --

7 MR. PFLUM: Which land are you talking about,
8 the.....

9 MR. L. IVANOFF: All the -- both the airport
10 site and White Alice.

11 MR. PFLUM: The main site?

12 MR. L. IVANOFF: Uh-huh (affirmative).

13 MR. DEGNAN: My name is Charles Degnan, I've
14 lived here all my life. The concern I have is the drainage
15 system of the -- our rivers, we have the south facing
16 elevations which run into the Unalakleet River and the north
17 facing slopes run into a little north of here that moves into
18 the Unalakleet River also. So, you know, those -- if there's
19 contamination at those areas and if it's left it will
20 eventually migrate to the river because of the spring break up
21 and annual rains. So it may take awhile for it to migrate into
22 the river, but it's still a concern to the -- to me who live --
23 you know, and my family who live here. And it's a concern to
24 all of our people, so it's best for us if the contaminations
25 are removed from the areas. Thank you.

0021

1 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm Dave Cunningham, I've only
2 been here about 30 years. One thing I would suggest you use as
3 a factor of when you clean it up is the bridge that some of you
4 may be familiar with that is really on it's last leg. It could
5 go out any break up and if it were to go out, the cost of the
6 clean up would sky rocket, so I think if there is a way to move
7 it up on the list it -- it could end up save a whole bunch of
8 money if you don't have to do a real expensive rig repair or
9 replacement.

10 MR. DEGNAN: It might be helpful if repair the
11 bridge for that.

12 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, yeah. But it's -- it's
13 eroding at the.....

14 MR. PFLUM: We were out there today.

15 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Then you're probably familiar
16 with it and every break up I cross my fingers, but one of these
17 years it's going to go and -- and you know, 2010 is only two
18 years away but if you can move it 2009 it may be in your best
19 interest for cost efficiency.

20 MR. PFLUM: Well, it's not a FUD's issue, it's
21 not covered under the FUD's program, at least the bridges.

22 MS. DEGNAN: You could get helicopters to fly
23 in too.

24 MR. PFLUM: It's actually more the Air Force
25 site then us. North River Bridge, right?

0022

1 MR. FICKLE: And our site we probably -- we're
2 probably a phase behind the Army. The Army is doing a proposed
3 plan, we just got wo- -- we just finished with our
4 investigation. So we'll have to do the same feasibility study
5 they just did, come up with recommendations of removal so we're
6 probably looking at 2010 for our remedial activities. People
7 are aware of the bridge issue, it's a different section, not to
8 pass the buck here, but we have an engineering section that
9 takes care of infrastructure and they're aware of the condition
10 of the bridge and their concerns are your's as well of what
11 happens if that bridge goes. So it's not that they have any

12 money earmarked for it, but they're aware of it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's easier to remove
14 things by bombing, right?

15 MR. DEGNAN: The other portion of that is the
16 road, you know, it's going to be removing some soil. The road
17 is getting worse every year and you know there definitely needs
18 to be some improvement from the bridge going up to the White
19 Alice Site, it's really bad. It's going to be awfully hard on
20 equipment and anything else that might be operating. And you
21 did say that the target date to clean up the White Alice Site
22 will be 2010 also?

23 MR. FICKLE: I believe so yeah, again based on
24 funding an how quickly we move on to the other phases that we
25 need to do. Again, the Army is about a phase and a half ahead

0023

1 of us.

2 MR. L. IVANOFF: One more thing since they
3 mention the bridge. Above the bridge there, I don't know if
4 they told you guys there's a bunch of trucks that were dumped
5 there to try to make a wall right there to help the water go
6 that way.

7 MS. DEGNAN: Along time ago.

8 MR. L. IVANOFF: I don't know if there's
9 anymore trucks buried there or not.

10 MR. FICKLE: I was under the impression that
11 when our in-house crew, the 611th crew was out here doing the
12 big PCB removal probably in 2004, 2005 I think they finished
13 up, on the way out they did remove some vehicles and cleaned up
14 the area right by the bridge abutments. I have photos showing
15 it was pretty -- pretty well taken care of, I don't know if new
16 vehicles have been put there since then or not.

17 MR. DEGNAN: No, there's no other vehicles put
18 in there. It was an Air Force project I believe, machinery.

19 MR. FICKLE: Like I said, on the way out they
20 took some things with them. Any comments from the State?

21 MS. DeRUYTER: I don't think so, I left contact
22 information with Teri so if anybody wants to get in touch with
23 us. And I have a couple questions of Dave before you leave if
24 you could hang out I had heard that you were involved in some
25 well drilling and I just have questions about how that happened

0024

1 and where some of the local drinking water wells on the hill
2 are, if you have a minute.

3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah, do you want to do it
4 publicly or after the meeting?

5 MS. DeRUYTER: No, it's just -- just curiosity
6 more than anything. Just trying to get some information from
7 you.

8 MR. DEGNAN: I might be able to expand a little
9 bit on that. We were involved with ACAT as you know was doing
10 things, drilling and testing in the area and they tested every
11 well that was up on the hillside for any contaminates and.....

12 MS. DeRUYTER: When was that?

13 MR. DEGNAN: It was about two years ago I
14 believe.

15 MR. CUNNINGHAM: When they -- the wells that
16 ANTAC put in?

17 MR. DEGNAN: Right.
18 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Those wells?
19 MR. DEGNAN: Right.
20 MR. CUNNINGHAM: They were tested, but only for
21 -- I think it's called fecal chloroform.
22 MS. DeRUYTER: That's pretty typical.
23 MR. DEGNAN: They were tested by ANTAC for that
24 kind of stuff but ACAT, A-C-A-T, an agency that was just formed
25 for national health research and -- and public clean up came
0025
1 back with a crew from Saint Lawrence University and conducted
2 testing in all the wells that were dug up by ANTHC and found no
3 contamination at that point. As far as the other heavy metal
4 stuff that they were looking for.
5 MR. CUNNINGHAM: And you say they didn't find
6 contaminates?
7 MR. DEGNAN: They didn't find any meaningful
8 amounts. I might be able to get some of that data for you.
9 MS. DeRUYTER: That would be great, I'd really
10 like to see what they tested for and what they found or didn't
11 find even would be helpful to know. And maybe where those
12 wells are?
13 MR. DEGNAN: Yes, we could do that.
14 MR. CRAVEN: Since we're talking about it, I
15 didn't know that ANTHC put in wells that aren't on the public
16 water supply. Is that the case?
17 (Indiscernible)
18 MR. CRAVEN: How many are there roughly, do you
19 know?
20 MR. DEGNAN: I don't know why 13 comes to mind
21 but that seems too high.
22 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Probably about 7 or 8.
23 MR. DEGNAN: And there's two new houses going
24 up.
25 MS. DeRUYTER: And when the land transfer
0026
1 happens will more houses be moving up on the hill do you think?
2 MR. L. IVANOFF: Most likely. Since we have
3 the woman from the State, can you send the Unalakleet Native
4 Corporation the level -- the State's level on contamination to
5 clean and what's not -- Because they're saying in their report
6 here, they're saying below the State's.....
7 MS. DeRUYTER: Clean up levels? Yeah, and our
8 clean up levels are not as straight forward as they might be.
9 But I can send you information and that might start a
10 discussion, so if you have questions.
11 (Indiscernible)
12 MS. DeRUYTER: But, yeah, I can do that and
13 compare them to the levels at the sites.
14 MR. CRAVEN: It gets really confusing because
15 in many ways the federal government doesn't have a lot of the
16 standards the State has, we have our own petroleum tests.
17 These acronyms you hear like DR and RO are State specific to
18 Alaska, tests that we implemented to test for fuels. You know
19 the feds don't have their own direct equivalent and things like
20 water quality standards for like protection of fish the State
21 has one of the most restrictive levels for that.

22 MR. L. IVANOFF: So cleaner water is what
23 you're saying?
24 MR. CRAVEN: Right.
25 MS. DeRUYTER: Yep.
0027
1 MR. CRAVEN: Thank you.
2 MS. DeRUYTER: Mr. Ivanoff, I didn't get your
3 first name.
4 MR. L. IVANOFF: Larry.
5 MS. DeRUYTER: Larry, okay. Thank you.
6 MR. FICKLE: All right, that's everything. I
7 guess we'll adjourn this public meeting and the RAB. We've
8 always had a different -- a difficult time scheduling meetings
9 so I won't try to do a schedule at this time, I'll just start
10 e-mailing Terry as we move forward. Probably in -- we'll have
11 to -- when we get to the next stage, maybe when Ron gets his
12 RODs (ph) together and we have a feasibility study it will be
13 another appropriate time to have a meeting, so we'll start e-
14 mailing about that. Thanks everyone for coming.

15 (Off record)

16 * * * END OF PROCEEDINGS * * *

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0028

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
4) ss.
5 STATE OF ALASKA)

6 I, Sharon Wilcox, Notary Public in and for the State of
7 Alaska and Reporter with Metro Court Reporting, do hereby
8 certify:

9 THAT the foregoing pages 2 through 27 are a true,
10 accurate and complete transcription of audio tapes of a Public
11 Comment Meeting that was held in Unalakleet, Alaska on the 7th
12 day of July, 2008, that was recorded by Barbara Dilling of
13 Metro Court Reporting and was transcribed by Barbara Dilling to
14 the best of her knowledge and ability;

15 THAT I am not a relative, employee or attorney of any
16 of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
affixed my seal this 24th day of July, 2008.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Sharon Wilcox
Notary Public in and for Alaska

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

My Commission Expires 9/27/2011