DESERET CHEMICAL DEPOT
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 15, 2005

ATTENDEES

RAB Members in Attendance
Walton Levi – Installation Co-Chair
Cherry Wong – Women Concerned/Utahans United
Harry Shinton – Tooele County LEPC
Colleen Johnson – Tooele County Commissioner
Brad Lauchnor – UDEQ DSHW

Deseret Chemical Depot / Outreach Office
COL Van Pelt – DCD Commander
Nam Doan – DCD Environmental Office
Alaine Southworth – DCD Public Information Office
Kathy Ryan – DCD Closure Officer

US Army Corps of Engineers / RAB Support
Brad Wright – AEC ROM
Paul Zianno – USACE Project Manager
Vicky Henderson – USACE/ISS
Paul Hubickey - Parsons
Michelle Bezverkov – Parsons
David Shank – Kleinfelder
Jen Grippa - Kleinfelder
Gene Barber – Tech Law, Inc.
Mary Franquemont – Tech Law
April Fontaine - USACE
Young Chong – USACE

Other Attendees
Angela VanDam – Outreach Office
Stew Paulick – Sci Tech Services
Louis Stout – Shaw Environmental
Tom Turner – TEAD
Robert Karlik – EG&G
Dean Chamerlin – TEAD
Joy Chamberlin – DCD
Jill Thomas – URS
Wendy Lessig – SAIC-TOCDF
Sandra Lunceford – Tech Law
Marx Hintze – EG&G
Kris Snow – SAIC
Mark Hutson – Weston Solutions, Inc.

RAB Members Not Present
Gerald Gordon – Utah Wildlife Federation
Steve Lyman – Tooele Community
Howard Murray – Grantsville Community

1. **Introduction/Business** - The Deseret Chemical Depot (DCD) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on Tuesday, November 15, 2005, at 5:30 p.m., in the Tooele Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office, 54 South Main Street, Tooele, Utah.

   This meeting is generally held every four months, on the second Tuesday evening. Its purpose is to involve and inform members of the local community and interested parties about the environmental restoration activities underway and planned at Deseret Chemical Depot. Community members who attend RAB meetings have access to representatives of the regulatory agencies involved in the environmental cleanup, including US EPA and the State of Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ), as well as members of DCD's Environmental Office, Tooele County, and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The meetings are open to the public, and everyone is welcome to attend.

A. Welcoming Remarks –Installation Co-Chair Walton Levi, welcomed participants and attendees, and invited everyone to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the agenda, **included as Attachment 1,** and conducted the business of the meeting.

Presentations – Briefing slides are available for each presentation. The agenda is attached.

2. SWMU and Groundwater Project Status - Overview
Paul Zianno, USACE Project Manager

SWMU 3 (Impounding Bay Disposal Pit) – The selected remedy for SWMU 3 was to remove the debris from the open portion of the trench, included pallets and drums that potentially contained agent at one point. The plan to backfill the trench and install a soil cover is on hold pending a geophysical survey to determine contents of the covered portion of the trench, scheduled for December/January 2006, weather permitting. The results of the survey will determine locations of angle borings to sample for potential volatile organic compounds (VOC) and agent breakdown products (ABP).

Q. Cherry Wong – How do you do the geophysical survey?
A. Paul Zianno – Parsons will run a magnetometer unit that rolls along the ground. We'll bring pictures to the next RAB.
Q. Harry Shinton – What if there are chemicals that can't be picked up by the magnetometer?
A. Paul Zianno – The geophysical survey is designed to give us a good idea of the dimensions of the trench itself. With the angle borings, we'll sample underneath the trench from the side; we're actually not going to penetrate it.
Q. Stew Paulick – Do you sample for chemical agent when you're doing that?
A. Paul Zianno – Yes.

SWMUs 1 & 25 (Demil/Disposal Pits) – A hydropunch groundwater study was conducted in April 2005 near well S-99-92 that had results high in carbon tetrachloride concentrations, thus identifying a small plume. The groundwater velocity in that area moves less than one foot per year. The proposed remedy to the State of Utah for this site is natural attenuation.

Parsons completed the Phase 3 Off-Post survey for Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) in Summer 2005. A burster tube was found near the boundary of the Phase 2 study, so the study area was extended an additional 200 feet for Phase 3.

The on-depot survey at SWMU 1 was discontinued when a glass vial was found at the site. These vials were generally used to contain agent for military testing purposes. Before work can continue at the site, a chemical safety submittal must be prepared and approved. Future actions may include a soil gas survey in Summer 2006.

The annual groundwater monitoring event was conducted in September, with the report due in December 2005. The next step is to award the 2006 contract in March for the September 2006 sampling event.

The Site Inspection (SI) of six sites is complete for the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP). The final meeting with DCD and UDEQ was held on October 18, 2005.

3. 2005 Groundwater Sampling and Oversight
David Shank and Jen Grippa, Kleinfelder

Mr. Shank presented maps with geologic features, groundwater and hydrogeologic contours. Ms. Grippa discussed the 2005 groundwater results from the September 2005 sampling. As part of the program, groundwater elevation was measured in 113 wells, 16 wells were sampled at 9 SWMUs, and the preliminary results were drafted into a monitoring report. She added that all data are preliminary and have not yet been validated by a third party laboratory. Following validation, a final report will be prepared. There were no significant changes in groundwater elevations from the 2004 event.

Q. Harry Shinton – What effect does the Mercur outwash have on groundwater, if any?
A. Paul Zianno – We haven't seen effects in the groundwater yet. We have seen higher levels in the soil, but we haven't seen anything in the groundwater. Especially on the southeast end of the property near SWMU 1.
Q. Harry Shinton – Is it possible we will see contamination in groundwater?
A. Paul Zianno – Probably not.

4. SWMU 25 and Off-Site MEC Removal Action
Paul Hubickey, Parsons

The visual Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) surveys were conducted to check roadways to existing monitoring wells at SWMUs 1 and 25, and look for anomalies on designated off-depot properties. During Phase 2 at SWMUs 1 and 25, two MEC items were found, staked, and reported. The work was supported by the US Army 62nd Ordnance Detachment (EOD) and Directorate of Ammunition Surveillance and Inventory from DCD. Mr. Hubickey showed maps of the survey areas and locations where items were found.

At SWMU 1, when a liquid-filled Pyrex (CAIS) ampule was found, the survey was halted. These ampules were used in training and contained chemical agent or simulant. Approximately 10,465 feet of pathway was cleared prior to the work stopping.

5. Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Status
Gene Barber, TechLaw

Mr. Barber discussed the MMRP program and site investigation (SI) activities completed at DCD. In 2001, when Congress determined that there was a potential hazard nationwide relating to the use, training, and development of military munitions and weapons systems used on ranges, the MMRP program began. An inventory of former and current military sites that had known or suspected unexploded ordnance (UXO), discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents (MC) released prior to September 30, 2002, was performed. At DCD, six MMRP eligible sites were identified for further investigation under the MMRP.

One of the MMRP's primary goals is to have stakeholder involvement throughout the process. Stakeholders were identified, met and helped develop the work plans for fieldwork. The final SI report is anticipated for December 9, 2005.

The SI activities conducted in July 2005 included, to varying degrees, visual surveys, geophysical surveys and soil sampling. The purpose of the visual survey was to identify potential surface MEC, munitions-related materials, and evidence of military activity. Soil samples were analyzed for metals and explosives to determine the potential for MEC contamination near the surface. Samples focused on "worst-case situation" locations where ordnance and scrap were identified, and known areas of interest such as berms and target areas.

During visual surveys, three rifle grenades were found and exploded in place by the EOD unit from Tooele Army Depot, a few munitions-related items, mortar rounds and bomb fragments were identified.

Q. Brad Wright – Did you say you don't see a need for additional sampling at the off-depot sites?
A. Gene Barber – Yes, based on our samples, everything was below EPA's Preliminary Remediation Goals. We focused on those areas were MEC items were located, so we don't see any need for additional sampling.

6. Status of DCD and TOCDF Closure Activities
Kathy Ryan, DCD Transition/Closure Officer
Bob Karlik, EG&G

Ms. Ryan presented an update of the DCD closure activities. After DCD was posted on the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) list, the BRAC Commission realized that DCD did not fit into the timeframe for BRAC. Treaty requirements stated the stockpile had to be destroyed before the Depot could be closed and within the next six years, which did not fit the BRAC timeline. DCD fits into a selection criterion for a structured plan that stated if the Depot closed after its mission was complete and a feasibility study was performed, then DCD can stay on the BRAC list. If it is found that it can be converted after the feasibility study is complete, it may be realigned to conventional use. If it is not feasible, then the Depot would be closed and the storage igloos given to Tooele Army Depot. That recommendation was approved, and passed into law in November 2005. Tooele Army Depot's alternate proposal to use the entire installation is being considered up through the appropriate chains of command.

DCD is contracting for assistance to establish a planning guide consistent with DCD and CAMDS missions, prepare cost estimates, and prepare documentation required to close the installation. A planning guide for CAMDS operations and milestones for closure will also be prepared. The CAMDS will be shut down by FY08.

Q. Harry Shinton – During your presentation you talked about the possibility of waste shipments; my question is, what type of wastes, what hazards may be incurred, and will notification be provided to local responders?

A. Walt Levi – It's typically the waste we have been storing, from the pumps to suits to whatever we have been generating over the years.
Q. Harry Shinton – It won't be any different than what's going down the street every day?
A. Walt Levi – Yes. If we do come up with some program and decide to ship it off-site, of course we would do transportation plans, community outreach and all that up front.
Q. Harry Shinton – There was a shipment problem with you shipping your waste because of a big truck making the turn at 100 North. Traffic was an issue. We worked out a deal with Tooele Army Depot where they would go through the Depot, come back out, and bypass Tooele. They said that worked great for them. But all that was stopped at some point and nobody told us that was stopped. We have deal with the traffic issues, and you don't. What I'm asking is, if it develops, we would like you to ship at times other than during busy traffic time so we don't have that issue. It's just a cooperative agreement that you keep the big trucks out of town while it's busy. I don't think I'm asking too much. If it becomes an issue, I'll stop them all at the south part of town until traffic is over.
A. Kathy Ryan – I'm glad you brought that up because that could be something we write into our plans.
Q. Cherry Wong – What are the possible sites to which you would ship?
A. Kathy Ryan – Right now it's really not known. There is a company in Texas that some of the other plants are shipping to from the East Coast. We are looking at that plant and local plants. We don't know what the capabilities are right now. We have been tasked to explore all the possibilities; for example, if we want to keep it in our own state to generate the revenue, if we want to ship it to Texas. We are just touching the tip of the iceberg, since it's a new requirement. We don't have a lot of answers for you right now. We'll be glad to bring them to you in the future.

TOCDF Closure Activities - *Bob Karlik, EG&G*

Mr. Karlik presented the strategy for closing TOCDF. He explained that JACADS (Johnson Island) is nearing completion of closure, and lessons learned from that installation will be applied to TOCDF. There are four sites around the country like TOCDF that are all closing down at the same time, and similar resources between the sites will be shared. The main goal is to get the facility closed in as safe and environmentally sound way as possible. URS is assisting with the environmental aspects of closure. The Human Health Risk Assessment and the Ecological Risk Assessments may be absorbed into the main Risk Assessment for the site.

Q. Cherry Wong – If you scabble the cement, what do you do with that kind of waste?
A. Bob Karlik – You can sample it, and it could go into a landfill depending on how the results come back, or it could be treated through a furnace facility. You would treat it just like any other waste coming out of the plant.
Q. Stew Paulick – Do you have a time estimate for how long this will take after the chemical processing stops?
A. Bob Karlik – At Johnston Island, the closure execution took about 33 months. There were some things they did there that we hope not to repeat, like the way they treated carbon. Probably within the 24-33 month time frame is what we anticipate for closure execution. When we get further into our planning phase we'll have a better estimate of schedule and cost.

Q. Harry Shinton – The commitment was made before we started the RAB that if the Army contaminated something, they would clean it up before they were done. With all of the projects still remaining to be completed, will there be enough time to get them completed before the Depot is transferred. With the change of commands, assuming that happens, you're talking different funding sources. Can we as a community feel secure that: 1) the Army is going to clean it up; and 2) if they're not done, will TEAD commit to cleaning everything else up?

A. Kathy Ryan – In order to close out our RCRA permits, we will be going forward with it. It will be a combined closure program with the TOCDF installation. So, yes, we will clean up to the point that we need to with RCRA. To answer your question, we will clean it up. I don't know what was promised at the beginning, but it will be to a clean closure for both DCD and the Plant.

Q. Harry Shinton – But does Tooele assume the responsibility to clean it up if they take over?

A. Walt Levi – Yes, they are still the Army.

A. Bob Karlik – Another thing we need to decide on is the end state of the facility. For example, at Johnston Island they agreed to clean it up to a residential standard versus an industrial standard.

A. Kathy Ryan – We're cleaning it up to an industrial standard, not residential standards.

Q. Brad Wright – Are there any plans for possible reuse? Have you been funded to do any feasibility studies?

A. Kathy Ryan – That's what we're talking about as far as the BRAC closure and that feasibility study has to be conducted to find out if it can be converted to a conventional end.

Q. Brad Wright – Who is going to conduct the study?

A. Kathy Ryan – We don't know who will do it yet. It has been ordered by the BRAC commission. We are waiting to find out who BRAC is going to nominate.

7. RAB Items

Review and approval of July 2005 Meeting Minutes: Cherry Wong asked that the word "mythologies" in the third line on the second to last page of the minutes be changed to "methodologies." With that change, Cherry Wong moved to accept the minutes, Harry Shinton seconded.

If members would like a copy of the finalized RAB rules (finalized on Oct 21, 2005), they should contact Vicky Henderson and let her know if they would like it on CD or a paper copy.

Michelle Bezverkov adds: I will be sorry not to work with this RAB and will miss you all. It has been an enjoyable experience with a great group of people. I wish you all the best of luck.

5. Next Meeting Date – March 14, 2006 at the DCD Outreach Center

Attachment 1

AGENDA
Deseret Chemical Depot
Restoration Advisory Board

Tooele Chemical Stockpile Outreach Office **Tuesday, November 15, 2005**
54 South Main Street, Tooele, Utah **5:30 PM**

1. **Welcome and Introductions** 5:30-5:40
   Walton Levi, DCD RAB Co-Chair

2. **SWMU and Groundwater Project Status Update** 5:40-6:00
   Paul Zianno, US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento

3. **2005 Groundwater Sampling and Oversight** 6:00-6:15
   David Shank, Kleinfelder

4. **Project Update: SWMU 25 and Off-site MEC Removal Action** 6:15-6:30
   Paul Hubickey, Parsons

5. **Military Munitions Response Program Status** 6:30-6:45
   Gene Barber, TechLaw

6. **Status of DCD and TOCDF Closure Activities** 6:45-7:05
   Kathy Ryan, DCD Transition/Closure Officer
   Bob Karlik, EG&G

7. **Questions, Meeting Business, Discussion** 7:05-7:20
   Old Business: **(1)** Accept Meeting Minutes (July)
   New Business: **(2)** BRAC Status

8. **Agenda Items for Next Meeting**
   Proposed Next Meeting Date – 14 March 2006