

Kirtland Federal Complex Future Use Options  
**LOGISTICS & SUPPORT WORKING GROUP**

*Ro-Kern*

*Steve P*

ENTERED



*Return to RKR*



**MEETING MINUTES  
LOGISTICS AND SUPPORT WORKING GROUP PLANNING MEETING  
FUTURE USE OPTIONS**

**DATE:** October 31, 1994

**LOCATION:** BDM Building, Conference Room #469

**ATTENDEES:**

- Deborah Garcia,  
Kirtland Area Office, U.S. Department of Energy
- Linda Campbell,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7312
- Camille Reyes,  
Sandia National Labs
- Floyd A. Thompson, III,  
U.S. Forest Service, Cibola
- Chris Tuttle,  
377 ABW/EMN
- Ed Tooley,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7255
- Cliff Richardson,  
377SPTG/CECA
- Charlie Thomas,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7255
- Ted Wolff,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7258
- Dorothy Stermer,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7584
- Beth Sellers,  
Department of Energy/ERPO
- Warren Cox,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7581 (ER Project)
- Barbara Doremus,  
Sandia National Labs, Dept. 7581
- Al Stotts,  
Sandia National Labs Media Relations

*SS*





Herb Bohannon, Jr.  
Keystone  
Karen Talbot Rohde,  
Keystone

## NOTES

The meeting of October 31, 1994 was opened with a summary by Deborah Garcia of a meeting with the Environmental Restoration (ER) group to discuss the proposed study sectors, levels of clean-up, and descriptive map overlays that had been discussed in the last meeting of the Future Use Support Working Group.

1. The basic sector areas were agreed upon by ER, with the exception of possible "residential" level buffer areas. Three basic levels of clean-up were designated, including "residential", "recreational", and "industrial". All of the USFS Withdrawal area, which has been designated as one study sector would, for instance, fall within the "recreational" level. Debbie Garcia indicated that citizen groups have said that they would like a buffer zone with clean-up to "residential" level; however, this may be a point of discussion in the future use planning process.
2. Warren Cox asked about the approach to different land use areas (such as archaeological sites). It was noted that site assessments will be done for future projects on a project-by-project basis. Zoning levels for different building types will be a spin-off of the future use project, but not related to the terms for clean-up levels.
3. Chris Tuttle opened a discussion about the buffer zone. It was noted that there are areas where it would make sense, and others where it would not. The question arose as to whether the buffer would be on the Federal lands, or outside the Federal boundaries, and it was acknowledged that there is no certainty that all contamination is inside the boundaries of KAFB. There was general agreement in the group that the question of buffer zones must be explored through risk analysis, as part of the Future Use process.
4. Warren Cox, in explaining the ER process, noted that investigations are made of all sites known or suspected to be contaminated; however, they don't look for new sites.
5. It was confirmed that the Air Force is participating in the process; they are including their ER site information in the mapping that is being prepared for presentation. All questions that arise relative to the Air Force will be referred.
6. Warren Cox noted that we should try to recognize potential questions before the Quarterly Public Meeting on Environmental Restoration Activities, which will occur on November 16, 1994. It was noted that it is one thing to clean-up to a "residential" level, but



we must be careful not to suggest that it will become residential, in the zoning sense of the word. Chris Tuttle suggested that maybe we should not use terminology, but some other designation for clean-up levels, in order to distinguish between clean-up and zoning.

7. In reference to the UXO shown on the map, Floyd questioned the triangle shown extending beyond the withdrawal area, noting that if it is shown, the whole "fan" should be acknowledged. It was agreed that either the whole "fan" should be shown, or nothing beyond the boundaries of the KAFB. The point was made that since the area was released in 1980, to now show it as a potentially contaminated area could cause potential legal problems. When the 2400 acres was released by the Air Force, it had only been cleaned-up to requirements and the technology of the time. At the time, UXO was not a major consideration. Debbie Garcia asked if the map has been released. Warren said that release of the map would have been approved by him, and he has made no such approval.

8. Chris Tuttle noted that UXO are not a Future Use issue, and clean-up can not be funded as ER clean-up. The issue of UXO must be handled by the Air Force.

9. Warren Cox was asked if the ER group has already completed most of the work of the Integrated Resource Plan, Step 1, Item (2), which prioritizes management areas (sectors) for study, as part of the Permit Process with the EPA. He answered in the affirmative, and added that Item (f), which involves areas with rare or sensitive components, will be approached through the NEPA process. ER will also provide information for Items 3(a) and 3(c), which involve geologic descriptions of each area, and climate.

10. Discussion continued about the approach in terms of describing the future use of certain areas (for example, the withdrawal area) relative to the prescribed clean-up levels. Specifically, what is the probability of the return of the withdrawal area to recreational use? Debbie Garcia stated that the DOE is taking the risk of identifying clean-up levels as deemed necessary at this time. Some potential will always exist for having to return to an area for further clean-up. Hopefully, the current zoning/clean-up level (Future Use) process will address some of the issues, but it is inevitable that things will change.

11. Floyd Thompson commented that the duality must break down between the DOE, DOD, and SNL. Ed Tooley said that the Air Force is going ahead to try to get the okay to be participants in the SSAB. Beth Sellers asked if there was a timeline for a decision about their participation, but Ed did not know when it might be decided.

12. Discussion returned to the question of UXO. It was noted that since we are not addressing other residual contaminants, maybe we should not be including the UXO as an overlay map for discussion of Future Use. It was suggested that if stakeholders have questions about UXO or other residual contaminants, we will make the map available to help answer



questions.

13. Beth Sellers asked if it is possible for comparable dollar costs for different clean-up levels to be developed, to be used as a tool in the planning process. Warren explained that since every site and each contaminant has such different characteristics, that it would be extremely difficult to develop a reliable approach to relative cost estimates for different clean-up levels.

14. Cliff Richardson asked if there is any intent to release any of the DOE withdrawn area. Beth responded that although that was indicated earlier, it is no longer intended. Debbie Garcia added that DOE Albuquerque had never identified any specific lands to be returned. As always, the mission is the first priority.

15. Warren Cox introduced Bob Milton, to help clarify the EPA definitions of clean-up levels. Bob indicated that the EPA has not achieved specific parameters for different clean-up levels. At this time, levels are negotiated. However, the EPA has no ability to guarantee that sites will always have the same land use or that jurisdictions have to maintain the same use-zones.

16. Beth Sellers asked why it is necessary to present the Future Use information to the Quarterly Public Meeting on November 16. Warren responded that it is all connected to the Voluntary Corrective Measures process. It is important to come to a resolution about the different clean-up levels. Beth then requested that maps to be used for the presentation at the Quarterly Meeting should be completed by Monday, November 7, for review prior to a "dry-run" of the presentation.

17. Al Stotts presented an update of the Citizens' Advisory Board Planning Task Force meeting, to be held on November 2, (Wednesday) from 7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. in the Cochiti Room of the Albuquerque Convention Center. It will be the last public meeting before the nomination period for the SSAB closes, on November 16, 1994. Following the nomination period, the nominating committee will review the nominees and name a slate of prospective members of the SSAB to be presented to DOE Headquarters for review. If Headquarters feels that the slate offered is not widely representative, it may be rejected. However, Al is optimistic that some of the people who have indicated that they will accept a nomination would be valuable stakeholder representatives.

At the meeting of November 2, the Draft Operating Agreement (formerly Mission Statement) will be presented. Al stated that there are still some problems with the Agreement in regards to compensation for SSAB Members, and the definition of "conflicts of interest". However, the Draft Operating Agreement is not binding or compulsory for the new board, and revisions can be made after the SSAB is established.



Representation by the Department of Energy and Sandia National Labs at the meeting is expected to include Al Narath, Jim Tagnalia, Lynn Jones, Tom Blevas, Bruce Twining, Jim Culpepper, Ted Eliopolis (EM-5) and Vic Reese (Deputy for Defense Programs).

**18. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 21, 1994, at 1:00, in the Keystone Conference Room.**

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding these meeting minutes.

Thanks for your participation!

Karen Talbot Rohde  
Keystone Environmental & Planning, Inc.

Attachments: Planning Meeting 12 Agenda, November 21, 1994  
Future Use Options Team Integrated Resource Management Action Steps

Attendees, Distribution List, File