DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
Headquarters 377th Air Base Wing (AFMC)

3 May 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS, BERNALILLO COUNTY/KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

FROM: 377 ABW/EMR
2000 Wyoming Blvd SE
Kirtland AFB NM 87117-5659

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Bernalillo County/Kirtland Air Force Base Environmental Working Group (EWG)

1. PLACE: Loma Linda Community Center, 1700 Yale SE, Albuquerque, NM

2. TIME/DATE: 1830, 23 February 1995

3. CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Nancy Morlock, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6

4. ATTENDANCE: See Attachment 1

5. INTRODUCTION/APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER MINUTES: Ms. Morlock called the meeting to order at 1830 and asked attendees to introduce themselves. The 17 November 1994 EWG minutes were mailed to members and available at the meeting. The November minutes were approved as written.

6. STATUS OF RELATIVE RISK EVALUATION:

a. The Air Force conducted classroom training for the community volunteers on 12 January 1995 and a base tour to see the sites on 31 January 1995. The community members said they would hold a separate meeting prior to the next one with the Air Force on 15 March 1995, when final rankings would be decided. Mr. Jerry Sillerud, Restoration Branch, will prepare and mail out to the team members additional worksheets for some new sites. A news release and photo about this joint AF-community effort were distributed to local media outlets and two Air Force newspapers. Copies of the Kirtland *FOCUS* article (Atch 2) were passed out at the meeting.

NOTE: The citizens held their separate meeting. Then, on 15 March 1995 the community volunteers, New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), and KAFB

Restoration Branch officials met to finalize the site rankings. As a result of citizen input, the rankings for seven sites were changed to high relative risk. These are sites containing radioactive materials needing more investigation and landfills. A news release describing the Relative Risk Evaluation Study and results is at Atch 3. Kirtland AFB submitted the new site ranking worksheets to higher headquarters; a list is at Atch 4.

b. Lt Col Scott Streifert, Environmental Management Director, said that the relative risk rankings are used in the Air Force budgeting process. The base wants to make sure cleanup dollars are channeled to the worst sites first; this is why community input is so valuable early in the cleanup process. He also stated the Air Force had cut Kirtland's cleanup budget this year, and more cuts are likely in the future.

7. STATUS OF INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM (IRP) ACTIVITIES: Mr. Sillerud stated that in December 1994 the base submitted two Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Facility Investigation reports, Stages 2D-1 and 2B, to the EPA, NMED, and citizen groups for comment. The Stage 2D-1 sites consist of a radioactive burial site (animal carcasses) near the Riding Club/Stables and a burial trench at Manzano. The Stage 2B sites are mainly oil/water separators and holding tanks.

NOTE: EPA is still reviewing these reports.

8. STATUS OF STAGES 2B AND 2C INVESTIGATIONS: Mr. Charles Remkes, Brown & Root Environmental, described work performed by his company at Kirtland. The field work for the Stage 2C waste-line investigation is proceeding as scheduled.

9. PRESENTATION ABOUT FOSTER WHEELER: Mr. Dan Mantooth described his company, Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. The company began doing environmental investigations for the Air Force at Kirtland last summer under a contracting arrangement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers called the Total Environmental Restoration Contract (TERC). Mr. Mantooth reported they have completed the investigation at the radiation training sites and radium dump/slag heaps.

10. DEVELOPMENT OF AIR FORCE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN:

a. Lt Col Streifert emphasized the complexity of land use at Kirtland. The base includes Air Force-owned land, Department of Energy (DOE)-owned and leased land, and the U.S. Forest Service withdrawn land used by the Air Force and DOE.

b. He stated that Kirtland's Base Comprehensive Plan is a five-year outlook which classifies land use. This plan should serve as a Future Land Use Plan. The Air Force follows the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), which requires the Air Force

to consider environmental factors when developing Air Force land or considering future land use. Whenever any organization on Kirtland proposes to change land use, the Environmental Management Division evaluates the proposal under NEPA. It requires a public comment process whenever there could be significant environmental impact resulting from a proposed government action.

c. Lt Col Streifert said that the Air Force is a member of DOE's Future Land Use Working Group.

d. There was a brief discussion about whether the Air Force would put deed restrictions on contaminated sites. Lt Col Streifert said that any such decisions would be made by the base's real estate staff (Civil Engineers), and there would have to be full disclosure about the environmental condition of property if land were to change hands. Full disclosure of environmental conditions is required in real estate transactions. Mr. Steve Pullen, NMED, said the state would probably require deed restrictions.

e. Lt Col Streifert said that predicting future land use l0 years from now is very difficult; he doesn't have much confidence in such predictions beyond five years into the future.

f. Mr. Pullen said the state will accept current land use when considering future land use, as long as there is a mechanism in place to properly evaluate any change in land use at Kirtland. Mr. Pullen would like to see the Base Comprehensive Plan maps at the next meeting, with overlays depicting AF future use plans and environmental restoration sites.

g. Ms. Garland Harris (Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping) suggested the Air Force make small-scale maps for handout at the next meeting. Lt Col Streifert agreed.

h. Ms. Ann Newsted (The East Manzano Alliance) proposed a topic for the next EWG meeting--a discussion about returning the withdrawn land to the U.S. Forest Service for public access.

i. Mr. Pullen would like an Air Force presentation at the next meeting about the environmental baseline study conducted at McCormick Ranch.

11. BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) LIST: Lt Col Streifert said Kirtland officials won't know for sure if the base will be realigned until later in the BRAC process. The Department of Defense (DOD) makes its formal announcement on 1 March, and the base won't know what the future holds until later this year when the President and Congress make decisions.

12. DOD POLICY LETTER ON ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT:

a. Ms. Newsted proposed a discussion about a DOD policy letter on ecosystem management, signed 8 August 1994 by Ms. Sherri Goodman, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security (Atch 5). Ms. Newsted stated she believes this letter forms a basis for merging the citizens advisory boards for DOE and DOD at Kirtland. Lt Col Streifert stated the letter doesn't mention merging DOE and DOD lands. He stated the ecosystem management letter doesn't conflict with the RAB guidance we received in November 1994 from that same office (not to merge the boards).

b. Lt Col Streifert added that DOD and DOE at Kirtland are discussing site-wide issues for the base, such as future land use. This is a topic of mutual interest. Mr. John Gould (DOE, Kirtland Area Office) said there is site-wide cooperation between his office and the Air Force on sharing data about restoration sites. Lt Col Streifert said there would be more future land use discussions at upcoming EWG meetings.

13. RESTORATION ISSUES OF MUTUAL INTEREST TO DOE/SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES (SNL) AND THE AIR FORCE:

a. Lt Col Streifert said that, despite some public perceptions, the Air Force and DOE/SNL are working together on environmental issues. At future EWG meetings, the Air Force will highlight where the interfaces occur. Ms. Morlock said she sees the spirit of cooperation between DOE and the Air Force at Kirtland--perhaps better than NMED does--because she oversees both entities herself.

b. Mr. Gould stated there is shared technology between the two entities regarding the RB-11 (stables) site and at Site 61D (Explosives Ordnance Range). Also, there is cooperation on DOE/SNL's site-wide hydrogeologic project and at the groundwater breakfast meetings at the International House of Pancakes restaurant.

c. Mr. Pullen questioned one restoration site interface between DOE and AF at Kirtland--the issue of cross-contamination. Mr. Gould and Ms. Sue Umshler (also from DOE) stated there is no cross-contamination of groundwater at Kirtland due to the sheer size of the base and separation of sites.

d. Mr. Stephen Lee (Restoration Branch) described two ongoing joint efforts by Sandia and the Restoration Branch. One is the preparation of a joint map listing both entities' restoration sites. The map was given to DOE's Future Land Use Study Group. The other cooperative effort is the conduct of a base-wide background study, requested by EPA Region 6. The study will establish "average" naturally occurring concentrations of metals and radionuclides in soil and groundwater on base. The background levels will help determine if a site is contaminated or not. One advantage of both organizations

working together is that data from wider areas on base provide better spatial coverage. The Air Force has generated over 100,000 records to date from Stages 2A and 2B investigations and turned them over to SNL for their database.

e. Mr. Lee mentioned another example of cooperation between SNL and the Air Force. Both are taking part in Earth Day activities at Hardin Field on base, 21 April 1995. The event, sponsored by SNL, will also have displays by Kirtland's Environmental Management Division and its contractors.

14. NEXT EWG MEETING: Kirtland will chair the next meeting. The 1 June date (originally proposed) will probably be postponed until mid-July. This postponement would allow for the 1 July BRAC decision as to whether Kirtland will remain on the proposed realignment list. Suggested items for discussion at the next EWG meeting include status of Kirtland in the BRAC process, funding possibility for RAB technical support, Air Force future land use maps with environmental restoration site overlays, interaction between DOE/SNL and Kirtland on environmental matters, baseline environmental study of McCormick Ranch, and the feasibility of converting the withdrawn land for public access.

Kari J. Paseur

KARI J. PASEUR
Recorder

CHRISTOPHER B. DeWITT, R.P.G.
Acting Chief, Restoration Branch
Environmental Management Division

Attachments:
1. Attendance List
2. FOCUS Article
3. News Release
4. List of Site Rankings
5. DUSD(ES) Ltr, 8 Aug 94

ATTENDANCE LIST

BERNALILLO COUNTY/KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP
LOMA LINDA COMMUNITY CENTER, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
23 FEBRUARY 1995

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE
Jeff Dickson	Professional Environmental Services	254-0863
John Gould	DOE, Kirtland Area Office	845-6089
Garland Harris	Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping	343-8647
Will Keener	Sandia National Laboratories	848-0038
Stephen Lee	377 ABW/EMR	846-0053
Dan Mantooth	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	986-6721
Maj David Martin	377 ABW/EM	846-2751
Tim Michael	NMED	827-4308
William P. Moats	NMED/DOE Oversight Office	845-5824
Nancy Morlock	EPA Region 6	214-665-6650
Catalina Muniz	SouthWest Organizing Project	247-8832
Ann Newsted	The East Manzano Alliance	281-9448
Stephen Pullen	NMED/HRMB	827-4308
Charles Remkes	Brown & Root Environmental	247-4933
Ellen Schumacher	NMED/DOE Oversight Office	845-5823
Jerry Sillerud	377 ABW/EMR	846-2773
Lt Col Scott E. Streifert	377 ABW/EM	846-2751
Mark S. Thacker	Brown & Root Environmental	247-4933
Ed Tooley	Sandia National Laboratories	844-5243
Sue Umshler	DOE, Kirtland Area Office	845-6671
Kevin Walter	Brown & Root Environmental	247-4933

Kirtland FOCUS

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1995 ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. VOLUME 25, NUMBER 6

CITIZENS TEAM UP WITH AIR FORCE

U.S. Air Force photo by Kari Paseur

WITH THE SHELL OF AN OLD fighter aircraft in the background, Christopher B. DeWitt (center) of the 377th Environmental Management Division describes contaminants at the base's old fire training site to the Relative Risk Evaluation Study Team. The group, composed of local community volunteers, state environmental regulators and Air Force officials, toured the base Jan. 31. By April they will complete the ranking of the relative risk of 40 contaminated sites on Kirtland. This effort will ensure cleanup dollars are channeled to the worst sites first. Base residents and workers are encouraged to learn more about the base's Installation Restoration Program at the next quarterly meeting of the Bernalillo County-Kirtland AFB Environmental Working Group Feb. 23. Call Kari Paseur, 846-0053, for details.

NEWS RELEASE

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

377TH AIR BASE WING (AFMC)

PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION, 2000 WYOMING BLVD SE, KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, N M 87117-5606 (505) 846-5991

CONTAMINATED SITES RANKED BY AIR FORCE AND CITIZENS

March 20, 1995

95-42

KIRTLAND AFB, N.M. -- A team of Air Force members, state environmental regulators, and local community volunteers met here last week to determine the relative risk of contaminated sites on Kirtland. The goal is to ensure cleanup dollars are channeled to the worst sites first for investigation and cleanup.

The group ranked the sites into three categories--low, medium, and high relative risk, ranking each site against the others using new Air Force guidelines. The base's Restoration Branch, Environmental Division, directed the effort.

Christopher DeWitt, acting branch chief, explained the importance of the project, "In this age of dwindling federal budgets, we wanted to work as partners with the local community to find out how they feel, then make sure we funnel money first to the sites that could pose the most risk." Last year, the Air Force encouraged military bases to include local community stakeholders in the relative risk evaluation process.

-MORE-

The group met three times this winter--for specialized training and a base tour in January, and then on Mar. 15 to finalize the rankings. The Air Force will now forward the relative risk ratings to higher headquarters so Air Force Materiel Command and the Pentagon will know Kirtland's priorities. Copies will also go to the New Mexico Environment Department and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in Dallas, Texas.

To rank the sites, the group considered the type, level, and location of the contaminants; the migration pathway (via subsurface water, surface soil, surface water or the wind); and whether humans or the ecology could be exposed to or affected by the contamination.

Under the Air Force's Installation Restoration Program at Kirtland, begun in 1981, the Air Force and EPA have identified 72 sites where potentially hazardous chemicals were used, stored or disposed. Forty-one of these sites require additional investigation and may require cleanup. Those are the sites that were ranked by the study group because they will need funding in FY 96 and beyond.

Twenty sites were ranked "high," 15 were ranked "medium," and 33 were ranked "low or already finished." Another four sites were not evaluated because they will be closed out this year and don't require future funding. The team put the highest priority on landfills near Tijeras Arroyo, oil/water separators that are leaking, and sites with low-level radioactive materials that need to be investigated or cleaned up.

This relative risk evaluation is for planning future cleanup budgets. All the base's IRP sites must be investigated and cleaned up eventually under very specific EPA rules. Later in the process, the base will have to perform a precise, scientific "risk assessment" under EPA guidelines for every site that is contaminated.

Kirtland's restoration program lags behind other bases in the command because most of its sites are still in the investigation stage. This was caused by budgetary shortfalls a few years ago when Kirtland was transferred from Air Mobility Command to Air Force Materiel Command.

Base and Albuquerque residents are encouraged to learn more about the cleanup program by attending the next quarterly meeting of the Bernalillo County-Kirtland AFB Environmental Working Group on June 1. Call Kari Paseur at Kirtland, 846-0053, for details.

-30-

NOTE TO EDITOR: For more info, contact Kari J. Paseur, (505) 846-0053

ACTIVE IRP SITES

IRP SITE No.	APP No.	DESCRIPTION	REL. RISK
LF-01	I	Landfill 1	High
LF-02	I	Landfill 2	High
RW-04	IV	Radioactive Holding Tank 4	High
RW-05	IV	Radioactive Holding Tank 5	High
RW-06	IV	Radioactive Burial Site 11	Medium
LF 07	I	Landfill 3	High
LF-08	I	Landfill 4, 5, & 6	High
LF-09	I	Abandoned Landfill	Low
RW-10	N/A	Radiation Training Sites 1 - 8	High
FT-13	I	Kirtland Fire Training Area	High
FT-14	II	Manzano Fire Training Area	High
LF-15	I	Landfill B	Medium
WP-16	I	MWSA Sewage Treatment Facility	High
RW-17	IV	Radioactive Holding Tank 6	High
LF-18	I	Landfill A	Medium
RW-19	IV	Radioactive Holding Tank 8	High
LF-20	I	Manzano Landfill	High
RW-23	IV	Radioactive Holding Tank 9	High
WP-26	N/A	Golf Course Pond & Two Sewage Lagoons	High
OT-28	I	McCormick Ranch Range	High
OT-29	I	EOD Range	Medium
LF-44	I	Fill Area SE of Sewage Lagoons	Medium
LF-45	I	Explosive Test Site Unnamed Dump	Medium
OT-46	I	Lake Christian	High
WP-47	II	Silver Recovery Unit	Low
ST-51	III	Sewage Effluent Line	Medium
LF-56	V	Landfill D	Medium
WP-58	V	East Laundry	Medium
ST 59	V	ART Drum	Medium
ST-60	V	ART Pit	Medium
SS-61	III	Fuel Shop Battery Storage Area	Low
SS-62	III	Bldg. 909 Waste Accumulation Area	Low
SS-63	III	Jet Engine Test Cell	Low
ST-64	III	COE Vehicle Maintenance Yard	Medium
SS-65	III	Horizontal Dipole Drum Rack	Medium
ST-66	V	Trestle Facility	High
DP-67	N/A	Three Mine Shafts	Low
RW-68	IV	Radium Dump/Slag Piles	High
ST-70	II	KAFB-7 OWS	High
ST-71	II	Bldg. 1001/1002 OWS	Medium
ST-72	II	Manzano Security Garage OWS	Medium
ST-73	II	CERF Drain	Medium

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-3000

ACQUISITION AND TECHNOLOGY

DUSD(ES)/EQ-CO

08 AUG 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(INSTALLATIONS, LOGISTICS, AND ENVIRONMENT)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(MANPOWER, RESERVE AFFAIRS, INSTALLATIONS
AND ENVIRONMENT)

SUBJECT: Implementation of Ecosystem Management in the DoD

I want to ensure that ecosystem management becomes the basis for future management of DoD lands and waters. Ecosystem management is not only a smart way of doing business, it will blend multiple-use needs and provide a consistent framework to managing DoD installations, ensuring the integrity of the system remains intact. Ecosystem management of natural resources draws on a collaboratively developed vision of desired future ecosystem conditions that integrates ecological, economic, and social factors. It is a goal-driven approach to restoring and sustaining healthy ecosystems and their functions and values using the best science available. The goal is to maintain and improve the sustainability and native biological diversity of terrestrial and aquatic, including marine, ecosystems while supporting human needs, including the DoD mission.

Ecosystem management will include:

1. Ecological approach: The DoD will continue to shift its focus from protection of individual species to management of ecosystems.

2. Partnerships: The DoD will form partnerships to achieve shared goals. Ecosystems cross political boundaries, making the need for cooperation, coordination, and partnerships essential for managing ecosystems.

3. Participation: Public involvement, communication, and incorporation of public needs and desires into management decisions will be emphasized.

4. Information: The best available scientific and field-tested information will be used in making decisions and selecting the most appropriate technologies in management of natural resources.

Department of Defense
Ecosystem Management Principles

Components of ecosystem management:

Ecosystem management is a goal-driven approach to environmental management that is at a scale compatible with natural processes; is cognizant of nature's time frames; recognizes social and economic viability within functioning ecosystems; and is realized through effective partnerships among private, local, state, tribal, and federal interests. Ecosystem management is a process that considers the environment as a complex system functioning as a whole, not as a collection of parts, and recognizes that people and their social and economic needs are a part of the whole.

Goal:

The goal of ecosystem management is to preserve, improve, and enhance ecosystem integrity. Over the long term, this approach will maintain and improve the sustainability and biological diversity of terrestrial and aquatic (including marine) ecosystems while supporting sustainable economies and communities.

Principles and guidelines:

1. Maintain and improve the sustainability and native biological diversity of ecosystems. Ecosystem management involves conducting installation programs and activities in a manner that recognizes, restores, and sustains the composition, structure, and function of natural communities that comprise ecosystems, in order to ensure their sustainability and biological diversity at landscape and other relevant ecological scales.

2. Administer with consideration of ecological units and time frames. Ecosystem management requires the consideration of effects of installation programs and actions at spatial and temporal ecological scales that are relevant to natural processes. A larger geographic view and more appropriate ecological time frames should assist in analysis of cumulative effects on ecosystems that may not be apparent with smaller and shorter scales. Consideration of sustainability under long-term environmental threats, such as climate change, is also important.

3. Support sustainable human activities. People and their social, economic, and national security needs are an integral part of ecological systems, and management of ecosystems depends upon sensitivity to these issues. Actions should support sustainable development by meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

7. Rely on the best science available. Ecosystem management based on scientific understanding of ecosystem composition, structure, and function.

8. Use benchmarks to monitor and evaluate outcomes. Accountability measurements are vital to effective ecosystem management. Implementation strategies should include specific, measurable objectives and criteria with which to evaluate activities in the ecosystem. Clear, specific accountability systems, including those in appropriate budget structures, should be developed to ensure timely, effective implementation of the strategies. Efficiencies gained through cooperation and streamlining should be included in the objectives.

9. Use adaptive management. Ecosystems are recognized as open, changing, complex systems. Management practices should be flexible to accommodate the evolution of scientific understanding of ecosystems. Based on periodic reviews of implementation, adjustments to the standards and guidelines applicable to management activities affecting the ecosystem should be made.

10. Implement through installation plans and programs. An ecosystem's desired range of future conditions should be achieved through linkages and subsequent adjustments and implementation of DoD plans and activities.