999020000762
10.03 - 1.0

ANDERSEN AFB
GUAM

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 2010-006

ORIGINAL

Andersen Air Force Base

Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

May 19, 2010, 6:30 P.M.

Guam Marriott Hotel @ The View

Reported By: Veronica F. Reilly, CSR-RPR

AAFB Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)/
Proposed Plan Public Meeting for
Sites 3, 10, 13, 15, 21, 26, & 27 NWF OU
and
Sites 57, 71, 74, 75, & 78 Site Wide OU
19 May 2010

NAME	AFFILIATION	TEL. NO.
Veronica Reilly	Reporter (Stenographer)	[redacted]
Christine Pascua	EA Science & Tech	[redacted]
Carmen Sia-Denton	GovA	[redacted]
Margaret Aguilar	Guam EPA	475-1607
Rick Mathews	USAF - Andersen AFB	366-7101
MIKE GAMEL	Reading Dededs	[redacted]
Steven Daugherty	NAVFACMAR	366-6042
MIKE CRUZ	Guam EPA	475-1649
Chip Brown	EA	[redacted]
ED HIPOLITO	AECOM	[redacted]
LARRY KASPERBAUER	Community	[redacted]
Joanne Brown	RAB member	[redacted]
Jamie Swing	EA	[redacted]
Rachel Hansen	SWCA	
Joe Vinch	36 CSS/CSVR	
Danny Azas	36 CSS/CSVR	

**Mtg held at "The View", Marriott Hotel, Tumon*

MR. AGAR: Good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Andersen Restoration Advisory Board public meeting. Tonight we'll be presenting proposed plans for 12 sites. Mr. Gregg Ikehara is not able to be present tonight. He's in a conference. And myself and Mr. Joe Vinch will be presenting the proposed plan tonight. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Danny Agar.

All right. We normally start out with the acronyms, as you've seen that a lot. Before we head on to the proposed plan, I'd like to brief you on the site status for our IRP. If you noticed, we have 79 sites here. We previously had 78. This year we added one site, and this site happened to be an MMRP site, which did not qualify for that program, so it went into the IRP program, and that is site 79.

Since the last meeting that you had in March, the site complete went up from 60 percent to 65 percent, and the site cleanup pending went up from 16 percent to 20 percent. And site studies pending went down from 24 to 15 percent, which is what we expected to happen. So most of our study projects are dwindling. We're actually getting to the point now that most of the sites will be, um, in the cleanup phase. Some sites actually went out of the cleanup phase because there's no further action. So once we complete the ROD for these 12 sites that we have, this status will change.

The presentation tonight is divided into two groups.

I will be presenting group one, and that will have two sites that are going to be proposed for some sort of action, remedial action, and the rest of the five sites will be no action.

Group two will have sites that will require some sort of remedial action. We will be providing a brief description of each site, the results of our investigation. We will present you with the methods of cleanup we have considered and methods we prefer and the reason for that preference.

As a note, we have considered the most conservative approach to screening cleanup methods, and that would be future residents. A copy of the proposed plan is located at the back. If you don't have one, it's also available at the Nieves Flores Memorial Library in Agana and JFK Memorial Library at the University of Guam.

MR. KASPERBAUER: RFK.

MR. AGAR: RFK. I'm sorry.

So let me finish my presentation first before you ask questions, any questions. If you do want to ask questions, please go up to the mic, the center of the room here, and state your name and your question.

Here we have a brief description of the process that the site goes through, the CERCLA process, and at this point in time, we are at the proposed plan phase. We are

presenting this to inform you of what we proposed, to solicit public comments and to address or incorporate any comments received tonight in the records of decision. We welcome any input in our decision-making process. And this is your opportunity to comment on our approach, our proposal, before we proceed to the selective alternatives for each site.

The following are the legal basis for the proposed plan process. There is a 30-day public comment period, which is 18 May to 17 June. Verbal comments will be accepted at this meeting and written comments can be sent to Mr. Gregg Ikehara, must be postmarked no later than 17 June. A final record of decision response to the summary will be included.

Okay. Starting with the two sites that require some sort of remedial action, we have Site 3, which is waste pile 3, and we have Site 21, which is landfill 26. And they're located -- right here is waste pile 3 and right here is Site 21. And this is the location of the ammunition storage area.

In the proposed plan, one site is planned for land use control, and that is Site 3; and the other one is for soil removal. Starting with Site 3. Site 3, northern portion is approximately about 7 acres, and the areas that we're really concerned with is the southern portion of the site, which is about 12 acres in size. Construction debris from

Capehart housing were disposed at the site, and also cleanup operation following typhoons back in 1964 and in the early 1970s were also disposed at this area here. And if you notice, this is landfill 2, and this is our current landfill at Andersen Air Force Base here.

Testing done at the site. We found arsenic, lead and benzopyrene, which were the primary risk to residents, and arsenic was the primary risk driver for the industrial worker. And no risks were present for wildlife at the site.

Of the six cleanup alternatives that we had screened against the remedial action objectives, we had four cleanup alternatives that were evaluated in detail. And these are the four cleanups that we had looked at. First one, of course, no further action. The other one's institutional control. And the cost is right here, where each alternatives -- for each of the alternatives.

So for Site 3, the Air Force had selected institutional control as the preferred alternative for the site. It will prevent future resident and industrial worker exposure to the contaminants at the site. And we will have restriction on its land use, and annual monitoring will be required at the site, an informal five-year review will be done when we leave the contaminants in place. Okay.

The next site is Site 21, which is landfill 26. It's about two miles north of Potts Junction, and it's located in

Northwest Field munition storage area, as I said earlier. Sanitary trash, construction debris, ordinance and explosive waste and drums containing waste were disposed at the site, and also there was evidence of burning. Testing done at the site found dioxin and metals, particularly aluminum, antimony, copper and iron, that posed a risk to residents and workers. And also, lead was found at the site. Dioxin, metals and PAH also pose a risk to wildlife.

Again, of six cleanup alternatives, we screened three cleanup alternatives to examine in detail, and these are the three and the cost involved. Okay. Air Force selected soil removal as the preferred remedy for Site 21, and that would prevent exposure for residents, workers and wildlife at the site.

Okay. The next five sites are proposed to have no further requirements or action, and these are Site 10, Site 13 -- Site 10 is right here, Site 15 is here, Site 27, Site 26, Site 13. And this mostly in the main base here. Okay.

Going through each one of them, starting with Site 10. So Site 10 was used for disposal of sanitary industrial waste from 1950 to 1976. Soil removal action was conducted in 1999 all the way through 2006. So basically, we've removed several drums of lubricating oils, white asphalt waste and soil contaminated with PAHs, antimony and lead. Confirmation sample at the site after the cleanup, we found no contaminants

at all, and the site does not pose a risk to future residents, workers or wildlife.

Next site is 13. The site was used as a landfill back in 1969 all the way through 1968 [sic]. It was used for disposal of metal debris, deteriorating metal drums, construction rubbles and waste asphalt. Originally, the site consisted of the 5.5 acres, which is northern part of the site here. And then during the investigation, they found more waste drums south of this original site, and that expanded the site to an addition of 11.5 acres. Testing -- down at the site, we found that there are no risks to residents, workers or wildlife. And this is the expansion site. Again, testing was done at the site, and there were no constituents that we found to be a risk to future residents, workers or wildlife.

Site 15 is a location of a former sewage treatment plant, and it was operated until 1975. After 1975, there were more dumping of sanitary waste and construction debris to the site. We did an interim remedial action back in 2006, all the way through 2009. We removed the structure, the sewage treatment plant structure, and soil contaminated with PCBs, pesticide, PAHs and chromium. Confirmation testing done at the site found no contaminants that were going to be a risk to future residents, workers or wildlife.

Next site is firefighter training area two, Site 26. Some of you are familiar with this site. This is an area

where fuels and volatile chemicals were stored in above ground and underground storage tank. The underground storage tank was a tank truck that was buried. And, of course, organics were found underneath it all the way down 240 to 220 feet below ground. The UST was removed back in 1997, and we put in a soil vapor extraction system to remove the volatile organics 200 feet below the ground. It was operated until 2001, and we removed approximately 10,000 pounds of volatile organic compounds from the ground. We also put in a upgraded monitoring well to be sure that the contaminant does not go into the ground water, and we have found that it has not. Some of the pipings at the site were removed. The mock plane is still there, so -- but there is an ongoing fire training area that's south of that -- hundreds of feet south of that that is current and is being used. Soil testing done at the site found no constituents that would be a risk to future residents, workers or wildlife. This is where they found the underground tanker. Tanker was underground. This is the mock plane and this is the current firefighter training area.

Next site is Site 27. It's a former hazardous waste storage area. The site was initially used as an outdoor storage area for solvents, oil and lubricants, and was also used as a hazardous waste or storage area from 1970 to 1983. The site now is an open space that's sometimes used for parking. Testing done at the site found no constituents that

would pose a risk to future residents, workers or wildlife.

Okay. So that concludes my presentation for the seven sites. Your questions and answers are welcome at this time.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Thank you very much. Larry Kasperbauer. Makes it kind of difficult to wait until you're at the end when the question has to do with Sites 3 and 21.

MR. AGAR: Okay.

MR. KASPERBAUER: I think with Site 3, you said there's no risk to wild --

MR. AGAR: To wildlife?

MR. KASPERBAUER: Animals, but risk to the humans. How do you -- the others are no risk to both. What's, um -- why wouldn't there be a risk to wildlife if there's a risk to humans? What kind of risk to humans are we talking about?

MR. AGAR: There are two risks. There's non-cancer risk and there's cancer risk. And what we do is basically look at the PRGs, which the EPA guideline has established, and we look at the range in which we -- when we conduct soil investigations, soil testing, we look at the concentration of that chemical that's published and we compare it to the screening levels that the EPA had established. If it's above the screen level, we go through a process of risk assessment. And in the risk assessment, they go through some

computation which we have a hazard index. After some formulation and calculation is done, when they -- when it's found that this particular chemical is above one, then it becomes a risk driver for humans.

And another calculation is done for wildlife, and it's based entirely on the different scale. And they look at a particular species, like, um, yellow bittern and Marianas crows, and they look at -- and they do a calculation on levels, so they have a different range level. Normally, the range is about -- for lead, for example, is 800 milligrams per kilogram. And for -- that's for wildlife. For humans, basically it's 400 milligrams per kilogram for lead. And so if it's below that, then it doesn't become a risk to wildlife.

So if you look at the proposed plan, it would summarize how the calculation is done; not in detail, but it will give you a good idea on how the calculation is done for each receptors. We call them receptors. And also, there's also a degree of risk for workers, because workers are not always at the site, so they have a much more higher tolerance or higher level of exposure than you would for residents, since residents are there all the time. So, um, I hope that can give you an idea on how --

MR. KASPERBAUER: What if -- excuse me. What if humans consumed those animals for which there's a risk? Can wildlife, the pigs or deer --

MR. AGAR: Yes, then that's also considered in the risk for this site. And when they start talking about a risk to wildlife, it means that if the wildlife is at risk, then humans would be at risk, unfortunately. Assuming that that's not -- that's not considered here when they do a risk. They're considering if humans consumes or exposed to the soil that's contaminated, not from the animals.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Why not? They do eat the animals.

MR. AGAR: Yes, they do. But for this particular scenario that we are calculating the risk for, specifically for humans exposed to the soil either through ingestion or through normal contact, you know, we look at the different routes of exposure that humans can play as far as the site is concerned, but not as far as the risk is -- animals is concerned, exposure to animals.

MR. KASPERBAUER: What about if there's a risk to humans, the percolation into the water system?

MR. AGAR: Yes. We have wells all over the sites that we monitor constantly, and based on the results that we have, we have no hits on any of the chemicals that we found here at this particular sites in ground water. So -- and there's no pathways for people to drink this water on the path where Andersen Air Force Base is at, because the water that's being used to supply to the population there is not from this

site. It's not within the base; it's outside the base.

So based on the fact that we don't find these contaminants in ground water at the site, then there's no consideration as far as risk to ground water is concerned because water at the site is not being consumed.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Well, that would be at this time. But it would just seem like since you did the soil removal at Site 21, I believe I noted here, um, it seems like kind of an action to solve kind of a short-range problem, but not necessarily long-range problem. You say the water isn't drawn from there now, implying that if it were in the future, it might be a problem.

MR. AGAR: Well, it won't be a problem because we do have monitoring wells at those sites and then in Andersen Air Force Base, and we have not found any of these chemicals at all in the ground water. So it proves to us that it's not going into the water itself. It's just staying up where the soil is at.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Thank you.

MR. MATTHEWS: Richard Matthews from Andersen Air Force Base. I just want clarification on Site 13 and when it was used. I think I heard you say '69 to '68, which I know can't be correct. So I just ask for the record of when it was used.

MR. AGAR: Site 16?

MR. MATTHEWS: Site 13.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Is it '59?

MR. MATTHEWS: '59?

MR. KASPERBAUER: I don't know. I thought it was '59 to '68, but I heard the same thing.

MR. MATTHEWS: I may have misunderstood.

MR. AGAR: Site 13, right?

MR. MATTHEWS: Yes.

MR. AGAR: It was used, yeah, 1967 to '68 for disposal of debris, construction debris. But, of course, that's the record we found --

MR. MATTHEWS: Okay.

MR. AGAR: -- from our documents. But we can always double-check and make sure that's accurate.

All right. Any other questions?

MS. BROWN: Hi. Joann Brown. I just want to follow up on the same Site 3. I notice you list the three options that are there and you pick the first option, but it looked like a second option, at least if the soil were treated and removed, then it would not be a long-term issue to worry about.

MR. AGAR: Yeah.

MS. BROWN: If you could identify with regard to the options and price list for remediation. The first one was, like, 700,000 or so; second one was like 2 million; and

the other is 5.7. Why the option for institutional controls? Because I've always been in a position if there's a way to address the cleanup, I would prefer that. It's more expensive, but then it's no longer an issue of concern where -- you know, 793, how long is that going to cover maintaining control of the area when the contamination still exists? So I have a concern about that. Can you elaborate further?

MR. AGAR: Okay. When we decided to choose institutional control, we also had what we called the remedial process team that consists of different disciplines to look at what our remedial action would be. And of course, they look at cost, which is number one; and then they look at locations. And in this particular one over here that we're talking about, this happens to be -- first of all, this happens to be the same roadway where an active is at -- where a consolidation unit is at and where our landfill -- current landfill is at. And these area here is gated. It's closed whenever operations here is done, so it's well controlled. And it's in an area where industrial process is constantly going through and out. There's no proposed plan to do any sort of construction of housing here. This is mostly designated for industrial use.

So for industrial use, institutional control can be allowed. And this will, of course, be there forever, until we find a way to remediate all the waste that we took out from the sites at Andersen Air Force Base. So it was pretty much

close to each other. So it makes sense, from this of point view, that since it's in an industrial area, close to Consolidation Unit No. 2, that this may be well used for other uses besides residential usage.

MS. BROWN: And what exactly are the $700,000 going to be used for? You know, I would have to say -- I mean, I appreciate the fact that you have your experts look and view and assess and, you know, cost is the number one consideration. At the same time, I assume our role here as members of the community is to provide input, hoping that input will be taken into consideration. I think whenever we have the opportunity to reduce the scope of where these long-term contaminates are, that to me is a preferable option. If you're going it spend 793,000, and the problem will still be there indefinitely, versus a little more than twice that amount and it's gone forever, for me, as a member of the community, I think that would be a more preferable option.

I realize cost is a factor and that's a reality from a lot of things, but I hate that to be the number one consideration as to which decisions are being made. And I would like to have a sense that those of us in the public feel very much that Andersen's prioritizing reducing these contaminants wherever and whenever possible, even though they are on the base, even though the base certainly has more control about the activities that occur in certain locations.

The only time I can even agree to say, "Oh, it's okay to leave it there" is because we don't have the technology to do it or are there any exercises involved in addressing removal.

But in this particular case, I just want to put for the record I do have some reservations regarding this decision. I would prefer that, because it is something that can be mitigated, it should be mitigated. Because if it's just going to sit there and you're going to give me the figure of 793,000, and that's going to address it, I mean, that's for now. How many years into the future is that going to be there? Versus maximizing the opportunity to clean up the site and reduce the footprint of the contaminated areas. So I do want to state that.

I also wanted to ask you, even though I know we have these handouts with a lot of the detailed information that's available, I don't know if you -- I'm not up there. I don't know if we have the normal presentation we have in our meetings where the slides are presented to us on paper so it allows us to go back and reference the presentations and ask questions as we go along, and then we get to take it with us and review it. So if, for future meetings -- I'm just asking, if you don't have a copy here, it would be more helpful, because we're all sitting here flipping through this while you're talking, trying to pinpoint where it's at, and it's a little more complicated for us. And there's so much

information being provided. We'd just like the opportunity to go back and reference it and follow along with the presentation and take notes. Because I agree with Senator Kasperbauer. And it's a lot of information, and it's very hard to do that and look at all the different locations that you're providing here.

MR. AGAR: We will. Also, may I make a note also that all the areas that have land use control will go through a five-year review. So every five years, we look at it and see if this remedy in place is still good or not. So there's opportunities that things can change.

MR. KASPERBAUER: If I could add on to Senator Brown's comments. Maybe you answered her or have told us, but could you review for me what this institutional control -- what do you do for $700,000-some if you don't remove soil and you don't do this and you don't do that? That's half of the full-blown process of removing the soil at all.

MR. AGAR: Yes. The institutional control is considered for 30 years. So the amount of money that we allot is for 30 years. So it's not just for the next five years, but it's for 30 years. And we're talking every five years --

MR. KASPERBAUER: Of doing what?

MR. AGAR: Every five years, we have a five-year review. We actually hire a consultant or contractor to come back and re-look at our proposal for the site -- let's say,

like, Site 3 -- and take a look at it and see if it's feasible to continue on with the land use control. Also, we have to -- we have to manage the area, so we have to do inspection, yearly inspection, quarterly inspection, at the site itself to make sure that the site is not disturbed or nobody is in there doing any sort of construction that's going on. We have to put it in our base general plan, basically, to make sure that if there's any construction going on at the base, we will have that information within our geo base and all the process flow that constitutes the review process as far as construction is concerned, that the site itself will not be affected.

So in the near future, if there's a change, any changes that may occur on the base where it's necessary to build a building at the site or to do some sort of construction, then, of course, the land use control, we change.

But the cost is for 30 years, and it involves these process that is costing us money to do this. So, um, maybe in a year's time, it costs about $10,000 or $5,000 a year, and that's 30 years. It easily can go up very high. And, of course, the ROD, the -- factoring in ROD is not cheap either, so...

MR. KASPERBAUER: Since this was the first item, I don't recall all the issues that were found, but I think I recall you saying chemicals and arsenic and other such items.

Could you go over what was found there? And I'm still concerned, even though you're monitoring wells, it may not have shown anything -- I don't know how far down, half a mile down, at this time. And since this is a 30-year project, what if in five years you do start to see these dangerous chemicals? Since there are risk to humans there now, these chemicals must be a risk, and they -- I can't perceive, unless you contain them in some kind of a concrete whatever -- um, box, that they would percolate down or be utilized by the plants and animals and whatnot.

So what were the -- there they are.

MR. AGAR: There they are, yes.

MR. KASPERBAUER: So arsenic and pesticide and --

MR. AGAR: And metals.

MR. KASPERBAUER: We learn are now very bad, some of those ones that were used early on.

MR. AGAR: And specifically dieldrin.

MR. KASPERBAUER: What was that used for?

MR. AGAR: Controlling insects.

MR. KASPERBAUER: On island or wherever?

MR. AGAR: It's also part of ingredients for some of the other type of pesticides and insecticides.

MR. KASPERBAUER: So doesn't it seem logical that these things could percolate down -- you've just done the studies now. They've been there for -- when did you say they

were put there?

MR. AGAR: This was used back in 1950s -- or I'm sorry. It was used back in 1964 and it was used as a construction debris disposal, 1964 to 1970.

MR. KASPERBAUER: I guess I'm seconding what Senator Brown said for the public record. We're expressing our concern not necessarily for right now -- well, for now also, but certainly in the future. And I'm concerned, as I'm sure many of us are, as to whether these things are going to percolate down and whether these animals are going to stay contained. If they somehow inject these materials, whether they're going to stay confined there or are they going to drift around the base and leave outside the base and be consumed by humans.

MR. AGAR: Okay. Any other questions? Yes?

MR. DAUGHERTY: Steven Daugherty. I just wanted to clarify for the record that Site 3 and the documentation here says from 1947 to 1977. Thank you.

MR. AGAR: Thank you.

Okay. If that's all, then we'll continue on with the presentation. Mr. Joe Vinch.

MR. VINCH: Hello. I'm Joe Vinch, Environmental Engineering at Andersen Air Force Base, and tonight I'll be going over five sites. They're all over in Northwest Field area.

This is a 1945 picture of Northwest Field. As most of you know, Guam was liberated from Japan in August of 1944. Northwest Field was constructed January to July 1945.

MR. KASPERBAUER: I'm sorry. August? Liberated in August?

MR. VINCH: Well, July, but -- end of July, right?

MR. KASPERBAUER: July 21.

MR. MATTHEWS: July 21st.

MR. KASPERBAUER: July 21, '44.

MR. VINCH: Thank you. But that's the invasion. That's not considered the liberation. Not that we need to argue that. That was the day it was invaded, I believe. I think so.

Built by the US Army Engineers and US Navy. It was designed for using the Boeing B-29 Superfortress bombers against Japan. It closed in 1949. Okay.

So I'm going go over five different sites: 57, 71, 74, 75 and 76. All of these are soil removal, so full cleanups. Okay.

First site is Site 57. Historical photo showed this as a disposal area in an old borrow pit, which was an asphalt road leading up to it, less than half an acre in size. We did soil sampling here. We checked for PAHs, pesticides, PCBs, metals and explosive residue. This is just a photo

showing some of the debris that was found at the site. For each of these sites that I'll go over tonight, each one had a human health risk assessment done and an ecological risk assessment performed.

So after sample results were analyzed and the risk assessments were performed, we came up with remedial action objectives. And what we found here was cadmium and lead that needed cleaning up. This lead us to our three alternatives: The no further action, institutional controls and soil removal. Andersen selected soil removal for this. It's the best choice. This is a full cleanup. This can be closed, and this is cleanup to residential standards. And that original cost of $263,000, that's for the excavation and offsite disposal of 141 cubic yards of soil.

Okay. Next site is Site No. 71. Less than a quarter of an acre; again, used for disposal during the construction of Northwest Field. And more of what was found: Scrap metal, poles and drums. All empty drums. Soil samples were analyzed for VOCs, PAHs, pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls. For this one, we found copper; it was too high and needs to be cleaned up. Small cleanup cost. In this case, institutional control would have been more, which is interesting. It's a small cleanup. It's only 16 cubic yards of soil. Again, we went with the soil removal for Site 71.

Site 74, that's near the old control tower. Did

soil sampling, again, for full range of contaminants. Ran human health risk assessment and eco risk assessments. Found an old underground storage tank and concrete pad. Non-hazard waste was found; it was just water in this empty tank. Nothing hazardous was found in it. And for this, we are leaning towards a cleanup, as well, because of the PAHs that were found.

MR. KASPERBAUER: How large an area?

MR. VINCH: Back up on that; .23 acres. And I know a few people have asked me about PAHs, what they are. They're polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. It's a group of 100 different chemicals that were formed during the incomplete burning of the garbage, coal, oil. We also find them in creosote, roofing tar. So that's where these show up.

Went through the three alternatives for this site, and Andersen chose soil removal for this site. Site 75 has two different areas to it, both small, 1.84 and 1.96 acres. Area B was shown as a drum disposal area, and Area C was a waste water treatment plant. Here's some of the things that were found: Just a concrete pad in Area C and a -- that's what the drums looked like. Most likely asphalt from the Northwest Field. And in 75, the contaminant of concern was copper, and this is going to lead us to a cleanup for alternative three, soil removal, for 156,000.

Okay. Site 76 has two areas to it, both debris.

Again, waste piles in both these areas. Soil samples were collected. They were analyzed for VOCs, PAHs, pesticides and metals. And, of course, the human health risk assessment and eco health assessment were both run. Found metal debris at both areas. And here we see the PAHs again; it requires a cleanup. Little larger price tag of 283,000 for soil removal. That's for 176 cubic yards of soil to be removed from the site. And, again, that will allow for site closure under CERCLA. That'll be back to residential standards. And no institutional controls will be needed, so no fencing, no zoning, nothing specific for that area.

That's the five sites up at Northwest Field. So all soil removal cleanup. I think when we add it up, it comes up to just over a million dollars for all of it. Small sites.

Yes, sir?

MR. KASPERBAUER: When you say the drums that were found were empty, were they also full of bullet holes?

MR. VINCH: Yeah, for target.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Yeah. So most of the stuff drained out. Like the drums that I've seen, which haven't been mentioned in any of this, on the left side as you head down towards Ritidian Point, as you turn the corner, instead of going up to the old tower, which I think is one of the sites on the left side of the jungle where the Japanese also had their hot baths, their concrete bathe areas where they had

water, there are drums in there with bullet holes. I assume they're the same kind of drums since they're nearby.

MR. VINCH: We found a lot of the asphalt drums that were just discarded. And a lot of these sites were old borrow pits, so they took it -- they used the limestone, the coral, for buildup where they needed it, and then it was a good hole, so they disposed of their waste in there.

Yeah, it's a shame, but we're cleaning it up now.

MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah, question: You characterize it all as soil removal. You show pictures of a lot of debris. Is debris removal included in the soil removal, for clarification?

MR. VINCH: It is. We do.

MR. KASPERBAUER: Is there a time frame? I mean, the other was 30 years, the institutional. Are these one year? Five years?

MR. VINCH: Oh, for the cleanups?

MR. KASPERBAUER: Yeah.

MR. VINCH: Danny, do you know when these are scheduled for? The cleanup date.

MR. AGAR: Yeah. We're scheduling -- these sites should all be cleaned up by 2014. They're scheduled for those years. So we still have our -- what do you call it -- defense remedial goals. The Navy has it in 2014.

Any other questions?

MR. VINCH: Anything else?

MS. BROWN: We like soil cleanup. Just like Site 3, we'll be happy.

MR. KASPERBAUER: You got it.

MR. AGAR: All right. Well, thank you for attending the meeting tonight. This concludes our public meeting. And we hope to see you in our future public meetings. And, of course, we'll address the issues of having papers for everyone here to use.

MR. MATTHEWS: Copies of the slides.

MR. AGAR: Slide -- copies of the slides.

[Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 7:33 p.m.]

* * *

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Veronica F. Reilly, Certified Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify that at said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; that thereafter my notes were reduced to typewriting under my direction; and the foregoing transcript, pages 1 to 26, both inclusive, constitutes a full, true, and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Barrigada, Guam, this 23rd day of June 2010.

Veronica F. Reilly, CSR-RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE