

**Pribilof Islands Restoration Advisory Board Meeting**  
**Thursday February 13, 2003**  
**9 AM – 1 PM**  
**WestCoast International Inn**  
**Anchorage AK 99502**

**Attending:**

Richard Legatski (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - NOAA)  
Mark Ridgway (United States Coast Guard - USCG)  
Laurence Lestenkof (St. George Tanaq Corp.)  
Andy Kashevarof (St. George Tanaq Corp.)  
Shaun E. Sexton (St. George Chadux^ Corp.)  
Melvin Smith (The Aleut Corporation)  
Max Malavansky (City of St. George)  
Louis Howard (Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation - ADEC)  
John Lindsay (NOAA)  
Jason Bourdukofsky (St. Paul at large, Chairman)  
Ron Philemonoff (St. Paul Tanadgusix Corporation - TDX)  
Victor Mercurief, Sr. (TDX/St. Paul Co-Chair)  
Greg Gervais (NOAA)  
Robert Aguirre (NOAA)  
Nir Barnea (NOAA)  
Julianna Shane (Bering Sea Eccotech - BSE)  
Anthony Philemonoff (TDX Corp.)  
Bill Arterburn (BSE)  
Elary Gromoff (BSE)  
David Ausman (Polarconsult)  
David B. Winandy (NOAA)  
Richard Zacharof (Tribal Government, St. Paul)  
Myron Melovidov (ON-PHONE from City of St. Paul)

*Note: The format of these minutes is to paraphrase questions and comments by RAB members, followed by the response and name of person responding.*

*Sources: Powerpoint presentations were supplied by the respective presenters. Minutes based on notes taken by Robert Aguirre (NOAA) and Greg Gervais (NOAA) during the course of the meeting.*

**Opening and Introductions (including Public Comments/Modifications to Agenda/April 2002 and September 2002 RAB Minutes Comments/Approvals)**

Chairman Jason Bourdukofsky (St. Paul at large) officially opened the meetings and asked for introductions (a full list of participants is included above).

The first order of business was a motion to approve the agenda and a motion to approve both the September 28, 2002 and April 4, 2002 minutes, with a name change, from “Walter” Lestenkof to “Laurence” Lestenkof (St. George Tanaq Corp.).

Initial questions and comments regarded the priority list of sites for cleanup on St. Paul, which is a subject that would be addressed in more detail later in the meeting – see below, and that Telegraph Hill should be on the priority list. NMFS (NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service) was alleged to have buried drums on Telegraph Hill and there were concerns about drinking water. John Lindsay (NOAA) referred the question back to discussions in April.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* By-laws may stipulate periodic rotation of RAB members. Therefore we would like to make a request that someone find the by-laws, if they are available, and address this issue. Are the by-laws available?

*Elary Gromoff (BSE):* The by-laws do exist.

## **LORAN Station Update**

**9: 35 AM**

Mark Ridgway of the U.S. Coast Guard presented “LORAN Station St. Paul Update” (copy of presentation is available upon request). Mark’s presentation included the following issues: city power connection, St. Paul High-Vacuum Extraction (HVE) system and groundwater data history, HVE system fuel recovery, HVE system fuel recovery vs. hours of operation, St. Paul 2002 groundwater data summary, St. Paul HVE system status, and HVE system operating costs.

**Question:** What is the monitoring interval, is there free product, and is the water drinkable?

*Mark Ridgway (USCG):* The Coast Guard will propose to ADEC the shutdown of the system with long-term quarterly monitoring. There was free product but now there is none, and the water is drinkable.

**Question:** Are the low product recoveries due to winter groundwater levels when the water is frozen? Shouldn’t the system be operating in May, June and July instead?

*Mark Ridgway (USCG):* The Coast Guard will continue monitoring and watch. (Louis Howard (ADEC) also elaborated.)

**Question:** Is the soil saturated, is there a soil problem that may require material removal, were there any ‘hits’ in drinking water wells, and were PCB’s detected or tested for?

*Mark Ridgway (USCG):* Based on existing data and previously removed soil there is currently not a soil problem, but if the system were decommissioned there may be a need to examine the soil issue.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* (responding to the question about drinking water wells) NOAA tested wells at Telegraph Hill and Frederika (sp.). Although diesel range organics (DRO) were detected, they were detected below ADEC cleanup levels. Notification was sent.

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* (with regard to whether PCBs were investigated) PCBs were not investigated unless suspected.

## Landfill Updates for Both Islands

### 9:50 AM

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* The need is for a solid waste management plan, costing \$1 million each, and that effort is on schedule.

**Question:** Our concern is that the effort may be behind schedule, leading to a denial of services. What can be done to expedite new landfill openings while the effort is underway, in other words, an interim or emergency option?

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* There are some options. One is to wait for the new landfill to come on-line. Another alternative, an emergency option, is to construct a monofill.

**Question:** How is the \$1 million dollars being used, and who oversees air permits and monitoring of air quality?

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* The State of Alaska is the ultimate overseer of the redevelopment grant.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* NOAA will give notice that the landfill is closed when the designated area is filled. The landfill is one of the most serious issues faced by the community at present. Regarding some of the interim or emergency alternatives, the burn box was able to reduce the initial volume of material by 85%. Note that the monofill permit was intended for construction and demolition material only.

**Question:** Something smelled bad in the burn box. Is the burn box in the wrong location given prevailing winds, are there standards for monitoring air quality, and is any monitoring of air quality even being done?

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* One needs to see the burn box given the constraints of finding an interim solution.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Consider if the burn box was *not* there and the specter of household waste piling up. Consider if that was a healthy alternative.

**Question:** Understanding that the City of St. Paul and ADEC are asserting that the burn box is the best interim solution, why not simply move it further away?

(The question was turned to Myron Melovidov (City of St. Paul) regarding the nature of material being burned; whether it was ordinary household waste or whether it contained plastics, carcinogens, or hazardous materials; whether any procedures were in place to segregate household garbage prior to burning; and an overall update about the St. Paul landfill. However, these questions were not answered.)

*Max Malavansky (City of St. George):* Update on the St. George landfill design plan, including the desire to upgrade the facility with electricity and a new scoria road. Barging or even flying trash off of the island was a possible cost alternative. Hoped to get the design approved within the next month or two. Preliminary estimates of the total cost were \$4.5 million dollars, or \$4.1 million dollars with some adjustments, at a cost of \$40-50/month per household, although industry and business will need to pick up their share.

**Question:** What is the political or legislative status of landfill money, and is there money available from NOAA or the State of Alaska?

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* The current appropriation bill does not have money for landfills (FY03). The war in Iraq may complicate FY04 and FY05 landfill funds. Theoretically, NOAA could request specially earmarked money for landfills in FY04 and FY05.

**Question:** If \$10 million is in place for landfills, and \$2 million has been used so far, this means that only \$8 million is remaining. How can St. George be requiring \$4.1 million for their landfill (essentially half of the remaining amount) when St. Paul is a much larger community? If a city of 3,000 people like Dutch Harbor/Unalaska only requires a \$2.8 million landfill, how can the City of St. George justify a \$4.1 million landfill design?

*Max Malavansky (City of St. George):* The St. George landfill plan was developed by an experienced engineer named Chuck Egner (sp.). (Others representing the St. George Tanaq Corp. felt that a simple comparison between Dutch Harbor and St. George was unfair because the cost of living on St. George was significantly higher.)

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* The State of Alaska ultimately makes sure that things are not “gold-plated” in a landfill design plan.

**Question/Concern:** Costs have to be reduced, especially in the face of budget cutbacks. One option is to take out plans for power or road improvements, or defer them to basic infrastructure plans instead of including them as part of a landfill design, perhaps by talking creatively with the Alaska Department of Transportation, the federal government, or other agencies to co-link landfill and infrastructure projects.

**Historic/Cultural Preservation Update**  
**10:20 AM**

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* We were successful in being able to find a professional government cinematographer (named John Brooks) to do High-Definition electronic media work for a documentary about the islands. John Brooks has national credentials, and is less expensive to use than a commercial cinematographer. TDX cannot at present provide help in funding the documentary work, but may be able to offer technical advice and promote the project.

**Question:** How much is it going to cost, and can we expect an Oscar nomination?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* The documentary work might cost between \$100,000-200,000 over the life of the project. If Walt Disney films could win an Oscar for a 1948 film on the Pribilofs (which got them into the nature film business in the first place), then anything is possible.

*Robert Aguirre (NOAA):* Edits to the cemetery mapping project and the cemetery interactive CD are complete. Expect to transfer the entire project to the church council's on both islands sometime this summer.

**Break**  
**10:40 AM**

## 10X Rule Update

10: 55 AM

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* The State of Alaska accepted the initial 10X rule application in the St. Paul Village area contingent on an implementation plan including land use restrictions. The issue is the long-term liability of overlaying soils, not drinking water. However, the State of Alaska would like to see the City of St. Paul issue an ordinance not to put drinking water wells within the city. The City of St. Paul has proposed an ordinance to restrict groundwater use several times, but as of yet it has not been approved by the city council.

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* The Alaska State Attorney General's Office, in communication with the City of St. Paul legal counsel, would like to see stronger measures.

**Question:** Is using the 10X rule consistent with the Two-Party Agreement (TPA), which we believe says that cleanup levels must be acceptable to the community?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* We do not believe that the TPA has language requiring community acceptance of cleanup levels, rather the focus is on ADEC approval. The State encourages NOAA to follow current regulations and not avail itself of the right to use older or less stringent regulations. NOAA has tried to meet ADEC's preference and only once invoked a 1991 cleanup standard (for benzene, 0.5 mg/kg versus 0.2 mg/kg). NOAA's policy has been to remove soil to the most stringent standards but NOAA may opt for the 10X rule in cases where NOAA may have inadvertently left behind soil above the more stringent cleanup standard but below the 10X rule level (when confirmation samples indicate higher concentrations than that found during initial site characterization work). In this case, NOAA may determine that leaving this soil behind is preferable to going back again at more cost. RAB members are reminded that if soil were to be removed by someone else, they would therefore also have the ability to apply the 10X rule for soil within the designated area.

**Question:** The Machine Shop and Gas Station area in St. Paul may be the most contaminated site for NOAA. In the past, we dug out petroleum-contaminated soil at the gas station near the Machine Shop but we had to stop and backfill due to the adjacent road and utilities being exposed. The fumes during removal were significant enough that site workers smelled it. Since roads are all around, does this mean NOAA will not clean up soils beneath the road?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* NOAA wants to address all problems and finish cleanup work, but it understands the issue of long-term liabilities. Nonetheless, NOAA doesn't feel digging up a road to get a little soil contamination, for instance, like the soil left over from UST removal at the Decommissioned Power Plant site is worthwhile, since in that case it did not go to groundwater. Contamination may extend on other side of the road from the Decommissioned Power Plant toward the Machine Shop and NOAA will address contamination on that other side of road. *If* (emphasis) it appears that contamination is under the road, then NOAA will be proposing to tear out the road, access that soil, and then restore the road.

**Question:** (Reiterating question about roads)

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* If contamination beneath roads presents a major problem, not marginally but a major problem, NOAA would propose to address it and will not leave that soil in place. Regarding the existence of fumes, an issue to consider is whether prior excavation work hit into shallow groundwater, which might explain the existence of fumes. In addition, because of shallow

groundwater, when NOAA excavates it will stop once the saturated zone has been hit, as further excavation is not practicable.

**Question:** How will the 10X rule affect salt-water wells?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Salt-water wells will be decommissioned once they are determined not needed for groundwater monitoring.

**Question:** What about existing structures and utilities on St. George? What is the State of Alaska's policy on soil removal from beneath existing structures?

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* It's case by case. If contamination goes under a building or within buried utilities, ADEC wouldn't require a responsible party to remove the building or cut off utilities access unless there is a direct exposure issue. But if vapor intrusion affects people inside then perhaps. The amount of, and type of, release is a key consideration.

**Question:** What are the additional controls beyond water usage for landowners?

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* We need to have deed restrictions that indicate 10X rule status and presence of contamination, and we need to comply with other cleanup levels for soil taken out of designated areas.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* NOAA will need to install sentinel wells along the harbor, too. Will need to coordinate with landowners for site access for wells.

**Question/Concern:** The city ordinance is written to apply to big part of the island beyond the ADEC 10X rule designated area.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* We understand that the city drafted the ordinance not only to comply with the 10X rule but also to meet their other needs to protect the drinking water supply and sewer system on the island. The ordinance would kill two birds with one stone. The community needs to decide what they want to do, but NOAA's specific needs are applicable to a 10X rule area.

**Question/Concern:** The ordinance would prevent anyone but the city to drill wells. City water isn't available everywhere on island, and the inability to drill wells could restrict development. Did NOAA get anywhere with expanding the 10X rule boundary?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* NOAA will likely request the 10X rule by the Byproducts Plant, as contamination is there in groundwater, which is not drinking water, and may not practicably be remediated to 1.5 mg/l for DRO. Other NOAA sites on island (Ice House Lake) may be in the same situation. The critical consideration is whether the higher cleanup level will protect human health and the environment; if they do and they meet the criteria, NOAA would consider applying for the 10X rule. It may be efficient for the city ordinance to apply to those sites at this time, ahead of NOAA applying for 10X rule.

**Question/Concern:** Applying the 10X rule to Ice House Lake area might be resisted by many citizens.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Lake water and sediments are clean. Groundwater near the pump house doesn't feed the lake. NOAA's issue would be that contaminated soil was removed from the pump house area, but due to shifting priorities not all soil was removed (maybe 1000 CY above 250



mg/kg). If site groundwater were contaminated above groundwater cleanup levels, it would be a candidate for NOAA requesting the 10X rule there.

**Question:** How would the 10X rule be applied to the Byproducts Plant?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Only one well shows the DRO cleanup standard is exceeded. Removal of soils at the site would only reduce potential groundwater contamination source. Site will be expensive to clean up. NOAA will do everything it can to prevent the sheen in the Salt Water Lagoon. NOAA previously received an NFA for the Diesel Seep Site; addressing the sheen is the reason further work will occur. The intent is to remediate the sheening, not excavate soils.

*Louis Howard (ADEC):* ADEC re-opened the site to deal with the sheen.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* We may be going beyond minimum effort to eliminate sheening. It is our interest to address the site to prevent the need to re-mobilize in five years, or to have a remedy for sheen fail.

**Question/Concern:** Kids are swimming in lagoon in summer and may be exposed. We would not want the 10X rule to become an excuse to walk away from a problem. For the record, the boom is not working and the oil sheening has not stopped.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* The 10X rule won't solve the problem if a sheen shows up. We would be violating federal water quality standards. Addressing the sheen is the priority.

## NOAA Project Activity Update 11:35 AM

Nir Barnea (NOAA) presented on the ETC (Enhanced Thermal Conduction) process, benchmarks, and illustrated how contaminants are oxidized using a 3D animation (see presentation).

*Nir Barnea (NOAA):* We treated 10 cells for a total of 5000 cubic yards, 3870 cubic yards (77%) passed ADEC cleanup level. Soil was challenging to treat, leading to cases of soil that needed to be retreated (like the old Blubber Dump stockpile).

**Question:** Is there a pattern for where the failures occur in the pile, which contaminants?

*Nir Barnea (NOAA):* There doesn't appear to be a strict pattern though many come from the bottom of the pile (cooler location). Problems come mostly from DRO but we have an occasional benzene problem (think we are actually creating it in the system versus not treating what's in the pile initially).

Nir Barnea (NOAA) then presented the CAP (Corrective Action Plan) for field season 2002.

*Nir Barnea (NOAA):* Two sites required only soil removal (Old Movie Theater, Former Power Plant), and four required both UST and soil removal (Decommissioned Power Plant, Lot 101, Lot 103, Alaska Dormitory). At the Former Power Plant (Duna's Kitchen), there was some extended excavation, so a rock wall was erected. At the Decommissioned Power Plant, it was a NOAA, BSE, and City of St. Paul combined effort. A tank that was initially thought to be perpendicular was actually parallel. It was not fully inert (contained oil). The site was restored. We returned in October and removed USTs. Tanks (except DPP) were taken to POSS Camp for cleaning, cutting, packaging for off island disposal. We collected water from cleaning and disposed of it at the PCS stockpile at the Blubber Dump. DPP tank was so big (10,000 gallons) it was taken directly to Blubber Dump for cleaning and cutting; its water, sand and sludge went to the PCS stockpile. Finally, the Tribal government replaced the E-Shed roof.

*Nir Barnea (NOAA):* Regarding Salt Lagoon sampling, sediment samples were analyzed for DRO and PAHs (Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons) and bioassays were conducted to look for biota in sediments. We installed a Semipermeable Membrane Device (SPMD) to collect a sample of contaminants in the surface water and sediments in-place over several weeks (contaminants diffuse across the plastic membrane from the surface water and establish an equilibrium concentration; this is very representative of surface water and sediments contaminant concentrations). Results show water and sediments and surface water were very clean at the sample locations, relative to ADEC cleanup levels. A full report is due in the Spring of 2003.

**Question:** What kinds organisms were in the bioassay?

*Nir Barnea (NOAA):* Amphipods (not indigenous). They represent a lab standard for survival percentage.

Dave Winandy (NOAA) presented St. George progress during 2002 (copy of presentation is available upon request), explained progress of monitoring wells and refined vertical datum, and presented results of October 2002 well monitoring data.

*Dave Winandy (NOAA):* We installed 5 monitoring wells and sampled the well network: two at the Open Pits Site (78 ft average depth), two at the Gasoline Tank Farm Site (55 ft average depth), and one on E. Rookery Road east of Open Pits Site (100 ft depth). We implemented corrective actions at

TPA 24 (Gasoline Tank Farm Site), TPA 22-1 (School UST), TPA 6 (Open Pits Site), and started TPA 19 (Old Carpenter Shop Site). In addition, we backfilled previous excavation at TPA 23 (Inactive Diesel Tank Farm Site). Groundwater contamination is focused on village near waterfront (city office, Tanaq Shop).

**Question:** Where is the diesel free product, would the 10X rule change the extent or make the area of concern a lot different? Is the large peak at MW-1 (near the waterfront) a new phenomena? And what about water levels?

*Dave Winandy & Greg Gervais (NOAA):* Free product was only at TPA 8 in 2001, but now also observed at TPA 1 along the waterfront in 2002. One problem with interpreting water level results is that some of the wells weren't screened to the desired interval so some perched water is causing erroneous water level readings. In other words, wells may be monitoring different aquifers (because they were screened too far and may cross two water zones). There is also the possibility of impact from sewage outfall. Tetra Tech (CESI) and IT had an issue (to be addressed with the State) of wells monitoring perched aquifers instead of the main aquifer. NOAA is working with ADEC to address these data collection needs. Once it is worked out, we will work with ADEC, the RAB and others to come up with appropriate course of action to deal with contamination. The plume would shrink a little bit with 10X Rule, but contamination is focused in village area near the Tanaq Shop, City office, and waterfront. No regular sheen is present near the TPA 1 well with the diesel in it.

*Dave Winandy (NOAA):* (continuing) At TPA 24, we stopped digging at the "boundary" with N-S Fuel Cargo Pipeline. The site is ready for NFA (No Further Action). At TPA 24 we noted the problem with the original estimate versus what was eventually excavated - 80 (estimated) vs 1351 (actual) cu yds. At TPA 19, I personally believe that the source of lead may be lead-based paint. We had estimated 5 cu yds, but turned out to be 21 cu yds. That soil is ready to be removed off of the island. We used the track-based geoprobe for first time, and it performed well (going to refusal).

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* For clarification, the fuel supply lines overlap between TPA sites.

*Dave Winandy (NOAA):* (continuing) At TPA 22-1 St. George School UST, we encountered one hit at the edge of excavation along the school building. The monitoring well downgradient of that sample is clean, and the site is ready for NFA. At TPA 6, we added the old crane site based on prior knowledge. There were three sub-sites addressed (Coal sub-site, crane sub-site, SE sub-site). The coal sub-site was biggest portion of site, where we removed soil to 24 feet below ground surface before we met refusal. There was dumping of household waste and burning (from years past). The site was cleaned and back-filled. At TPA 19, past sampling indicated a small amount of lead contaminated soil there. We removed 21 CY of soil so far. At the ETC unit, we treated 4 cells. The first 3 cells were 100% clean, one segment (33 CY) on fourth failed for benzene. So the total success rate is 98% effective.

## **NOAA Project Budget and Priorities Update**

**12:25 PM**

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Senator Stevens informed NOAA several weeks ago that the Senate is not likely to appropriate funds to NOAA beyond the currently authorized period of FY05 for Pribilof Islands Restoration. The prospect is \$6 million per year. To expect \$6 million this year and \$10 million in the following years would be a blessing. Given the FY05 funding deadline, and given that the project may continue into FY07, the Pribilof Project Office has been directed to prioritize cleanup needs and we are asking the RAB to provide input on prioritization. Once funds are appropriated the decisions on prioritization must happen quickly.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* NOAA received input that cleaning up TOPA sites would be a priority. Only one site on St. George is applicable (the school). NOAA will remove AST and remove/treat contaminated soils so that property can be transferred to the State of Alaska. The transfer of property agreement sites are mostly on St. Paul. Many TOPA sites on St. Paul still need to be cleaned up and transferred but a lawsuit complicates this process. The lawsuit regards who those properties go to, but potentially that lawsuit could be settled this year. The expectation is to quickly transfer properties to corporate entities once that happens.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Another priority is the Diesel Seep Site, due to Clean Water Act violation and the opportunity to use the Corps' dredging contractor to remove NOAA's contaminated sediments along the buffer strip, and potentially also have them remove contaminated soil upland in groundwater zone once surface soils (clean) are removed.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* A third priority is the St. Paul landfill closure. It is due for transfer under TOPA and the city needs to move forward with its long-term landfill solution. NOAA's view is to close out the active area and older areas, seeing an interim solution on the old landfill before the new one is created.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Congressman Young would want a fair distribution of funds to both islands, consistent with community priorities given the priorities listed above. St. George cannot be shut out of the funding because it only has 1 TOPA site to be cleaned up and transferred.

**Question:** What about formerly cleaned up sites like the sand dunes near Little Polovina, where sand shifted and exposed surface debris and lead based materials (lead acid batteries and lead plates)?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* If items become exposed NOAA can just pick it up and dispose of it.

**Question/Concern:** At a past meeting John indicated he was prioritizing projects to show progress to congress and NOAA superiors. As a result St. Paul has been shortchanged on cleanup work because St. Paul had expected money at the end of the cleanup period. Let Congressman Young know this in the context of prioritizing St. Paul sites now.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* St. Paul surface debris sites exhausted a lot of funding. St George debris was already picked up in earlier years, so contaminated soil sites were the only thing left. It is still important for NOAA to close up sites and we have closed a significant number of sites on both islands. Part of the issue is that characterization work was lacking and made it difficult to move forward with cleanup. St. George characterization work made it look like those sites were ready for cleanup, and there was less debris on St. George, so some resources were put there.

**Question:** Please clarify. Was too much work put on the back burner?

*Dave Winandy (NOAA):* While we did scope a number of sites on St. George, we had to stop work due to the same budget issues that delayed work on St. Paul.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* TOPA properties are not small sites. And we had a large increase in scope of removals on St. George last year due to inadequate characterization (80 CY estimate at TPA 24 turned into 1700 CY actual removal).

**Question:** What about John agreeing to write a letter about UST's in occupied houses that are slated for transfer on St. Paul?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Letter will go to TDX, drafted to address TDX counsel's concerns.

**Question:** How will priorities be addressed? How will the prioritization discussions with the community be brokered? Will a list of sites be provided?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* A list should have been provided already to the RAB. NOAA would like to emphasize St. George work on sites in the village or on sites in or near the community, the free product problem, and soil at the Oceanfront site (which might impact St. Paul cleanup due to its size). Oceanfront sites could be a big-ticket item, so doing those wouldn't leave much money for other St. George sites this year if our budget were \$6 million.

**Question:** Should we have another RAB meeting on the islands in a month or two to get community input to prioritization?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* We may be able to do it. We'd want to do it after we have our budget. Note that some of the priorities will be set at levels above us (e.g., VADM Lautenbacher, the head of NOAA, will be meeting with Congressman Young regarding project issues including prioritization). Thus be aware of the potential that higher-level decisions will change or modify the community's input on priorities. We may be able to sit down on the islands in a couple of weeks, when we will be on the islands.

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* We understand that Congress plans to vote on the omnibus appropriation bill this week, so we may know by the beginning of next week. Would reiterate that John's (Lindsay) management has the final say on prioritization. Regarding FY03, we will have to get feedback from higher channels, at the political level, before generating the final priority list. The community's input may not necessarily be the final word.

**Question:** What happens if money runs out before work is done, relative to TPA with ADEC?

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* TPA language indicates that NOAA will do work under TPA until it is done, or there are no appropriations (*force majeure*). This would not preclude the State from using its authorities to get NOAA to do rest of work.

**Question:** Who at Stevens' office told NOAA to not expect more funds after FY05?

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* Don't know, but will try to find out for the RAB members. There has been a change in priorities in the U.S. House of Representatives, and a change in priorities away from Alaska to Lower 48 environmental restoration work

**Question:** What about asking for more than \$10 million? Can NOAA request funds to make up for past year's levels below \$10 million/yr?

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* No. We cannot go beyond the authorization level on a year-by-year basis, regardless of having less than the full \$10 million amount in prior years. Authorization allows only for \$10 million per year, for each of 5 years. We can't make up for past years.

**Question:** NOAA should ask for \$10 million for cleanup each year, as well as a separate request for landfill redevelopment, even if it comes out of other NOAA programs. Can NOAA make a request for landfill money?

*Richard Legatski (NOAA):* Advise that you make your pitch to NOAA leadership and Congress.

**Question:** How does NOAA prioritize funding for its sites? The USCG has 125 sites and has to sharpen its pencils each year. Is there a matrix for plan priorities?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* It's a different situation. We had to re-establish trust levels and demonstrate progress, we are mandated to work on the islands, and we have 7 island entities plus State and congressional delegations. It is difficult to satisfy all perspectives and needs. The 'matrix' approach was often political.

**Question/Concern:** Each time we look at prioritizing sites, we add new ones to the list. The list continues to grow and change. It never seems to stay the same.

*Ron Philemonoff (TDX):* We just heard the budget is up to \$8 million for FY03.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* If we do get \$8 million it is an example of the project showing good progress and stewardship with past appropriations. If progress is not made (with \$8 million, for instance) it may mean difficulties in the next years.

**Public Comments/Next Meeting/Adjourn**  
**12:55 PM**

**Question/Concern:** Add Telegraph Hill to the list. The City of Saint Paul previously excavated scoria for a public works facility and breached drums in the process.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Past reports written about Telegraph Hill were not good quality. We needed more qualified staff to re-write reports to the quality adequate to submit to the State of Alaska. We finally have that staff (just hired 2 new engineers). Telegraph Hill characterization report will be rewritten and re-evaluated. NOAA installed wells at the site and did find fuel products in groundwater and soil, but below levels of concern. Removed barrels (buried) and have seen barrels being removed. However, the Department of Defense is responsible for Telegraph Hill. We will document NOAA's work, but we have no plans for additional spending. NOAA intends to finish its report and recommend DoD handle the site under FUDS.

**Question:** We believe the drums came from Amchitka, and that aerial photograph footprints show areas of debris and other materials being left. Will you document that it is the Department of Defense's problem?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* (regarding the drums coming from Amchitka) We would need to see documentation, but based on available information NOAA believes that Telegraph Hill is a DoD responsibility. We can't handle FUDS sites under PL 106-562. Buried debris is not required to be exhumed without evidence of being contaminated. It is a Defense problem, and the State may also find that DoD did not fully document that they completed cleanup.

**Question:** What is the cost to clean up buried barrels?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* With more than 2 feet of surface over debris, and with no compulsion to clean them up, and no evidence they are contaminated?

**Question/Concern:** The soil may be contaminated.

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Groundwater well monitoring does not suggest a threat to drinking water. Soil has not been tested near where current barrels are being dug up, but overall NOAA is not assuming any more responsibilities at Telegraph Hill.

**Question:** When is the next meeting?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Will do my best to come out to the islands in the next several weeks and lay out my perspective on the site lists and priorities with the communities. We can send a site and status list to RAB members.

**Question:** Can NOAA e-mail out a list of the sites to be considered?

*John Lindsay (NOAA):* Write down your e-mail addresses and we'll send them out.

*Meeting was adjourned.*

**Adjourn**  
**1:10 PM**