

Pribilofs Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Notes
Anchorage, Alaska
March 16, 2006

Co-Chairs: Mr. Jason Bourdukofsky Sr. (St. Paul at large) and Mr. Bernie Denno (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)

Participants

Bill Arterburn, Bering Sea Eccotech (BSE)
Dave Ausman, Polarconsult
Jason Bourdukofsky, St. Paul at large
Bernie Denno, NOAA
John Fox, Booze Allen Hamilton (NOAA contractor)
Greg Gervais, NOAA
Elary Gromoff, BSE/The Aleut Corporation
Louis Howard, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Laura Johnson, Booze Allen Hamilton (NOAA contractor)
Andy Kashevarof, St. George Tanaq
Aquilina D. Lestenkof, St. Paul at large
John Lindsay, NOAA
Max Malavansky, City of St. George
Jim Malchow, NOAA
Robert Melovidov, Tribal Government of St. Paul
Victor Mercurief, Tanadgusix Corporation (TDX)
Iliodor Philemonof, St. George Tanaq
Anthony Philemonoff, TDX
Ron Philemonoff, TDX
Leslie Simmons, ADEC Solid Waste Program
Linda Snow, City of St. Paul
Paula Souik, NOAA
Jim Wright, NOAA

Welcome and Introductions

- Jason called the meeting to order at 9:08 AM. Linda Snow, the new St. Paul City manager was introduced. Everyone was asked to please sign in.
- RAB Member Roll Call: Initially, the Tribal Governments of St. Paul and St. George were not represented. Robert Melovidov, the new Tribal Government of St. Paul President, arrived about 10:15 AM and was introduced.

Additions to Agenda

- John Lindsay asked to add a review of the RAB membership.
- Victor Mercurief asked to add discussion of Telegraph Hill monitoring wells.
- Agenda adopted with additions.

Distribution of RAB Notes for Review and Approval (Co-chairs)

- St. George August 2005 notes approved.
- St. Paul August 2005 notes approved.
- St. Paul January 2006 notes approved with a comment by Ron Philemonoff. Ron clarified that his comment on page 2 should read that he heard the \$2 million would

go towards cleanup. John Lindsay stated that at the time of the January meeting, the decision on how much of the \$2 million would go towards cleanup was in deliberations among Congressional members and in NOAA. Bernie Denno's response included in the January meeting notes also addresses this point.

St. George & St. Paul Site Status Tables Update (Lindsay)

- Tables distributed.
- St. Paul table
 - 60 sites on the island required cleanup.
 - Property owners have been added to the table at the request of the RAB. This information may not be completely accurate. Let NOAA know if you have corrections.
 - NOAA will be abating the interior of the buildings for lead and asbestos. The state has no oversight authority on lead abatement in buildings. For this reason, the interior abatement is not on the table. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) have regulatory authority for the abatement.
 - The state has oversight over Two Party Agreement (TPA) sites, and lead soil contamination is regulated by the state. Lead-contaminated soil cleanup has been added to the table as Site 60.
 - NOAA plans to HEPA vacuum lead paint chips off the top of soil to help cleanup soils around buildings.
 - NOAA has been requested by the Alaska delegation to demolish two buildings (Equipment Shed, a.k.a. E-Shed or Municipal Garage, and Decommissioned Power Plant). Petroleum-contaminated soil (PCS) exists under these structures. NOAA intends to remove this soil. PCS removal underneath buildings will be a continuation of previous removals so no new sites are listed.

Comment: RAB and property owners should have the opportunity to review reports that are submitted to EPA. Elary Gromoff requested that owners see a sign off from EPA. Bernie Denno stated that the EPA is not required to sign off on such actions. A NOAA contractor will prepare closure reports, and NOAA will follow applicable regulations. Elary indicated EPA did so for a site on Adak. Greg Gervais made point that that was a Superfund site. NOAA will check with EPA Region 10.

Question: At which properties does The Aleut Corp have subsurface rights? Response: For Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) properties, the Aleut Corporation owns the subsurface. For Transfer of Property Agreement (TOPA) properties, NOAA owns surface and subsurface and both will be transferred to the TOPA recipient.

Comment: The Aleut Corporation does not have subsurface rights at Telegraph Hill. At Polovina, outside of NOAA property, The Aleut Corporation has subsurface rights. NOAA has strayed off TOPA scoria mine onto TDX/The Aleut Corporation mine a few times. NOAA rejected those assertions.

Comment: In one instance in 2003, NOAA's contractor inadvertently mined scoria at non-NOAA property on Telegraph Hill. Julie Shane quickly corrected the situation.

Comment: Your table notes the property ownership is based on best information, not title searches etc. NOAA should make sure the information is accurate. Also, NOAA should be sure to add The Aleut Corporation as the subsurface landowners as appropriate.

Question: Why are both NOAA and TDX listed on the table as owners for Tract 50?

Response: Site 58 crosses two properties. (NOAA currently owns the portion of Site 58 that is within Tract 50. TDX owns the property to the north.)

Comment: NOAA should delete this information or clarify.

Question: What does NTPA mean?

Response: It means non-two party agreement site. These sites follow the intent of the TPA, but were not added to the TPA to avoid unnecessary paperwork in a verbal understanding between the State and NOAA project managers.

Question: Is the Salt Lagoon Channel a navigable waterway of the United States? This would matter vis-à-vis who owns Site 35 (Salt Lagoon Diesel Seep Channel).

Response: The channel is a navigable waterway. Though NOAA listed the State of Alaska as the owner, NOAA is uncertain of the owner.

- St. George table
 - 36 Sites on the island required cleanup.
 - NOAA still needs to remediate Sites 1, 2, 29 (a.k.a TPA Site 25-1), 32, 35, and 36. PCS must be removed from the Oceanfront Sites (i.e., Sites 1, 2, and 29).
 - The PCS stockpile (Site 32) must be closed.
 - Sites 35 and 36 are groundwater sites with free phase diesel fuel on the groundwater. The State requires NOAA to address this issue.

Comment: Andy Kashevarof said some ownership information on the table is not correct. The oceanfront belongs to the City.

Response: Bernie Denno asked Andy to please mark up the table and provide the corrections to him.

Question: What is Site 34 – Public Health Service PCS Open Pits Site?

Response: This is the soil removed during sewer system upgrades. NOAA sampled the soil and found no PCS above cleanup levels.

Summary of Field Season's Work (Lindsay)

- Summary list distributed to introduce 2006 field season efforts.
- St. George
 - NOAA will conduct the Oceanfront Sites PCS removal.
 - The City will allow NOAA to place the PCS at the new landfill. In return, NOAA will help city close the interim landfill.
 - NOAA will conduct groundwater monitoring for 5 years at 10 wells located in the village. At the end of 5 years, data will be evaluated by NOAA and ADEC, and decisions on future monitoring will be made. Monitoring could go on for 25 years.
 - NOAA would like to begin installing wells on St. George for free product removal. Not clear yet whether funding will be available for this. NOAA will address this issue next year if no money is available this year. NOAA is, however, setting aside funds to prepare its drill rig for this work.
- St. Paul
 - NOAA will conduct groundwater monitoring at 36 wells.

- NOAA's Safety and Environmental Compliance Office (SECO) managed by Bernie Denno will manage the lead and asbestos abatement at a number of structures.
- NOAA will demolish the E-Shed and the Decommissioned Power Plant at the request of the Alaska delegation. Exposed PCS will require removal.

Comment: Victor Mercurief said the wells on Telegraph Hill should continue to be monitored. They are near the drinking water supply for the island. They should remain open until NOAA-FUDS issue is resolved.

Response: John Lindsay explained NOAA believes this is a Department of Defense (DOD)/Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) issue. NOAA has already decommissioned the wells due to security and liability concerns. Anyone could have gone up there and dumped hazardous materials into the wells. NOAA did not want to wait for the DOD to decide what to do. Bernie Denno reiterated that it is a liability issue. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) had the opportunity to accept the wells. NOAA gave them 90 days to accept. NOAA did not receive a response from the Corps.

Response: Louis Howard said the State believes the issues at Telegraph are the Corps responsibility. ADEC has sent the Corps a letter.

Comment: NOAA added some wells to the landspread site.

Comment: NOAA is trying to close as many unneeded wells at possible.

Comment: It seems birds get higher priority than people.

St. George Oceanfront Sites Cleanup (Malchow)

- Cleanup at the Oceanfront Sites to be conducted per the corrective action plan (CAP) approved by ADEC in 2004.
- Sites included in the CAP are TPA 1, 2, 3, and 25-1. Cleanup at TPA 3 was completed during 1997 and 2004. The remaining sites have an estimated 11,200 cubic yards of PCS requiring removal, primarily at TPA 1 and 2.
- TPA 1, the Former Diesel Tank Farm Site, had 21 10,000-gallon tanks. Records show at least one tank held gasoline and leaked. TPA 2 is the Former Drum Storage Area Site. Both TPA 1 and 2 operated in the 1950s to 1970s. TPA 25-1 is the E-W Fuel Supply Lines Sites. TPA 25-1 includes 4-inch lines installed in the 1950s that sat atop ground. Two 2-inch lines (gasoline, diesel) were installed when the other lines were taken out of use in 1970s. These lines sat atop pillars. TPA 3 is the Inactive Gas Station Site.
- In 1997, Tanaq removed two TPA 3 USTs and 1,600 cubic yards of PCS. Excavation was limited to the north and vertically due to septic tanks and equipment refusal.
- Woodward Cylde (1994), Hart Crowser (1995), and Tetra Tech (2001) conducted site characterizations at the Oceanfront Sites. The estimated 11,200 cubic yards requiring removal is based on modeling of their site characterization data.
- See St. George Oceanfront Cleanup presentation for figures depicting the areas and levels of contamination and the anticipated excavation extent for the Oceanfront Sites corrective action.
- Past investigation data, which is based on samples from fairly shallow bores and pits, indicate contamination concentrations primarily decrease with depth. However, if the concentrations actually increase at depths below past sampling locations, which has

been the case at other sites, the volume of soil requiring excavation may be much more than the estimated 11,200 cubic yards.

- The 2006 corrective action will focus on removing soil contaminated with diesel range organics (DRO) and gasoline range organics (GRO). Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (BTEX) have been detected at some locations in conjunction with GRO.
- In 2004, lead-contaminated soil at TPA 3 was removed.
- Tetra Tech prepared geologic cross sections from well logs. Toward the north end of the excavation area, the water table appears to be shallower than 15 feet below ground surface (bgs). Most soil 0-15 feet is fill or gravel in this area, so NOAA anticipates that groundwater may be reached during excavation near the coastline, which will potentially expose floating product.
- A sample from product recovered from wells in TPA Site 1 flashed at less than 140 °F, an indication of the presence of flammable liquid such as gasoline. Therefore, precautions must be exercised during excavation.

PCS Disposal and St. George Interim Landfill Closure (Malchow)

- PCS disposal on St. George has been an issue. The enhanced thermal conduction system (ETC) proved to be too expensive for continued use.
- The old landfill was closed with a geosynthetic cap. The central area within the closed landfill has been used as an interim cell with open burning.
- Under a land use agreement, NOAA can help the City close the interim cell. Two feet of PCS (approximately 2,000 cubic yards) could be placed over the area of the active burn to cover debris and ash.
- At the new landfill, day cover material will be needed by the City. A possible use for PCS is to stockpile it inside the landfill berm for use as day cover. If the PCS is stockpiled 5-foot high, 8,000-9,000 cubic yards would fit in approximately one half of the bermed area. NOAA would build an access road into the new landfill to facilitate hauling the PCS to the stockpile, and allow access by the City for use as day cover.

Comment: Max Malavansky indicated that according to a land use agreement, the City Council approved the placement of PCS at the new landfill. The interim landfill must be closed. Tanaq has expressed concerns about placing PCS at the interim landfill. While Max is familiar with the model for how long it takes oil to reach groundwater, others are not informed on the issue. Max feels NOAA should make a presentation on St. George to educate the community, the City Council, and the Tanaq Board on why NOAA believes it is safe to place PCS at the interim landfill. The City Council's approval is necessary before NOAA can proceed in using PCS to close the interim landfill.

Comment: Ed Philemonof acknowledged NOAA already placed PCS at the new landfill. At Tanaq's board meeting last month, the board passed a resolution objecting to placement of PCS at the interim landfill due to concerns of groundwater contamination. Tanaq, the City, and NOAA spoke a few days ago. Ed feels the only way to get past the board's objection is for NOAA and ADEC to have a hearing on St. George to get community approval. He thinks the community, the City, and Tanaq would sign off following an on-island presentation.

Comment: Max suggested a presentation be held on St. George in April. Without a place to put the PCS, the Oceanfront Sites cannot be cleaned up, and they need to be cleaned

up. Public education would help the situation. Also, the City Council's concerns should be heard and addressed.

Motion: Policy-makers [i.e., NOAA and ADEC] should hold a public meeting on St. George to discuss the placement of PCS on the interim landfill site (PCS disposal model and plan) and to educate the public. The date of the meeting to be determined.

Motion approved.

St. George Free Product Removal & Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring (Malchow)

- 47 2-inch monitoring wells installed between 2001 and 2003.
- 22 wells decommissioned in September 2005.
- 10 wells retained for plume monitoring.
- 15 wells retained for possible use during free-product extraction.
- NOAA plans to begin groundwater monitoring in May.
- NOAA will install six new 4-inch wells (two in the area of TPA 1, four in the Active Power Plant/Municipal Building area [TPA 8]) for product recovery.
- The free product plume at TPA 1 is diesel and gasoline; the plume at TPA 8 is diesel.
- NOAA intends to use pneumatic bladder pumps with hydrophobic chambers to remove the free product. Once the chamber becomes full, air will cause the bladder to push oil out and into drums. This system is designed to minimize the amount of water entering the drums. There are alarms that will indicate if water gets into drum, or if drums spill into a secondary containment. The system will include remote monitoring from Anchorage via modem.
- Belt skimmer system and vacuum assistance were also evaluated, but belt skimming brought up too much water and vacuum assistance did not increase production appreciably.
- Based on tests and modeling, SLR Alaska estimates the volume of free product in the areas of TPA 1 and TPA 8 at 2,000 gallons. Previous estimates put the free product volume at greater than 40,000 gallons.
- Recovered product may be used as fuel in a used oil burner.
- See St. George Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring and Free Product Removal presentation for figures depicting well and free product locations.
- SLR Alaska estimates that the first 3 years of product removal will be the most productive. After 3 years, a determination will be made as to whether it is cost effective to keep the systems running.

Question: Is this the same design as use at the St. Paul LORAN station?

Response: No, that was high vacuum extraction.

St. Paul 10x Rule and Critical Water Management Area (Howard)

- Louis Howard of ADEC provided an update from Gary Prokosch of Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR).
- The commissioner of the DNR is expected to sign off on the Critical Water Management Area (CWMA) this month. The area will then be noted on land records.
- The CWMA serves as an institutional control. The industrial area of St. Paul has contaminated groundwater. ADEC asked NOAA to determine contamination locations and levels, and then propose institutional controls to prevent the use of contaminated groundwater. DNR's CWMA is the only way for the State to control

groundwater use. This will put restrictions in place, such as prohibiting the installation of wells. The main purpose of the CWMA is to prohibit access and exposure to contaminated groundwater and to prohibit the installation of and extraction from wells, which could lead to the spread of the contamination.

St. Paul Long-Term Groundwater Monitoring (Malchow)

- 87 wells installed by NOAA on NOAA and Department of Defense (DOD) sites between 1996 and 2004.
- 38 wells decommissioned in October 2005.
- 36 wells retained for long-term monitoring at 5 sites.
- 13 wells that may be transferred to third parties or decommissioned.
- NOAA removed aboveground stickups at all decommissioned wells, except for two at Telegraph Hill due to the stickups being welded to the well casing. NOAA will remove those at a later date.
- NOAA will monitor groundwater under the village, the Diesel Seep Site, the Icehouse Lake Site, and the landfill.
- The purpose of monitoring is twofold. Sentinel wells, which past sampling has found no contaminants above cleanup levels, will be monitored twice a year to ensure groundwater contamination is not moving outside the CWMA. The remaining wells have DRO, GRO and BTEX contamination levels above cleanup standards, and will be monitored once a year to gage contaminant concentration trends in order to measure the effectiveness of NOAA's mitigation efforts.
- Wells by ATCO are to be either transferred to a potentially responsible party for cleanup in that area (not a NOAA responsibility) or decommissioned.
- The Diesel Seep Site has two wells that will be monitored, one in which DRO contamination has consistently been found, the other at the edge of the excavation site that will be used as a sentinel well.
- The Ice House Lake Site has three wells that will be monitored; one in which DRO, GRO and lead contamination has been found, the other two wells down gradient will be used as sentinel wells.
- The landfill will have eight wells monitored for GRO, DRO, BTEX, and lead. Constituents to be monitored include the types of contaminants in the soil used to cap the landfill as well as lead, which was found during one sampling event in one landfill well.
- Monitoring will be conducted for five years, and then the data will be evaluated to determine future monitoring needs.
- The landspread area will have four wells monitored for GRO, DRO, and BTEX. NOAA will monitor the landspread area for three years before evaluating data to determine future needs.
- Four wells at the adjacent Oil Drum Dump Site either be transferred to DOD or decommissioned. This site is a FUDS issue, and the wells onsite are contaminated.

Summary of St. Paul Lead/Asbestos Abatement Activities (Denno)

- Houses 101, 102, 103 were built before 1960 and are residences. Therefore, before property transfer is completed the lead-based paint hazards must be abated in a way that will last for 20 years. Twenty years is considered to be permanent by definition.
- House 101: will be gutted due to lead-based paint, asbestos, and mold issues. Some wood trim and doors will be salvaged and given to the Tribe for potential reuse if they

renovate the house. Basement floor, walls, and ceiling to have lead-based paint removed. Asbestos is located on heating system elements and will be removed.

- House 102: will have some lead-based paint drywall removed, but most will be repaired and encapsulated using specialized paints. Friction surfaces painted with lead-based paint will be removed (doors, windows, etc). Asbestos-containing material on exposed pipes to be removed. Basement floor, walls, and ceiling to have lead-based paint removed. Windows to be replaced.
- House 103: efforts will be similar to House 102 but less interior work is needed due to recent renovations performed by the Tribe.
- On the house exteriors, the National Park Service would like NOAA to preserve the historic look. The Tribe expressed concerns with removing House 101 and House 102 T111 siding and insulation. Currently the plan is to keep the T111 siding in place. NOAA may propose applying concrete-based exterior panels colored white to keep original look but leave insulation in tact. Negotiations with SHPO will determine final actions/design.
- Duplex: lead-based paint and asbestos issues. Windows will be replaced with windows to match historic look. NOAA has historic photos of building on which to base design.
- Headstart: lead paint will be removed above the suspended ceiling on walls and ceiling. There is also an asbestos issue in the crawl space. It is planned to encapsulate the paint on the exterior surfaces with specialized paint. Concrete panels may also be used on the exterior surfaces, as an option.
- 5-Car Garage: has asbestos ceiling in poor condition. NOAA will remove 220 square feet of material and replace with non-asbestos sheetrock. Because this building is not a residence, NOAA is only required to identify the location of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing material. An operations and maintenance plan will be provided to the new owner when the property is transferred.
- There are lead paint chips around some buildings. NOAA will first attempt to remove visible lead chips from the ground surface using a HEPA vacuum. NOAA will subsequently test lead concentrations to determine whether soil removal is necessary. Removed soil may be a hazardous waste requiring off-island disposal.
- Anyone in the community removing paint from a building should capture the paint chips. This is a community issue.
- NOAA and Bering Sea Eccotech (BSE) are still looking into the types of materials available for restoration.

Question: What about the Machine Shop?

Response: Bernie responded that as with the 5-Car Garage, NOAA will identify lead-based paint and provide an operations and maintenance plan with the property transfer.

Question: How will NOAA prioritize the abatement work?

Response: Bernie said that NOAA will work with BSE. House 101 is the only house that is not a priority.

Comment: Keep in mind that Headstart does not operate in the summer.

Comment: Robert Melovidov said the Tribe would really like to have the Headstart work complete by the beginning of August.

Comment: Bernie Denno indicated that NOAA must also work out issues with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Comment: Ron Philemonoff stated that Pat Baker is concerned about what condition the building will be left in after the lead-based paint is removed.

Comment: Bernie: NOAA will remove or encapsulate lead-based paint and replace the suspended ceiling. NOAA recommends the tribe insulate the ceiling to prevent condensation. NOAA will also abate asbestos in the building's crawl space and remove items from the attic. Concrete panels may be used to cover the building's exterior. The building will be fit for use. The facility needs to be inspected for electrical and HVAC deficiencies noted during a walk through several months ago. Since this is a facility used by children the systems should be upgraded to highest standards to ensure the safety of the occupants.

Question: Ron Philemonoff asked, can the NOAA abatement money be used to match the federal grant that the tribe received to rehabilitate the Headstart Building?

Response: John Lindsay said Public Law 106-562 allows economic development funds as match for other federal grant programs. Does this work if you call abatement "economic development?" Not sure. Will have to look into this.

Question: Will the cupboards in House 102 be replaced?

Response: Yes, NOAA will replace the cupboards. NOAA cannot leave lead-painted friction surfaces in place.

Question: Will NOAA address relocation for residents during the abatement work?

Response: Bernie: NOAA is not authorized to provide a place for families to stay while work is being conducted. NOAA will work with home owners to schedule the work. NOAA does not have any legal or other agreements with current occupants.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff stated that at the last St. Paul Island RAB, there was a discussion regarding the need for people occupying buildings prior to transfer under the TOPA to sign an indemnification agreement. TDX reviewed the agreement and does not intend to sign it as written. They have communicated the issues in a letter.

Response: Bernie Denno indicated he had not seen the letter.

Response: Ron said Bernie should check with Craig O'Connor.

Summary of St. Paul Building Demolition & PCS Removal Activities

Question: Debbie Lestenkof asked, before starting the presentation can someone explain the background that lead to the decision to demolish the buildings?

Response: Ron Philemonoff stated that TDX created a development plan 10-12 years ago. The Decommissioned Power Plant and the Equipment Shed are in the way of a planned road. TDX is planning to level the area, straighten out the road, and build a fish processing facility.

Question: The plan was created 10-12 years ago, has it been reevaluated to determine if other community members have a need for the buildings?

Response: Ron Philemonoff said the plan has been discussed on occasions, including RAB meetings, and TDX has heard people's concerns. Some buildings are hazardous and as a result cost the community money.

Response: Elary Gromoff indicated TDX had discussed the plan with the City in a public forum.

Comment: Bernie Denno stated that NOAA's response has always been that it is not in the TPA for NOAA to demolish the buildings. Recently, however, the funding from the

2006 appropriation has provided funding to perform additional work, including the ability for NOAA to demolish the buildings in question.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff said he can appreciate the unique structure of the Equipment Shed and asked if an effort can be made to save some of the structural members from the building. He indicated TDX might like to save the roof trusses and reuse in a building the community can appreciate. Concrete buildings, however, are of no use to TDX.

Response: NOAA can set aside unique structural members if it can be done cost effectively. However, some of the structural elements are in poor condition and NOAA is concerned that these will be used at other locations. It is strongly suggested that an engineering evaluation be made regarding future use of these materials. NOAA will place these materials as demolition debris and any future use of these materials is not the responsibility of NOAA. NOAA will properly dispose of the materials otherwise.

Question: The SHPO asked NOAA for a copy of TDX's development plan. Can NOAA get a copy?

Response: Ron Philemonoff said NOAA could receive a copy.

Comment: Bernie: SHPO is obviously concerned that NOAA will be conducting the demolition of a listed historic building. It is one of a few remaining historic facilities tied with the sealing operation. Even though it is only a "support" structure it is relevant to the island's history.

Response: Ron Philemonoff stated that the Equipment Shed roof is only temporarily fixed, the walls have issues, and it is not structurally sound beyond 5-10 years. The building is historical, but it will fall down if it's not knocked down.

Response: Victor Mercurief said limited space in the harbor district contributes to the problem.

Comment: Bernie: SHPO is very concerned that the Equipment Shed and the 5- and 6-Car Garages will be the only industrial, historic buildings left on St. Paul. SHPO may review the historic elements of St. Paul and possibly submit a new nomination regarding the historic district.

Comment: Debbie Lestenkof said she just visited Shetland, Scotland, and Ireland. They preserve historic buildings and capitalize on them. She is disappointed to see the approach being taken on St. Paul.

Presentation (Wright)

- Equipment Shed has seven bow trusses.
- Structural engineers evaluated the trusses and found rotting on the ends, compromising their integrity. It could be difficult to move them and salvage them.
- Lead-based paint was used on all wood painted on the Equipment Shed. If painted wood fails hazardous waste tests (*i.e.*, TCLP), it would be disposed off island. If not, NOAA's plan is to landfill the wood on NOAA's Tract 42, though other options for disposal are still on the table.
- The Decommissioned Power Plant has a small amount of lead-based paint trim and doors.
- The concrete is not a hazardous waste and will be landfilled on island.

- There is an aboveground storage tank inside the Decommissioned Power Plant. It contains some sort of oil product. NOAA will remove the liquid and dispose of the tank.
- The Gantry crane and tracks have lead-based paint, but it is not a hazard. NOAA wants to remove these items for potential reuse.
- The Decommissioned Power Plant is not painted with lead-based paint. Metal parts will be shipped off island for recycling. .
- BSE will be tasked to determine how to conduct the demolition effort.
- Once buildings and foundations are removed, PCS removal will be required. The excavated PCS will be disposed at NOAA's landspreading area.

Question: Is it possible that the contractor be directed to demolish the saltwater well houses?

Response: John L.: NOAA management determined NOAA would not demolish these because the Alaska delegation has not explicitly directed NOAA to do so.

Question: Is there lead-based paint or asbestos on the three well houses?

Response: Bernie: NOAA will conduct testing next week to determine if there is lead or asbestos-containing material inside these buildings. NOAA has to test and disclose the results for property transfer.

Question: The wells have been capped already, right?

Response: Yes.

Question: What about lead-based paint on the Machine Shop exterior siding?

Response: The Machine Shop is not being addressed this year.

RAB Membership Review

- Linda Snow was nominated to represent the City of St. Paul, replacing John R. Mercurief.
- Robert Melovidov, president of the Tribal Government of St. Paul Island, will replace Richard Zacharof.
- Chris Mercurief will replace Anthony B. Mercurief.
- Ed Philemonof, Tanaq CEO, will replace Mark Mercurief.
- An updated RAB membership list will be sent out with notes. RAB members should verify that their contact information is correct, and let NOAA know if it is not.

Telegraph Hill Wells

- NOAA invested effort at the site prior to the determination that it is a FUDS site.
- NOAA sent a summary report of Telegraph Hill investigations to the State.
- By definition, the site is not contaminated. Soil and groundwater do not exceed ADEC regulatory cleanup standards. There is some petroleum in soil, but that doesn't mean it's "contaminated."
- Based on studies, the site is not posing an unacceptable risk to drinking water.
- Drums are still being found at the site.

Comment: Victor Mercurief said he knows the city has found drums at this site as they've mined scoria. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and NOAA brought the drums from Amchitka Island.

Comment: Louis Howard said that ADEC has asked the Corps to put the site on their list, and they've put it on their list, but it is not a priority. ADEC won't be able to push them to raise priority given NOAA did not find contamination in wells.

Question: What must be done to raise its priority?

Response: Elary Gromoff said if the landowner plans to develop the land, the landowner can send a letter to the Corps indicating the plans, and the Corps will increase the site's priority.

Question: Jason Bourdukofsky asked if NOAA is sure that the Corps is responsible for the drums at the site. He believes NOAA is responsible; he was probably involved himself.

Response: Between 1984 and 1986 the Corps hired Chase Construction and an island entity to identify FUDS sites. Their report identified the Telegraph Hill drum site as a FUDS and included references to agent logs saying where they disposed of FUDS drums. This doesn't mean NOAA or the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries didn't contribute. At the Oil Drum Dump Site, the Corps segregated 400 drums out of 4,000 drums that they identified as NOAA drums. These drums eventually dumped over and spilled. Per Public Law 106-562, NOAA cannot spend its funding to cleanup DOD problems.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff said a lot of drums were stamped U.S. Army, so Corps assumed they were theirs. However, drum disposal occurred in the 1960s or 1970s by NOAA using excessed drums.

Comment: Victor Mercurief stated that there are still drums that are full.

Comment: John Lindsay said the government is responsible, but it's just a matter of which agency. The Corps, ADEC, and NOAA previously met, and Corps said they're no longer responsible.

Comment: Jason Bourdukofsky said Pribilovians should have participated in the meeting.

Public Comments

Comment: Iliodor (Ed) Philemonof brought up the issue of lead and children. All homes on the islands were painted with lead-based paint. Children have been playing around this lead for years. He recommended that NOAA do sampling around houses on St. George for lead, stating people should take precedence over seals and birds.

Response: NOAA worked with the Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Association (APIA) on St. Paul Island to use lead kits to test children's lead levels. NOAA could talk to APIA about doing this on St. George. NOAA has no current plans to perform additional lead testing on St. George.

Comment: The community may not know or understand about the testing. The St. Paul testing focused on Headstart school children. It should be extended to other children.

Response: Communication efforts were made on several levels to ensure that the lead testing for the children was effective. NOAA held a community meeting at the school. Radio announcements were made prior to the meeting, and radio interviews were held to provide additional information to the community. The interviews were played and provided information regarding the lead testing initiative being coordinated by the health clinic. The school is responsible for teaching kids to wash hands when coming in from

the playground, etc. NOAA did go to the school and talk with the teachers. The results of the APIA/Health Clinic lead testing: Thirty kids were sampled, and no elevated blood lead levels were found.

Comment: NOAA does not have a mandate to sample around buildings that have been transferred. Houses were theoretically transferred in good condition at the time of transfer. When property is transferred, the responsibility to maintain the property is transferred to the new owners. There is no obligation under current laws for NOAA to conduct this sampling. Congress said a revolving fund could be set up to fund loans for PCS and lead soil testing and removal around old houses. If this doesn't meet the RABs needs, citizens have alternatives to try and get NOAA a mandate.

Comment: Debbie Lestenkof stated that Pribilovians as American's have the right, duty and privilege to do things for themselves when in a position to do so. Pushing things onto the government could result in a loss of freedom in how to address local problems. Also, let's not forget the importance of seals in subsistence.

Comment: Ed Philemonof stated that under the Fur Seal Act, the government is responsible for health and welfare of the Aleuts on Pribilof Islands.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff stated that the RAB needs to be the voice for the community and be on record as being concerned.

Comment: Bernie: reiterated that any future lead-based paint removals in the community needs to be performed correctly to prevent exposures or the spread of lead into the community. The lead paint law passed 1992 is what requires NOAA to abate houses before transfer. Older houses were transferred before 1992, so there was no requirement for NOAA to abate at the time of the earlier transfers.

Comment: Ed Philemonof said NOAA should work with EPA or the Public Health Service to get house testing done.

Motion: NOAA should take soil and interior samples around and inside each previously transferred home for lead paint chips and petroleum-based contamination in the best interest of the Aleut people on the island.

Motion passed.

Question: What was the fate of the \$2 million that might have gone towards economic development?

Response: Congressional language stated that it was NOAA's discretion to provide up to \$2 million for economic development. The abatement [and demolition] work will be conducted with the funding. NOAA will use local contractors to support its fieldwork so the funding will contribute to economic development.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff said he feels NOAA went to Don Young and Ted Stevens and indicated most of the money was needed for cleanup. Neither Young or Stevens were pleased with the situation.

Response: John L.: indicated that was not the whole story.

Comment: If there is any money that is not used on the abatement, demolition, or PCS removal, it is NOAA's understanding that the funds may go towards other cleanup issues.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff stated that RAB members are upset that NOAA has never supported economic development. Given FY07 is the last year available for economic development, it would be nice if NOAA supported economic development.

Response: John Lindsay said it is his understanding that Congress authorized a pool for cleanup money and a separate pot for economic development; however, Congress is treating this as one pot.

Motion: NOAA senior management should recommend to the Alaska congressional delegation that economic development funds be appropriated in FY2007.

Motion passed.

Comment: Ron Philemonoff said Young and Stevens say it would be helpful if NOAA would come to them and state that it supports economic development rather than saying that it is not part of NOAA's mission.

Closing Remarks; Tentative Date for Next Meeting

June—Next meeting on-island during field season

September—Joint meeting

Meeting adjourned at 12:08.

END OF RECORD