

Environmental Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes
February 21, 2007

Opening

The regular meeting of the Environmental Steering Committee (ESC) was called to order at 1:00 pm (EDT) on February 21, 2007 by James Biasco.

Roll Call

Members Present:

James Biasco, Chair

Steve Aoyama

Gordon Delchamps

Roger DeRoos

Gary Gefroh

Paul Geisert

Burke Helmer

CJ Means

Keith Shortall

John Smart

Members Absent:

Dale Mossefin

Deanne Waconda

Others Present:

N/A

NOTE: voting members are shown in bold type.

A. Old Business

1. Environmental Health and Safety Awareness Guide

- Roger discussed the Guide, its history, and timeline for completion. It is in final draft and the IRT will review and discuss one more time after which, it will be sent to the ESC for review. It should be ready for distribution by April 2007.
- It is intended to be a brief desk compendium for CEO's to understand their environmentally-related responsibilities.
- It may be desirable to have the Facility Manager become familiar with the Guide and make the CEO's aware of the requirements.

- John asked whether the Guide should be tied to the NEPA Guide that is on the EHSC Web site.
- We discussed how we want to implement and distribute the Guide. It was suggested to use a Technical Handbook chapter similar to how the *Guidance Document for Managing Hazardous Materials in IHS Buildings* was implemented.

ACTION ITEM: James will check with Tom Gaulke to see where they distributed the *Facilities Engineering Guide*.

ACTION ITEM: The IRT will discuss how to post and distribute the Guide.

2. Environmental Assessments/Audits

- Roger discussed what we will accomplish with the updated audit process and the IRT that was put together to develop the guidance.
- The IRT has met one time and another meeting has been scheduled. The first meeting was spent briefing the members on the history, background, desired outcome, etc.
- Milestones for the process will be developed during the next IRT meeting. One milestone will be to perform pilot audits at approximately six facilities of different size, function, and location.
- The process should be useable by IHS (internal) auditors or by external auditors (contractors).
- We are trying to determine what other agencies are doing.
- We are looking at CPTrack to determine if and how it will help meet our needs.
- It will take time to determine the overall direction we should go with the process.
- Roger asked whether anyone knows of other audit processes that could be adapted to our needs, e.g., NOAA, Coast Guard, VA, etc.

ACTION ITEM: If you know of a good audit process, please contact Roger.

3. On-line Document Repository

- ES-Seattle is gathering reports and having them scanned. A listing of available documents is located at <http://www.des.ihs.gov/index.cfm?module=envasr>.

- It is anticipated that all available environmental assessments will be available by early April. Existing hazardous material, lead, and asbestos studies should be available by 30 April.
- There are currently no documents available on-line. According to Steven Christopher, the first phase will include only documents that were on the shelves at ES-Seattle. He was unaware of any reports provided from Area Offices or facilities.

ACTION ITEM: Gordon will contact ES-Seattle and request additional reports, if any, from the Areas.

4. Technical Documents

a. Technical Handbook Chapters

i. Assessment/Audit Workgroup and new ESC members

- When the new audit process is developed, related Technical Handbook chapters will require updating. It is proposed that the IRT undertake this assignment as it contains all but one of the new ESC members.

b. Guidance Document

i. O&M Plans

- This item has been discussed before but no conclusions were reached.
- Good O&M plans are sometimes required as we do not completely remove (remediate/abate) all environmental materials. Therefore, plans are needed for any materials left in buildings or on site.
- We need to determine whether we want a “standard” template for O&M plans. A standard format is preferable to content with lists of references. Also, should any templates/guidelines be in a separate document?
- John suggested that future inspection contracts include requirements for O&M plans.
- James requested that Roger convene the Guidance Document IRT to specify the content and format of O&M plans (if you are doing an O&M plan it needs to include this information in this format). It could be either an addendum to the Guidance Document or a short stand-alone Technical Handbook chapter.

ACTION: Roger will convene the Guidance Document IRT to develop content and format requirements for O&M plans.

ii. UST's

- New regulations will be in effect to allow the EPA or state to inspect tanks that have not been inspected within a specified time period. If there are no problems they are alright. If there are problems, they must be corrected within a certain time period.
- The new IHS NEPA Manual has information on storage tanks.
- The Aberdeen Area had FOH inspect their tanks.
- The discussion will be tabled until further notice as IHS has only 16 tanks.

ACTION: Gary will send Gordon information he has related to tanks.

5. Previous Projects

a. San Xavier Lagoon

- This project was agreed to in 2003 and will provide environmental funds to correct environmental problems associated with the sewage lagoons serving the San Xavier compound. James Biasco will honor the previously made commitment and fund the project.

ACTION: The Area must provide an updated PSD, current cost estimate, and explain how this work is in addition to what was already approved.

b. Lawton Campus-wide

- This project was withdrawn by the Oklahoma Area.

c. Status updates from Areas

- Since we do not have closure on any of the projects funded with Environmental Remediation or Demolition funds. There is a draft Technical Handbook Chapter 75-6 titled *Final Reports for Environmental Remediation and Demolition Projects*. However, it has not been used and no reports have been submitted.

Beginning with projects funded last cycle (July 2006), the Committee requires close-out reports for all projects funded with Environmental Remediation funds and/or Demolition funds. Until final determination is

made regarding the chapters, the reports should comply with Chapter 24-8 *Project Final Report* dated September 30, 1996. If reports are not received for projects funded from this cycle forward further funding will not be awarded.

- Status reports can be posted on the ESC Web site as they become available.

ACTION ITEM: Gordon will ask each Area to update the status of each previously funded project and provide reports as required.

6. Position on Mold

a. Gary to draft position with rationale for Handbook chapter

- Gary Gefroh will develop the Committee's position on mold. The position will contain rationale for the *decision* and will be incorporated into a Technical Handbook chapter.

ACTION ITEM: Gary will research several sources and develop the official position paper.

B. New Business

1. Funds Available Recap

- We discussed the funds balances and the listings of Environmental Remediation and Demolition projects awarded.
- We have environmental remediation projects to perform and buildings to dispose of. We need the Areas to submit PSD's for funding.
- The call for PSD's included Area totals of environmental deficiencies listed in HFDS and instructions how to print a report that will show buildings they indicate are to be demolished or transferred – HFDS, Admin Tab, FAQ's, General, Vacant Excess Building Report.
- The following funds are currently available:
 - \$8,707,155 – Environmental Remediation.
 - \$1,146,694 – Demolition.

NOTE: The above numbers reflect anticipated FY-2007 amounts of \$3M for Environmental Remediation and \$500,000 for Demolition. Also, as we are still under Continuing Resolution, the anticipated numbers do not reflect any rescission that may occur in the actual budget.

2. PSD Review and Project Award

- A total of three (3) PSD's for Environmental Remediation projects and three (3) Demolition projects were submitted, received, and reviewed by the ESC.
- Each PSD was reviewed and discussed in detail by the ESC.

a. Environmental Remediation Projects

- **ACTION ITEM:** The ESC requested that each respective Area **provide clarification** regarding the following two (2) Environmental Remediation projects:
 - Aberdeen – Mandaree and Twin Buttes Health Stations Hazardous Materials Remediation (AB6FB013C6) – \$41,000

It was unclear exactly what has been tested and what the findings were. Gary will look at the report to determine what was and was not tested. He will then e-mail the ESC with his opinion regarding whether additional testing is required. The Area should consider including development of O&M plans in the project.

ACTION ITEM: Gary will review report and e-mail ESC who will then re-review.

- Alaska – Tanana Environmental Remediation (AN0TN485Z7) – \$2,432,000

Phase 1 is fundable and the Committee commits to funding the remediation associated with Phase 2 and Phase 3 contingent on approval by Alaska DEQ.

Phase 1 is to be broken into Phase 1a which will include all of Phase 1 not included in Phase 1b. Phase 1b will consist of testing the remediation area, a pilot study of the remediation area, and a two-acre remediation area. The estimated cost of Phase 1b is $\$99,900 + \$33,800 = \$133,700$.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will revise the cost estimates to clearly show how much of each Phase is environmental remediation and how much is demolition.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will determine and advise when it is anticipated that Phase 2 and Phase 3 will be ready for funding.

- **ACTION ITEM:** The ESC **recommended against funding** the following one (1) Environmental Remediation project:
 - Oklahoma – Abatement of Asbestos Containing Thermal Systems Insulation Building 2 – Room 319 – \$43,464

When replacement costs are removed the project does not meet the funding threshold. The facility can combine with another project to address all environmental issues at once and submit for consideration in the next round. Also, if workers are in a “hazardous” area, the facility should develop O&M plans and consider performing air sampling.

b. Demolition Projects

- **ACTION ITEM:** The ESC requested that the Area **provide clarification** regarding the following Demolition project:
 - Alaska – Maniilaq Association Building 310 Demolition – \$117,000

The project is tentatively fundable but further information is required. If a more studied approach were taken the project could be more cost effective. What is the extent of the contamination? Can the siding be removed and the rest be disposed of locally? Is one TCLP sufficient? Can the disposal be combined with other projects to help reduce costs? The Area needs to provide explanations for the statements regarding regulatory risk.

ACTION ITEM: The Area must provide answers to the questions above.

- Alaska – Tanana Environmental Remediation (AN0TN485Z7) – \$2,316,500

Phase 1 is fundable and the Committee commits to funding the remediation associated with Phase 2 and Phase 3 contingent on approval by Alaska DEQ.

Phase 1 is to be broken into Phase 1a which will include all of Phase 1 not included in Phase 1b. Phase 1b will consist of testing

the remediation area, a pilot study of the remediation area, and a two-acre remediation area. The estimated cost of Phase 1b is $\$99,900 + \$33,800 = \$133,700$.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will revise the cost estimates to clearly show how much of each Phase is environmental remediation and how much is demolition.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will determine and advise when it is anticipated that Phase 2 and Phase 3 will be ready for funding.

- **ACTION ITEM:** The ESC recommended funding the following Demolition project:
 - Tucson – Demolition of San Xavier Buildings 621T, 624T, 625T, 626T, and 627T (TU4SX033Z7) – \$25,745

3. Dental Decommissioning Pilot

- The ESC recommended funding \$15,944 and requested that the FDA provide a copy of the study design. Several drafts were received but did not provide information that satisfied our questions/concerns. The item is on hold until such time EPA provides satisfactory information.

4. New Members

- a. Burke Helmer filled the spot vacated by Roger Carmichael.
- b. Paul Giesert joined as an ex-officio member.

5. Other New Business

- We discussed the possibility of requiring an executive summary in addition to the PSD. Some PSD's are very long and cumbersome to read, interpret, and determine exact amounts of funding requested.

James explained the history of the PSD and that they used to be 30-40 pages long. He suggested that we may want to rewrite the Technical Handbook chapters to specify exactly what information we want in the PSD's for Environmental Remediation or Demolition. We should determine how much information we need to make an informed decision. We will leave the process unchanged for now and will readdress as required in the future.

- PSD's can be submitted at any time and they will be addressed at the next ESC meeting.

C. Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next Environmental Steering Committee meeting will be scheduled for May 2007. The agenda will be developed and distributed to all members prior to the meeting.

D. Adjournment

James Biasco adjourned the meeting at 3:30 PM EDT.

Minutes submitted by: Gordon Delchamps

Approved by: James R. Biasco