Minutes

Project:	Umiat Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS)
Subject:	2022 Community Meeting
Date:	Tuesday, June 14, 2022
Time:	6:30 – 8:30 PM AKST
Location:	Nuiqsut City Offices & Online via Zoom

In-Person Attendees	Andy Sorum, USACE	Lucas Germain
	Col. Damon Delarosa, USACE	Leroy Symbol
	Kendall Campbell, USACE	Maryanne Napageak
	Melissa Scully, USACE	Robert Lampe
	Josie Wilson, HDR	George Seilak
	Rosemary Ahtuangaruak	Lillian Lampe
	Jeremiah Ahmeksa	Austin Bennett
	Erik Kenning	Kevin Bennett
	Jamie Kasah	
	Joe Barron	
Virtual Attendees	James Nunley	Harmony Hirtch
	Jamie McKellar	Kamalesh Pinisetti
	Melody Debenham	Chastity Olemund
	Jim Peterson	Ashley Gilbert
	Scott Szmyd	Ian Stroud
	Harry Brower	Rob Benkovik
	Kelly Walker	Lisa Geist, USACE
	Mayble Kaulk	Jenny Merrill, HDR

Our Goal: Clean Up and Close Out

Welcome, Roll Call, and Safety Moment

Andy Sorum welcomed attendees and thanked everyone for attending.

Josie Wilson conducted a safety moment on the exit plan for in-person attendees in the event of an emergency.

Josie mentioned the meeting was being recorded and minutes will be provided after the meeting.

Maryann led the attendees in a prayer.

Col. Delarosa provided opening remarks. Col. Delarosa expressed appreciation for the attendees' time and commitment to participate in the FUDS program. The mutually beneficial relationships between USACE and Alaska native communities and corporations provides the project team local expertise and perspective to ensure successful project delivery. Col. Delarosa stated the purpose of his attendance is to reestablish open and transparent communication with the community as USACE moves forward with the environmental remediation efforts in the Umiat Landfill.

Andy and Josie conducted a roll call.

Project Site/Properties Update

Andy provided a presentation on the Umiat FUDS project updates.
See slides attached and summarized below.

Slide 3 CERCLA Process

- CERCLA is an acronym for a federal law that was passed. It stands for the Comprehensive Environmental Responsibility Compensation and Liability Act.
- CERCLA is the preferred framework for FUDS work.
- The CERCLA process roadmap includes:
  1. Site Discovery – officially identifying a property and project for potential remediation. The Umiat Landfill Site Discovery occurred in November 1990
  2. Remedial Investigation – determine the nature and extent of contamination
  3. Risk Assessment – evaluate the risk to human health and environment
  4. Feasibility Study – evaluate potential remedies or alternatives.
  5. Proposed Plan – identify preferred remedial alternative and allow for public comment. The public comment period for the Umiat FUDS was 12 February to 23 April 2018. All stakeholders, landowners, affected people had the opportunity to comment and influence the remedy. The community provided fantastic feedback for USACE to alter the remedy.
  6. Decision Document/Record of Decision (DD/ROD) – officially document the selected remedy which is signed into a legal decision at the USACE headquarters. Approval for the Umiat FUDS occurred on 27 September 2019.
  7. Remedial Action – implement the selected remedy. The Umiat FUDS program is currently funded for remedial design.

8. Long Term Management – includes monitoring, inspecting, and sampling. This phase occurs if the remedy is complete, but the risk has not been completely mitigated.
9. Closeout – demonstrates remedial objectives were complete. LTM is complete. Collaborative effort between all stakeholders, landowners, and the state regulatory entity agree the remedies have been implemented, the risk is mitigated, and the project is complete.

Rosemary commented that past remedial work was completed at the site, but there were problems with the equipment due to the characterization of the soils. Rosemary asked, what are the alternatives after that fact?

Andy responded to Rosemary that Andy is not familiar with the exact problems or which project Rosemary referred to, but Andy will take the action to research and follow up. Andy mentioned USACE has completed extensive work at Umiat, including the test wells. USACE could not easily remediate the PCB contaminants onsite, the remedial actions that USACE has implemented over the last 12 years have been offsite disposal operations. USACE achieved closeout on test well-9 and was working in the drainage below test well-9. Over the last five to six years, USACE investigated the other test wells. As a result of the evaluation of the eligibility of the FUDS program funding, a decision was made that the test wells were no longer eligible for funding. The test well projects were closed out, other partially completed work were transitioned to federal land manager with the Department of the Interior. Andy will check on any other attempted remediations in the area and follow up.

Rosemary asked Andy, what quantity of soil was dealt with and what is the characterization of soil was left.

Andy responded to Rosemary that USACE is happy to share that information and follow up on field actions. Reports are also shared with regulators to ensure documentation of the results of any field work completed.

Josie added that Lisa Geist may have some of the field work documentation. Lisa took the action to provide that documentation.

Slide 4- Umiat Landfill Approximate Location Looking North

- Image depicting airfield in the background, vegetation over the landfill, and low ground that runs right through and along the edge of the landfill. Higher ground at the top of the image that will faction onto the remedy.

Rosemary asked Andy, is the low ground considered the slough or is that next to the riverbank?

Andy responded to Rosemary that the area is considered a seasonally running river, or possibly a slough, but definitely a seasonally flooded flood channel.

Slide 5- Landfill Selected Remedy

Andy mentioned the selected remedy information summary on this slide originated from the public decision document. USACE took the action to post the decision document on the project website: www.umiatrab.com. USACE distributed electronic and hard copies of the decision document with the administrative records information repository in town.

In the decision document, the selected remedy was described by:

- Removal of the landfill content from the Colville River floodplain.
- Separate excavated material into waste streams.
    - PCB contaminants will be separated for appropriate disposal.
    - Petroleum contaminants will be isolated.
    - Inert debris, like metal, that doesn't represent a specific contaminant, it will be isolated from the rest of the contaminants.
    - All debris will be separated for individual handling.
- Inert debris will be placed into a newly created monofill
- Offsite disposal of hazardous substances including:
    - PCBs, high-content lead, or other substances that cannot be disposed locally.
    - Substances are taken from an ice road to the haul road and placed on a barge and delivered to a landfill in the lower 48 that is licensed for those substances.
    - Offsite disposal means off the Umiat property, and likely not in the state of Alaska
- Onsite treatment of eligible contaminated soils, e.g., thermal treatment, landfarming, or stabilization.
    - USACE has the capability to complete remediation of low levels of petroleum contaminated soil onsite, achieve the appropriate cleanup standard, and then reuse it onsite.
    - Use innovated technology to save cost, time, and effort by not hauling away low-grade treatable soils that the project team can remediate onsite.

- Treated soils that meet cleanup levels may be used the monofill, for road maintenance, or at the handling pad.

Mayor Brower asked Andy, is there any update on debris from the landfill site that has possibly moved down river with flood stage.

Andy responded to Mayor Brower that USACE is aware the flood state of the Colville River is quite high one to two times a year. USACE has the ability to follow contamination that leaves a delineated property. To the extent that contaminants move off the delineated property, USACE has the opportunity to ensure cleanup is applied to those contaminants. Andy also noted USACE has been conducting annual surveys of the landfill since 2011 to identify contaminants with the potential to mobilize. During several surveys, USACE found batteries and disposed of the batteries properly. Melissa and Andy are scheduled to complete another survey in 2022 to examine the landfill and take immediate action to mitigate the risk of contaminates with the potential to mobilize.

Josie commented that if members of the community see any potential contaminates, please contact Andy with location details like latitude and longitude, or position on a map. Andy's contact information is available on the project webpage: www.umiatrab.com.

Slide 6- Changes from Proposed Plan

Andy mentioned that Slide 6 highlights the remedy that was improved based on community feedback. Changes from the proposed plan that are now being implemented include:

- Only inert debris to be place into the monofill.
- Onsite treatment of contaminated soils, if feasible, using thermal treatment, landfarming, or stabilization.
- Treated soils that meet cleanup levels may be used at the monofill, road maintenance, or at the handling pad.
- Hazardous waste and contaminated soil unable to be treated onsite, will be transported offsite for disposal
- Additional project implementation details to be addressed during the design phase.

Rosemary asked Andy, when the decision was developed on how the treatment would occur, the strongest treatment was selected, but now USACE has gone backwards on some of those recommendations. The community was told thermal

treatment would be the best way to remove the highest level of contaminants. If USACE is not going to complete thermal treatment, how well will the soil be treated? What levels should the community worry about if the soil is not treated using the best remedy?

Andy responded that the remedy is both specific and open ended as it regards to the onsite treated of contaminated soils, USACE has the opportunity to use any type of innovative treatment. Thermal remediation is still an option. Currently, the project is in the design phase and the project team's next step is to hire an industry professional contractor team. The contractor team will conduct a value engineering study to identify all the potential alternatives of onsite treatment and consider the impacts of commercial availability, regulatory framework, viability of operating and maintaining in an extremely remote environment; and then the contractor will make recommendations to the project team, community, ADEC, BLM, and all stakeholders involved. The stakeholders will have an opportunity to review the recommendations, weigh the options, and then make a collaborative decision to move forward. Andy mentioned, to his knowledge, no remedy or innovative technology has been dismissed. Evaluating innovative technologies will be part of the value engineering step. This process is not considered a final decision, meaning USACE has opportunities to conduct a pilot study on some of the selected innovative technologies to determine if the remedy meets the established criteria for success. If the remedy meets those established criteria for success, then the project team can advance it for full-scale remediation. If the remedy does not meet the established criteria for success, then USACE can try a different technology.

Randy clarified that the cleanup standard has not been lowered. Industry contractors will determine if they can meet cleanup standards or not. The cleanup standard will be a contractual requirement for treatment options.

Rosemary commented that since the project area is and will continue to be heavily used by the community, the community needs assurances and accurate reporting and analysis on the cleanup. Studies have indicated that the community's food sources have increased levels of contamination. The community needs information in order to properly inform populations at risk, e.g., pregnant women, not to eat fish or other animals caught in the project area. A cleanup memo needs to be completed, if not, then the project team needs to inform the community in a timely manner so that the community can make informed decisions about the usage of the project area.

Maryanne requested that subsistence users help identify additional areas of contamination outside the landfill area by taking pictures with location coordinates.

Slide 7- Conceptual Approach

Andy mentioned USACE is hiring a contractor to help design the remedy. The contractor will determine what is required to implement the remedy efficiently, safely, and effectively. The yellow area delineates the landfill, the red area delineates cells of concentrated debris. USACE identified an area that can potentially be developed into a flat handling pad. The project team will excavate debris from the landfill and handle it on a flat space in order to separate the contaminants from the debris. The debris will then be packaged appropriately, and either taken offsite, remediated on site, or taken to the monofill location. USACE will coordinate with landowners on potentially improving the roads near the handling pad for heavy equipment operation. The black dashed line delineates the property boundary with the ADOT&PF for the airfield above and BLM below and ASRC is around the perimeter. USACE will coordinate with landowners for all portions of the remedy. The yellow area is a hotspot for PCB contaminated soil in the low ground seasonally flooded channel. USACE will likely spend 2-3 years working on design and then provide an opportunity for public feedback and then make any required changes to the design. USACE will spend another couple of years mobilizing to the site to set up the monocell, complete road maintenance, and build the handling pad. USACE will likely conduct a pilot study. If the pilot study succeeds, then USACE can begin funding the full-scale removal at much more aggressive intervals. USACE will start work at the interface and one of the biggest risks is seasonal flooding. USACE may develop hydraulic protection at both ends of the seasonally flooding slough to prevent the mobilization of contaminants. USACE will not be able to build a structure large enough to hold back floodwaters, but USACE may design hydraulic controls to mitigate the energy of that flow and prevent the mobilization of contaminants. The public will have the opportunity to review all recommendations made by the contractor design team.

Maryann asked, has additional work been done along the road in the project area?

Andy responded that the yellow delineation in the map is an imperfect line. The boundaries may extend after USACE excavates the landfill and implements the remedy.

Robert commented that there are potentially intact and destroyed drums in the area.

Andy responded that as work continues in the area, USACE will document and assess debris for the appropriate remedy for disposal.

Slide 8- Conceptual Approach

Andy commented the larger scale image depicts the three potential monofill sites to the north on higher ground. The contracted design team will design the monocells to ensure they are stable in relation to climate change and will not become a future hazard to snow machines or overland users. The blue lines indicate potential ice roads or gravel roads for seasonal use that will improve operational capability on the site. Andy repeated the lines are conceptual and USACE has operated in the winter in the Umiat area before and is aware of what is required to build ice roads and operate in the area. A value engineering study will be conducted to identify cost drivers and risks while ensuring the safety and efficiency of implementing the remedy. The public will have the opportunity to provide feedback on the results from the study.

Robert asked about the schedule, Andy responded that the schedule will be addressed later in the presentation.

George commented that there should be a requirement for contractors to hire local community members. George suggested hiring 1-2 locals to monitor work that the contractor is doing. Andy responded USACE incentivizes contractors to hire locally. USACE's partners regularly hire locally and rent local equipment. At other locations USACE has provided lodging for tribal representatives to observe on site, they are not paid positions, but they provide the opportunity for representatives of the affected tribe to participate in quality assurance steps.

Maryann commented that community members and subsistence users have cultural knowledge, they understand how to build ice roads and move on site. USACE should not rely solely on industry experts.

Rosemary commented that the community just hired a cultural coordinator, Peter. USACE should come back and meet with Peter. Peter completed some community mapping. The project site is in close proximity to areas of migration. In the past there have been efforts to observe and report migration to contractors to limit activity. Better communication surrounding herd migration needs to occur.

Kendall added that the current administration has placed high value and put out initiatives on increasing incorporation of ecological knowledge within federal projects. USACE is actively working on incorporating community expertise into plans.

Slide 9- Next Steps

Andy mentioned that USACE is currently in the remedial action phase. Next steps include:

- Annual Landfill Site Inspections will continue to identify potentially mobile contaminants.
- Remedial design phase is underway. Melissa and Andy are drafting a scope of work.
- Award contract to Removal Contractor ideally by March 2023.
    - Conduct surveys/investigations/data gathering
    - Design and locate monofill, done in conjunction with landowners
    - Onsite remediation planning
    - Site operations analysis, understanding road improvements
    - Value Engineering, identifying cost and risk drivers
- Stakeholder coordination meetings.
- Remedy implementation/construction start 2025.

Rosemary commented that the community needs a historical report of the survey results. What USACE has done initially versus what USACE is doing now is not always the same. The community needs to be fully informed for the historical perspective but also future proactive planning. If the community is not informed why the plan changed, then the community will question whether or not more sampling should occur.

Andy agreed that USACE will evaluate prior work and share that in the context of what the project wants to achieve to ensure there is continuity of the plan. Because the work takes decades to complete, sciences improve, and sampling methodology becomes more robust. USACE will incorporate more specific information during the design phase and prepare a roadmap of where the project has been through where the project is headed.

Rosemary asked about the follow up regarding the initial contamination issue on contaminated fish in the project area. Decades have passed and the community should have received multiple years' worth of presentations in the process. Providing information to the community has not been forthcoming.

Randy commented that it is worth clarifying who does those studies because it is not USACE.

Andy responded that the FAQ sheet summarizes findings from reports conducted by entities that are not associated with USACE. “In 2001, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) and again in 2003, the U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine (CHPPM, which is independent from USACE) released evaluations that concluded that consumption of fish from the Colville River Seasonal Slough at the Umiat Landfill is not expected to cause harmful health effects.” Andy mentioned, USACE will elect a remedy that will be protective of human health and the environment. There are regulatory guidelines that USACE will have to meet in order to proceed with a remedy.

Robert asked if there is dynamite in the project area.
Andy responded that as the project team opens the landfill, USACE will have a robust sampling regime to understand what is in the landfill. Part of the pilot study phase will be understanding and characterizing the contaminants.

Maryann commented that there have been fires in the area.

Andy responded that the operational analysis that will occur will ensure the project team does not do more harm than good.

Melissa added that part of the design phase will include interviews with locals and subsistence representatives. USACE will collect and investigate all the concerns.

Slide 10 Umiat Landfill Timeline
Andy provided a summary of the Umiat Landfill Timeline. Andy mentioned the timeline is conceptual and is not intended to communicate exact dates. The project is fully supported by the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, and the Congressional Delegation from Alaska. USACE will have continuous funding on a routine basis to maintain momentum and productivity. Andy mentioned it will take a decade to fully implement the remedy.

Rosemary asked, how will USACE respond to the increased oil and gas development and increased activity in the area. Will USACE coordinate with other activity in the area to maximize ice roads and ensure minimal disruption to the community?

Andy responded that USACE has the responsibility to implement the remedy, but USACE is not a landowner, so USACE does not control what other activities will take place on the land. An effective partnership with the landowners and community is critical to ensure the work is done in harmony with the other land uses. If there are other uses to the property that will be detrimental to the remedy, then USACE will rely heavily on the landowners and stakeholders to identify any conflicts and mitigate any activities that are a risk to the success of the FUDS project objectives.

Slide 11 Communication Planning
Andy outlined the various methods USACE will utilize to communicate with the community and project stakeholders. Andy encouraged the attendees to make suggestions for other methods of communication.

Mayor Brower asked if there is an opportunity for USACE to share more information about the project plans in the next 1-3 years. USACE is open to providing project summary updates in a variety of methods.

Andy responded, yes. USACE is willing to provide project summary updates in a variety of methods based on requests from the stakeholders.

Mayor Brower asked, what would the pilot study entail.

Andy responded that pilot study is a term used to describe a small-scale test of plan before committing to full implementation of the plan. For example, if USACE wants to pursue thermal remediation for petroleum contaminated soil onsite, a pilot study would involve obtaining all the necessary equipment and permits, completing a test of a portion of the contaminated material, and evaluating for effectiveness in meeting the cleanup criteria. If the test meets the criteria, then USACE will begin full-scale implementation. Andy is not sure what portion of the remedy USACE would need to conduct a pilot study yet, but the intent of a pilot study is to conduct small scale testing after the design phase. USACE will share pilot study results with the community for public comment before awarding contracts for full scale implementation.

Discussion and Q&A

Andy recommended that USACE make annual trips to the community to meet with stakeholders. USACE will have field seasons in the summer and winter, so

an optimal time to meet would be in the spring or fall. During those meetings, USACE can provide summary level results of the work completed in the last year and a roadmap of future work plans; and the community would have the opportunity to provide feedback.

Rosemary commented that communication is key, especially on notifying the community about scheduled meetings. The community needs notification one month prior to ensure the meeting is added to the community calendar. Rosemary requested the stakeholder contact list be shared. Rosemary recommended scheduling a separate meeting for the community to provide feedback on the sampling report. A report of the activities USACE completes by the end of summer needs to be provided to the community by Christmas to ensure enough time for feedback. Quarterly communication is important. Inter-village communication with AKP is mandatory. Air traffic interferes with the short moose season in the fall.
Melody shared a link about the fish studies: http://www.north-slope.org/departments/wildlife-management/studies-and-research-projects/health-assessment-of-subsistence-resources/fish-health-studies

Chasity suggested minimum biannual meetings alternating between NUI and AKP in person and virtual option for others, with month prior notice to all trilateral entities of all villages including NSB.

Andy asked Rosemary for clarity on meeting expectations, does the community want to meet again in three months?

Rosemary responded that the community requested information, so how will USACE follow up with the community and how will the community respond and ask questions after reviewing the information to ensure a proactive process.

Andy responded that USACE intends to follow up within three months with the requested information, after the community reviews the information, USACE would engage with the community again to collect feedback and answer questions.

Rosemary responded that Eunice Brower has been involved in many ways, Rosemary would like to collaborate with Eunice.

Andy asked for feedback on what time works best for a community meeting.

Rosemary responded that availability opens up after September 30th.

Andy responded that after USACE follows up in writing, the project team will check on potential dates for an in-person meeting in Nuiqsut.

Maryann suggested meeting in January.

Rosemary commented that as long as the community receives the requested information with enough time to for the community to review and prepare for the meeting, then January will work.

Maryann suggested a tri-lateral meeting.

Josie commented that as a result of today's community meeting, HDR will create minutes and a summary packet that will be mailed, emailed, and available on the project website. All attendees from today's meeting will be added to the contact list. After today's meeting, another meeting will be scheduled in January.

Maryann responded that a discussion also needs to occur on the sampling report before the meeting in January.

Andy commented that the trilateral group is critical. BLM and landowner involvement in the discussion is also critical. Is there a concern to have members of the city, tribe, city corporations, regulators, and landowners in the same meeting?

Maryann commented that it is important for everyone to be on the same page. Andy asked Maryann to clarify, is Maryann asking for a separate meeting for trilateral, or is it acceptable to have a large meeting with all the critical stakeholders.

Maryann recommended two meetings, inter-community and inter-region. Divisions occur in larger meetings. The local community should coordinate first.

Austin asked, what is this project fails?

Andy responded that USACE conducts investigations to effectively pick an appropriate remedy, but after completing a pilot study, the results might require the project team to develop a new plan. USACE moves in an orderly fashion, so as new findings and changing technologies occur, the project team can always

modify the plan to achieve the desired results. This is a hard problem to solve, but with the right communication strategy and the right teamwork, USACE is going to work through the challenges and adjust the plans to solve the problem.

Josie asked would USACE consider breaking up the meetings and hosting the smaller intertribal meetings virtually, and then hosting the larger meeting in-person. This would allow more frequent intertribal meetings.

Andy responded, yes, USACE is committed to building an effective communications strategy based on feedback from the community, but USACE wants to avoid breaking the meetings into such small teams that the project loses efficiency and/or USACE is not communicating fairly and effectively with all parties. USACE may try a variety of meeting options first and then make refinements. Andy also referred back to the Umiat Landfill Timeline (slide 10) and mentioned the communication strategy and meeting frequency is going to change depending on which phase the project is in.
Andy commented, in order to effectively coordinate a date, time, and location for meetings, USACE needs accurate contact information for who the project team should follow up with and who can assist with notifying the community about upcoming meetings and project updates.

Rosemary asked, was a tribal risk assessment completed? The Shoshone Tribe risk assessment is a good model to follow and should be incorporated into this project.

Andy responded that USACE will find out if a tribal risk assessment was completed and follow up with Rosemary.

Andy asked if the community is interested in electronic newsletters.

Rosemary responded that sometimes newsletters are beneficial, but the timeliness of all communications in advance of a meeting is more important. Rosemary suggested engaging through the cultural coordinator to add information to the community reports.

In-person attendee commented that they received the mailing a week ago which is not enough time to plan for a meeting.

Andy asked Melody, as a representative of a landowning entity, how often does Melody think USACE should communicate with stakeholders.

Melody commented that it is important to gauge the meeting schedule with the project work that is occurring. There is a delicate balance between ensuring everyone is involved and having too many people involved. Melody recommended targeting communications and narrowing down the scope of meetings. Melody recommends meeting at least once a year with everyone involved so everyone receives the same information.

Kendall commented that one challenge USACE faces is increasing tribal engagement and exchanging information. USACE distributes annual newsletters to communities that are meant to be an update that allow for information flow outside of scheduled meetings. USACE is also engaging in government-to-government letters to all Alaska native villages and recognized tribes, so recipients receive an annual point of contact and source of information.

Maryann asked about funding, laborers/workers want to know if the funding is reliable.

Andy responded that USACE does not get grants for this project, the funding is provided by the DoD appropriated funds, which are a reliable income stream and are generally one of the first appropriation of funds that Congress addresses each year. The environmental funding is consistent. Variations occur when a budget is passed in a given year. For example, this year the federal government didn't have a budget until March, USACE didn't have appropriated funds until after the budget was passed, but USACE has other ways to manage funding, work does not stop while waiting for a budget to pass.

Maryann commented that it is important to know about potential funding changes to the project.

Andy recommended part of the project team's routine communications can include a funding update. USACE plans for funding at least 2-3 years in advance.

Col. Delarosa commented that FUDS has been a historically underfunded program across the entire United State, however Alaska is the highest performing FUDS team in the entire Corps of Engineers, and nearly doubled the program budget for this year. There will always be a concern over how FUDS is funded, but the fact that this project was identified and is funded means it will not get un-funded.

Rosemary commented about concerns over losing funding.

Col. Delarosa responded that the government gives money to programs that execute, and the Alaska FUDS program executes. Col. Delarosa has full confidence in the Umiat FUDS team. USACE is known for extensive studying, as a result the project will take time in order to achieve the desired results without further impacting the project area.

Rosemary commented the community needs to stay informed on USACE's defense mechanisms for maintaining funding.

Josie commented that meeting save the date postcards were mailed on May 20th. Josie apologized if any community members felt they did not receive enough advance notification about the meeting. Josie requested feedback from the public on how the project team can do a better job of communicating. Attendees agreed the Arctic Sounder ads were not an effective communication tool. The product team used 10 different communication tools. If any community members have ideas to improve methods of communication, please contact Josie before the next meeting.

Kelly Walker recommended sending mailers out at least a month ahead of time.

Maryann thanked the project team for coming to the community.

Andy made a last call for comments.

Jenny provided a summary of the action items, listed below.

Rosemary commented that the community did this project because elder fishermen witnessed abnormalities and the community needed to know what the lands and waters contained. The community is still waiting for clean up to occur. 100 years have passed since initial conversations began. The land and waters are still important to the community today, and it is important to be reassured that the harvesting is safe for consumption. There are serious health concerns for the village and the community needs to know whether or not it is historical activities, current activities, or future risk. The community wants to improve the relationship to engage effectively and stay informed. Returning answers to the community is taking too long.

Austin asked if this project fails, how will it affect the people who live in this land.

Andy commented that it is USACE's intent to mitigate risk. USACE will use the best science, industry practices, and best tribal and community knowledge to mitigate risk and ensure the project will not fail. USACE has successfully completed the selected remedy in other remote areas. USACE does not attempt once and then walk away. Andy's responsibility as project manager is to mitigate risk while ensuring the appropriate safeguards are in place to make the project a success.

Rosemary commented that the community needs young people like Austin to get involved and stay engaged to ensure the project achieves the desired results.

Andy called for final comments.

Col. Delarosa provided closing remarks, reiterating USACE is committed engaging with the community and ensuring the project delivers the desired results.

Andy reminded attendees that he is the point of contact for the project and email is the best way to reach him Andy's contact information is available on the meeting materials.

The meeting concluded at 9:15pm AKT.

Meeting Action Items Review

- The project team will provide contact information for Jamie McKellar and Kelly Walker from ADEC.
    - Jamie McKellar
        - Email: jamie.mckellar@alaska.gov
        - Phone: 907-451-5175
    - Kelly Walker
        - Email kelly.walker@alaska.gov
        - Phone: 907 451-2166
- Andy will investigate additional remediation actions that potentially occurred at the Umiat FUDS project site and report back any findings.
- Lisa Geist will share additional documentation on other remediation actions that occurred at the Umiat FUDS project site.
- The project team will add a copy of the Decision Document to the project website: www.umiatrab.com

- The project team will share the stakeholder contact list and complete ongoing updates.
- Andy will investigate if a tribal risk assessment occurred.
- The project team will follow up with stakeholders within the next month.