Cleanup Chronology Report for **CANOL Pump Station J - Ida Joe Allotment**

Site Name:	CANOL Pump Station J - Ida Joe Allotment
Address:	Mile 1285.5 Alaska Hwy. ~19 Mi. W. of Northway Jc Northway, AK 99764
File Number:	170.38.034
Hazard ID:	3255
Staff:	Louis Howard - 9072697552
Status:	Active
Landowner:	Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc.
Latitude:	63.209167
Longitude:	-142.196389
Section:	32
Meridian:	Copper River
Range:	East
Township:	017

Institutional Controls Report
No ICs exist for this site.

Problem / Comments

Petroleum contamination of soil and sediments. The site is located on the Alaska Highway approximately 19 miles northwest of Northway Junction, near Midway Lake, and is associa with the former Canol No. 4 Pipeline. In 1999 the pump station consisted of structures, buildings, scattered metal debris, used oil filters, and several 55 gallon drums in various stage decay scattered over approximately 5.7 acres of land and surface water. Previous observations at the site included oil sheen on surface water and soil smelling of petroleum product well as a vent pipe potentially associated with an UST. DRO, RRO, benzene, lead, and a couple of SVOCs were detected at levels above cleanup in soil and sediments at the statior The surrounding area is sparsely populated. At the time of the SA, the site was accessible by the Alaska road system and was not fenced or otherwise secured. Allotments are being investigated for surface debris, dump areas, abandoned drums. EPA contracted Ecology and Environment, Inc. to conduct a SA in 1999. The E&E report is on file. The United States Department acquired the Pump Station J land tract in 1942. The land was relinquished to the Bureau of Land Management in 1975. The BLM designated the Pump Station J tract, no portion of US Survey No. 6145, as a native allotment. USACE refers to this site as the CANOL Pipeline Project Number 4 Site and the CANOL Pump Station J Site (formerly used defense site [FUDS] ID Number F10AK1033).

Action Information

Action Date	Action	Description	DEC Staff
07/20/1942	Update or Other Action	Public Land Order (PLO) 12, dated 20 July 1942. withdrew a strip of land 20 miles either side of a centerline containing an aggregate of 8,320,000 acres for the construction of the Alaska Military Highway.	Howard, Louis
12/31/1943	Update or Other Action	The Fairbanks Terminal was equipped with pumps to push fuel south to Eielson AFB when necessary. The terminal had a lab for final checks on the quality of the fuel inventory. The lab was mostly staffed with military personnel. The Fairbanks tank farm on Birch Hill (later to become Fort Wainwright SEE CS DB Hazard IDs: 1100, 1117, 1685, 4124, and 24218) was built in 1943 to store fuel arriving from the CANOL Pipeline. The tanks were a portable, bolted steel type, set up for permanent use in W.W.II. As George Lyle explained, "You could take them apart in sections and haul them on a flatbed truck and then bolt them back together when you got to the new location. But they set them up as permanent tanks and so they went inside and they welded a channel over all those bolt heads on the insides so it was more or less a welded tank after that." These older tanks were sometimes a problem in cold temperatures. Welds occasionally cracked when the fuel level was low and the tank would leak a small amount of fuel.	Howard, Louis
02/29/1944	Update or Other Action	Construction of the Canol No.4 Project began in 1942 and was completed in February 1944. The project consisted of constructing a 3-inch pipeline extending from Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, to Ladd Field, Fairbanks, Alaska and was designed to carry petroleum products. The length of the line from the Canadian border to Fairbanks was approximately 296 miles. The pipeline was laid on the surface, generally parallel to the Alaska Highway, and only placed subswface where necessary to protect it from traffic or natural hazards.	Howard, Louis
04/05/1945	Update or Other Action	PW 270. dated 5 April 1945 reduced the withdrawal to a strip 5 miles on either side of a center line and reduced the aggregate to 2,092,800 acres.	Howard, Louis
07/31/1947	Update or Other Action	PLO 386, dated 31 July 1947 revoked both PW 12 and 270 and further reduced the withdrawal to a strip of land 300 feet on either side of the then existing Alaska Highway from the Canadian border to Big Delta, Alaska. PLO 386 defined other withdrawals, one of which was a strip ofland 25 feet on either side of a telephone line generally constructed parallel to the Alaska Highway. The other was a strip of land 10 feet on either side of a pipeline generally constructed parallel to the Alaska Highway. This was the Canol Project No.4 pipeline. Additional PW 386 withdrawals included withdrawal of 305 acres of land for support facilities and pumping stations "r' through "M" of the Canol Project. The twenty-foot right of way for that portion of Canol No.4 pipeline. which ran from Big Delta, Alaska, to Fairbanks, was acquired by land notation under 44LD513 principles, Fairbanks Bureau of Land Management serial number 08691.	Howard, Louis
07/01/1958	Update or Other Action	General Description of Facilities USARAL Petroleum Distribution System. The three-inch and four-inch pipeline system is a portion of the Canol network ot pipelines constructed during World War II (completed 1945) under the Joint direction of the Public Roads Administration and the Corps of Engineers. This pipeline system was utilized by the United States Army subsequent to the termination of World War II. The system was composed of 1) 108 miles of four-inch pipeline (Canol Number 2, Skagway, Alaska to Whitehorse, Yukon-Territory, Canada) and 2) 596 miles of three-inch pipeline-(Canol Humber 4, Whitehorse to Fairbanks, Alaska); 3) three terminal pump stations (Skagway. Whitehorse, and Tok); 4) one receiving terminal (Fairbanks); 5) one non-operational standby booster statlon (Statlon"J" in Alaska between Northway, Alaska and the Canadian Border); 6) two take-off statlons (Fort Greely and Eielson Air Force Base); 7) and supporting terminal bulk storage tanks, and related tacllities. Effectlve 3l March 1958 the terminal at Skagway and the- four-inch line to the Canadian Border were sold to the White Pass & Yukon -Railroad. The four-inch line from the Canadian Border to Whitehorse was accepted by the Canadian Government 1 April 1958, and part of the terminal facilities at Whitehorse were leased to the White Pass & Yukon Railroad. The rema1ning facllities at Whitehorse and the three-inch line trom Whitehorse to Junction Pump Station (Mile Post 1026) were leased to the Alaska-Yukon Distributors, Ltd. Both of these leases are temporary measures pending formal disposal ot all Canol Facilities in Canada to the Canadian Government. The remaining facilities include 196 miles of three-inch pipeline trom Tok Terminal to Fairbanks Terminal, 60 miles of three-inch pipeline from Tok Terminal to Northway, a terminal pump station at Tok, a take-off station at Big Delta, a take-off station at Eielson Air Force Base and a receiving station at Fairbanks Terminal. The three-inch line runs parallel to the eight-inch line and is surface laid. Current operations are limited to transporting diesel fuel from Tok Terminal to Fort Greely, Eielson Air FOrce Base and Ladd Air Force Base (196 miles) and back-pumping from Tok to Northway (60 mi1es) for the Alaska Communication System and Civil Aeronautics Administration. The three-inch pipeline provides flexibillty of pipeline operations between Tok Terminal and stations served by this terminal.	Howard, Louis
02/24/1972	Update or Other Action	BLM record 031077 notes that on 24 February 1972, PLO 386 was revoked by Section 19 (a) of Public Law 92-203, for the section of pipeline from Big Delta to the Canadian border.	Howard, Louis
10/09/1974	Update or Other Action	A private contractor completed the physical removal of the Canol Pipeline # 4 on 9 October 1974. However, private landowners, and others, had previously removed some sections of the pipeline. Prior to removal, some portions of the pipeline were buried during road maintenance and construction of private access roads. These sections were not removed by the contractor due to environmental considerations	Howard, Louis
05/26/1977	Update or Other Action	Letter from F.A. Smith Chief, Management Support Office, Directorate of Supply Operations (DLA, DFSC Cameron Station Alexandria VA 22314 to Commander, DFR, Alaska, APO Seattle 98742. The attached book is one I have had for years and concerns a 1949 study of Bulk POL Facilities, etc., in Alaska. Originally secret, it has been downgraded to unclassified over the years. I feel it will be of some interest to you and the petroleum people in Alaska, especially the old maps and pictures - some taken in 1943. Incidentally, the Joint Regs in the back of the book are signed by people that I knew in Alaska 1947-1949 and later (I was an insignificant airplane driver but was checked out in float/ski ops, so was in demand). HW Alaskan Command	Howard, Louis

		later (I was an insignificant airplane driver but was checked out in float/ski ops, so was in demand). HW Alaskan Command, Area Petroleum Office, APO 942, C/o Postmaster Seattle, WA Serial 1111 January 18, 1950. SUBJECT: Logistic Study Bulk POL Facilities and Requirements - Alaskan Mainland. TO: Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, Navy Mail Center, Navy Bldg. Washington D. C. Forwarded for your information is a copy of the Logistic Study of Bulk POL Facilities and Requirements on the Alaskan Mainland, as prepared by Major Bernard Wobbeking, G-4 Section, United States Army, Alaska. RECONNAISSANCE OF CANOL PIPE LINE SYSTEMS NOS. 4 & 2 GENERAL 1. The active portion of the Canol Pipeline System presently consists of Line No. 2 from Skagway, Alaska, to Whitehorse Y. T., Canada, and Line No. 4 from Whitehorse, Y. T., to Ladd Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska. Line No. 2 is of 4 inch welded pipe approximately 110 miles in length, and Line No. 4 is of 3 inch welded pipe approximately 605 miles in length. 2. Line No. 1, which extended from. Whitehorse to Camp Canol, Canada, has been inactivated and dismant1ed. Line No. 3. which extends from Carcross Junction to Watson Lake, a distance of approximately 264 miles, is inactive and relatively intact. PURPOSE 1. The purpose of this reconnaissance was to make a visual observation of the general layout and physical location and condition of the facilities composing the Canol Pipeline Systems presently in operation. Observations were also made to determine improvements necessary to maintain its present operational status and for possible future demands that may be made on the stations and the systems. The reconnaissance commenced at Ladd AFB and proceeded to Whitehorse, Y. T., Canada, thence to Skagway, Alaska. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDIHGS STATION "J" - MILEPOST 1288.6 1. This 1s an active station and faci1ities comprise 1 - 2250 and 3 - 300 bbl welded steel tanka, 3 - Gas reciprocating pumps and Buda drivers, power generators, etc. 2. Living quarters for two families are in good condition but other living quarters are in urgent need of repair and alteration. a. Repairs and a1teratiOna to quarters mentioned in paragraph 2 could be accomplished by utilizing materials from buildings at inactive stations. 3. Product from the 3 - 300 bbl tanka cou1d be delivered to trucks by gravity, however, it is not recommended that this station be used for convey service due to lack of maneuverabilty for vehicles in the yard. 4. There are four operating personnel stationed at this location. 5. Maximum operating pressure at outlet of pump is 1,400 PSI. 6. The Buda engine drivers are gasoline driven, and it is necessary to truck mogas from Cathedral Rapids, a distance of 66 miles. (See Reference #6). Recommendations Living quarters for two fami1ies at both stations "J" and "E" are in poor condition and require rehabilitation. This condition makes it difficult for the Resident Engineer to retain reliable and conscientious men at these stations with the resu1t that Station "J" is presently undermanned. The Canol Pipeline system appeared well maintained, efficiently operated and supervised. There was considerable evidence, however, of pilfering of bul1dings at inactive stations beyond the control of the staff responsible for the system. The windows and doors at these inactive stations have been boarded, but entrance has been forced, by persons unknown, and the buildings pilfered of critical materials. Where practical and economical, it is recommended that buildings at inactive stations known not to be required for operations in the near future be utilized at stations or installations where needed. The Resident Engineer at Whitehorse, through the District Engineer, has been requested to obtain bids on the rehabilitation of the necessary dwellings at Stations “J” and “E” by the Army Engineer. The Army Engineer, has allocated $30,000 to accomplish the needed repair and/or alterations.	
06/14/1977	Update or Other Action	On 14 June 1977 the Bureau of Land Management accepted relinquishment of the pipeline right-of-way and removed the 44LD513 notation for the Canol line for the section from Big Delta to Fairbanks.	Howard, Louis
06/15/1978	Update or Other Action	BLM record 031077 notes that on 24 February 1972, PLO 386 was revoked by Section 19 (a) of Public Law 92-203, for the section of pipeline from Big Delta to the Canadian border. The final Revocation and Restoration action was completed by the BLM on 15 June 1978. The Haines/Fairbanks pipeline, which was laid generally adjacent to the Canol pipeline, was not affected by these actions.	Howard, Louis
01/05/1996	Update or Other Action	Letter January 5, 1996 from Robert Sattler, Real Estate Services, Environmental to Mr. Greg Smith, Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers P.O. Box 898, Anchorage, Alaska 99506-898 Dear Mr. Smith: This past summer I conducted a visit to a Native Allotment in the upper Tanana River region and discovered former military environmental impacts. I am writing to ask for an explanation on the types of activity that occurred on the land, and begin discussions about remediation of these environmental impacts resulting from former military activity. The land in question is located between Tok and Northway along the Alaska Hig)nvay.During a pedestrian survey of the allotment, we observed the cement foundation to a former building, adjacent cement pads, numerous large gray oil filters to combustion engines, a variety of large sheet metal exhaust pipes a small pond adjacent to the cement foundation in which the top of a fuel drum could be seen, the smell of petroleum products, extensive bull-dozing activity consisting of large trenches, and several bunkers in which army green fuel drums were found bearing the fol1owing marks: OE-30 OIL ENGINE HEAVY-DUTY MIL-O-2154-50 FT. RICHARDSON J-QM111 AGD·SPP~6 UNION OIL COL 5/53 BATCH AS T560 M-33 50 U.S. GALLONS From the looks of the area it appears that the building foundation is associated with a former pump station. I have learned that there two or three fuel pipelines in the Tanacross·Northway area during WWII aud the Cold War era. Please describe for me what these military remains represent, how hazardous or toxic these materials may be, and provide additional information about how the Army Corps of Engineers wou1d deal with this site under their Defense Environmental Restoration Program and Formerly Used Defense Site program. If I can be of any assistance you can reach me at (907) 452-8251, ext. 3343.	Howard, Louis
04/24/1996	Update or Other Action	Letter from Robert Sattler Real Estate Services, Environmental with Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. Fairbanks to Gordon J. Severson, Realty Specialist, ACOE, P.O. Box 898 Dear. Mr. Severson: Thank you for your fax on April 11, requesting additional information on the Native allotment along the Alaska Highway with former Department of Defense Evironmental impacts. The parcel in question is located at mile 1285.5 on the Alaska Highway. The allotment is USS 6145 (159.94 acres), application number F-035178, and is located in T.I7N, R.17E, Section 32, Copper River Meridian. I am unable to provide the name of the owner at this time since TCC is vested with that trust responsibility to manage land transactions for Native allotment owners for which TCC is vested with a trust responsibility to manage land transactions for Native allotment owners for which we are bound to a confidentiality obligation. However, I will send a copy of this letter to the allotment owner, and they may chose to contact you. Furthermore, the COE would need to obtain a permit to enter the property before any field investigations are initiated. I have numerous photographs of the environemntal impacts described in my letter of January 5, 1995 and could make those available to you for your review.	Howard, Louis
05/20/1996	Update or Other Action	From Gordon J. Severson, Realty Specialist. CENPA-RE-AQ (200-lc) 20 May 1996 MEMORANDUM FOR CENPA-PM-E-F (Bob Chivvis) SUBJECT: Canol Project No.4, Pump Station "J" 1. Reference your request to research military responsibility and land ownership for a Native Allotment, located at Milepost 1285.5 on the Alaska Highway, per inquiry from the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc., (TCC). It should be noted that TCC is the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) realty contractor. 2. The subject tract was originally acquired as part of the Alaska Military Highway (DERP-FUDS Site No. F10AK004400) which included the Canol (short for Canadian Oil) Project No.4, Whitehorse to Fairbanks. The site/s/ were acquired by Public Land Order (PLO) No. 12, dated 20 July 1942, as amended by PLO 270, dated 5 April 1945. PLO's 12 and 270 were revoked by PLO 386, dated 31 July 1947, which withdrew and reserved (reacquired) certain portions thereof for the Army's Alaska Communications System (ACS) and Canol Project No.4, including 60 acres for Pumping Station "J", now a portion of U.S. Survey (USS) No. 6145. 3. The Canol No.4 Pipeline was 'relinquished to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on 30 June 1975, having become obsolete and replaced by construction of the Alaskan Petroleum Pipeline System (APPS), Haines to Fairbanks. PLO 386 was revoked by BLM effective 15 June 1978. 4. USS 6145 is now a Native Allotment (NA) owned by the Heirs of Donald J. Joe, per NA Certificate No. 50-88-0075 issued by BLM on 11 April 1988. This site would be a FUDS eligible project under either the Alaska Military Highway, Site #F10AK004400 (as done for the Alaska Highway Dump at Mentasta), or alternately, a new site for the Canol Project No.4, Pump Station "J". 5. Enclosed are copies of supporting maps and documents. Please call me at X-2853 if you have any questions or comments. From community member - To Whom It May Concern: What really concern[s] all of us is that army use to have camp at Camp(J), Midway Lake area, and [a]longside road toward Forty Mile Roadhouse. In [the] 1960's I also remember they use to drop something or spray on [the] pipeline) from [a] plane. They spray[ed] something from both side wings and bottom of plane. They spray it from top of [the] hill to another end of the hill at Midway Lake. My mom, my sister and I, all use to pick wild berries, wild musbroom along pipeline side. We all get our native foods from the side of pipeline. Then we did not [k]no[w] what they spray[ed] on pipeline. Even rabbits start[ed] to be gone in those days. We all so used to have fish in Midway Lake in 60's, there all gone know. I can remember State or RCS workers use[d] to work along side road. They used to spray along side [of the] road. They use[d a] tanker truck for that in [the] 60s. Our concern is that Midway Lake area [needs] to be tested, [the] water [and the] ground. Also there's lots of clean up to be done when they put road and pipeline in. There [is] lots of trash like cans, barrels and etc, that [are] still laying around Midway Lake area.	Howard, Louis
09/19/1997	Update or Other Action	DISCOVERY 09/19/1997 Site Name: CANOL PUMP STATION J Street: MP 1285.5 ALASKA HIGHWAY City / State / ZIP: TANACROSS , AK 99776 NPL Status: Not on the NPL Non-NPL Status: NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information EPA ID: AK0002021848 EPA Region: 10 County: SOUTHEAST FAIRBANKS C.A. Federal Facility Flag: Not a Federal Facility	Howard, Louis
09/19/1997	Update or Other Action	SITE INSPECTION 09/19/1997 Site Name: CANOL PUMP STATION J Street: MP 1285.5 ALASKA HIGHWAY City / State / ZIP: TANACROSS , AK 99776 NPL Status: Not on the NPL Non-NPL Status: NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information EPA ID: AK0002021848 EPA Region: 10 County: SOUTHEAST FAIRBANKS C.A. Federal Facility Flag: Not a Federal Facility	Howard, Louis

Not a Federal Facility

01/04/1999	Update or Other Action	Part I of III CANOL Pump Station J Site Inspection Report Milepost 1285.5, Alaska Highway, Alaska TDD: 97-09-0013 Contract: 68-W6-0008 January 1999. The primary goals of the SI activities are as follows: - Collect and analyze samples to characterize the potential sources discussed in Section 2.6; - Determine off-site migration of contaminants; - Provide EPA with adequate information to determine whether the site is eligible for placement on the National Priorities List; and - Document any threat or potential threat to public health or the environment posed by the site. Completion of this investigation included reviewing site information, determining regional characteristics, collecting receptor information within the site's range of influence, conducting a site visit, executing a site-specific sampling plan in July 1998, and producing this report. During the summer of 1997, Portage Environmental in conjunction with the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC) performed a preliminary assessment (P A) of the former CA.~OL Pump Station J to document environmental conditions at the site. The report from this survey has not yet been released by Portage Environmental. Ko other environmental investigations have been performed at the site. Pump Station Complex The gas filling and debris area is on the southeast side of the pump station complex and covers approximately 10,000 square feet. Various cans and other metal debris are scattered throughout this area. Of the VOCs analyzed by CLP protocol, none were detected in the surface sample. In the subsurface soil sample, 11 VOC analytes were detected at significant concentrations (ranging from 12.6 ug/kg to 7,490 ug/kg). Of the SVOCs analyzed, the following two analytes were detected at significant concentrations in the surface soil sample: bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at 1,210 ug/kg; and 2-methyl naphthalene at 313 ug/kg. In the subsurface soil sample, six SVOC analytes were detected at significant concentrations (ranging from 329 ug/kg to 184,000 ug/kg). All of the detected VOC and SVOC analytes are associated with petroleum fuels or oils. No chlorinated pesticides or PCBs were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed, lead (326 mg/kg) and zinc (170 mg/Kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the surface soil sample. Chromium (9.7 mg/kg), copper (20.6 mg/kg), and vanadium (29.2 mglkg) were detected at significant concentrations in the subsurface soil sample. Benzene was not detected in these samples (GRO results were rejected). Toluene, ethylbenzene, and total xylenes were not detected at concentrations exceeding the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. DRO (6,800 mg/kg) and RRO (3,200 mg/kg) were detected above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard in the surface soil sample. DRO (21,000 mg/kg) also exceeded the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard in the subsurface soil sample. Oil Filter Area The oil filter area is located on the northeast side of the pump station complex and covers an area of approximately 2,000 square feet. Several used industrial oil filters are present at this site. No VOCs analyzed for by CLP protocol were detected at significant concentrations in these samples. No SVOC, pesticide, or PCB analytes were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed, lead (244 mg/kg) and nickel (10.9 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the surface soil sample. Arsenic (3.7 mg/kg), chromium (18.5 mg/kg), copper (22.4 mg/kg), nickel (20.3 mg/kg), and vanadium (48.3 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the subsurface soil sample. GRO and BTEX were not detected in these samples. DRO (5,800 mg/kg) and RRO (45,000 mg/kg) were detected above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard in the surface soil sample. The electrical facility area is located on the south side of the pump station complex and covers an area of approximately 2,500 square feet. A 2-inch steel pipe, leading from the pump station, terminates at the electrical facility area. Of the VOCs analyzed for by CLP protocol, 1,3,5- trimethyl benzene (38.2 .ug/kg) was detected at a significant concentration in the surface soil sample. The VOC analyte detected is associated with petroleum fuels. No SVOC, pesticide, or PCB analytes were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed, mercury (0.14 mg/kg) was detected at a significant concentration in the surface soil sample and six metals (ranging from 5.6 mg/kg to 62.1 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the subsurface soil sample. BTEX was not detected in the samples (GRO results were rejected). DRO (2,000 mg/kg) was detected at the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard in the subsurface soil sample. RRO was detected in both samples. However. the concentrations are below the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard.	Light, Greg
01/04/1999	Update or Other Action	Part II of III CANOL Pump Station J Site Inspection Report Milepost 1285.5, Alaska Highway, Alaska TDD: 97-09-0013 Contract: 68-W6-0008 January 1999. The garage area is located at the south-center of the pump complex & covers an area of approximately 2,500 square feet. The garage area pad is composed of gravel & spots of asphalt & tar. Additionally, a buried 2-inch steel pipe runs east/west through the garage facility area & joins at the west end of the area with the 2-inch pipe that runs north/south from the pump station to the electrical facility area. Of the VOCs analyzed for by CLP protocol, toluene (99.5 ug/kg) was detected at a significant concentration in the surface soil sample. In the subsurface soil sample, six VOC analytes were detected at significant concentrations ranging from 111 ug/kg to 9,350 ug/kg. Of the SVOCs analyzed, I-methyl-naphthalene (33,200 ug/kg) & retene (3.120 ug/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the subsurface soil sample. No SVOC analytes were detected in the surface soil sample. The VOC & SVOC analytes detected are associated with petroleum fuels. No pesticide or PCB analytes were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed. lead (16.4 mg/kg) in the surface soil sample; & chromium (6 mg/kg), copper (15.4 mg/kg), mercury (0.08 mg/kg), & vanadium (17.6 mg/kg) in the subsurface soil sample, were detected at significant concentrations. Toluene was not detected in the samples. GRO was not detected in the surface soil sample (the subsurface soil results were rejected). In the subsurface soil sample, benzene was detected above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. Ethylbenzene & xylenes were present in the subsurface soil sample, but below the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. DRO (up to 67,000 mg/kg) & RRO (up to 15,000 mg/kg) were detected in both the surface & subsurface soil samples above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. Pump Station The pump station is located in a gravel clearing northeast of the pump station complex area. All that remains of the pump station is the concrete foundation. The foundation is approximately 85 feet long & 35 feet wide. Of the VOCs analyzed by CLP protocol. Toluene (31.1 ug/kg) was detected at a significant concentration in the surface soil sample. No VOC analytes were detected in the subsurface soil sample. The VOC analyte detected is associated with petroleum fuels. No SVOC, pesticide, or PCB analytes were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed, lead (27.8 mg/kg) & zinc (173 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the surface soil sample. No metals were detected at significant concentrations in the subsurface soil sample. GRO was not detected in the surface soil sample (the subsurface soil sample result was rejected). In the surface soil sample, toluene (0.083 mg/kg) & m,p-xylene (0.16 mg/kg) were detected but below the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. DRO (up to 1,900 mg/kg in the subsurface sample) & RRO (up to 110 mg/kg also in the subsurface sample) were not detected above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard in these samples. Drum Bunker I Drum bunker 1 is located in the north portion of the pump station complex. The bunker is approximately 4 feet wide, 6 feet long, & 4 feet deep. Five 55-gallon drums with military markings were visible inside the bunker along with wood chips & metal scraps. The sides of the bunkers were shored up with wood timbers that are decaying. Just northeast of the bunker is a 4-inch pipe that may be an UST vent pipe. No VOC, pesticide, or PCB analytes were detected in this sample. Five SVOC analytes were detected at significant concentrations (ranging from 275 ug/kg to 9,270 ug/kg) in this sample. All five analytes detected are associated with petroleum fuels. Of the metals analyzed, copper (81.1 mg/kg) , lead (188 mg/kg), nickel (35.3 mg/kg) , & zinc (208 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations. Neither GRO nor BTEX was detected in the sample. DRO (2,100 mg/kg) & RRO (11,000 mg!kg) were detected above the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. Drum Bunker II Drum bunker 2 is located in the west portion of the pump station complex west of the dirt access road to the AST pads. The bunker is approximately 4 feet wide, 6 feet long, & 7 feet deep. No VOCs were detected at significant concentrations in this sample. No SVOC, pesticide, or PCB analytes were detected. Of the metals analyzed, lead (38.6 mg/kg), mercury (12 mg/kg), & nickel (19.4 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations. No GRO or BTEX was detected in the sample. DRO (19 mg/kg) & RRO (110 mg/kg) were detected below the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard.	Light, Greg
01/04/1999	Update or Other Action	Part III of III CANOL Pump Station J Site Inspection Report Milepost 1285.5, Alaska Highway, Alaska TDD: 97-09-0013 Contract: 68-W6-0008 January 1999. DEBRIS SOUTH OF THE HIGHWAY SAMPLES Building debris, pumps, & engines appear to have been hauled from the pump station complex & deposited on the south side of the Alaska Highway. The materials are scattered parallel to the Alaska Highway & encompass an area of approximately 20,000 square feet. Discolored soils were noted under some of the building debris. Of the VOCs analyzed for by CLP protocol. 1-methylethyl benzene (up to 88 ug/kg), 1-methyl-4-(l-methylethyl) benzene (l05 ug/kg), & toluene (88.8 ug/kg) were detected at significant concentrations in the surface soil. VOCs were not detected at significant concentrations in subsurface soil samples. Except for the trichloromethane, a potential blank contaminant, all the detected analytes are associated with petroleum fuels. The only SVOC detected at a significant concentration in these samples was di-n-butylphthalate (245 ug/kg), which was present in a subsurface soil sample. No pesticide or PCB analytes were detected in these samples. Of the metals analyzed, nickel (up to 24.2 mg/kg) & vanadium (up to 50.7 mg/kg) were detected at significant concentrations. No GRO or BTEX was detected in these samples. DRO (up to 53 mg/kg) & RRO (up to 390 mg/kg) were detected in the surface soil samples below the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. AST PADS Two sand and gravel AST pads are cut into the slope west of the pump station complex. Each pad is approximately 3,000 square feet and reportedly housed a 2,250-barrel tank. No stained soil was observed on the pads. At AST pad 1, no petroleum analytes were detected except for toluene (0.48 mg/kg) and m,p-xylene (0.089 mg/kg) in the subsurface soil sample. Neither DRO nor RRO was detected at AST pad 1. In the surface soil, at AST pad 2, toluene (0.47 mg/kg), m,p-xylene (0.076 mg/kg), and o-xylene (0.046 mg/kg) were detected. O-xylene (0.09 mg/kg) was detected in the subsurface soil sample. DRO and RRO were detected in the surface soil and subsurface soil samples at up to 360 mg/kg and 63 mg/kg, respectively. None of the detected at either AST pad concentrations exceeded the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard. Fourteen individual VOC analytes were detected at significant concentrations in the source samples. The VOCs were predominantly detected in the subsurface soils at the gas	Light, Greg

		filling and debris area and the fanner garage facility. The analytes 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, n-butylbenzene, and toluene also were detected at elevated concentrations in sediment target samples. Of the SVOCs analyzed, 13 analytes were detected at significant concentrations in the source samples. These SVOCs were detected at the gas filling and debris area, the former garage facility, and drum bunker 1. Seven of the SVOC analytes detected were also detected at significant concentrations in the sediment target samples. No pesticides or PCBs were detected in the source samples. A total of 19 metal analytes were detected at significant concentrations in the source samples. Lead was detected at every source location. Significant concentrations of lead were detected in the surface soil at the gas filling and debris area, the oil filter area, the pump station foundation station, and drum bunkers 1 and 2. Lead and nickel were also detected at significant concentrations in target samples. GRO was not detected in any source samples. Analyses by the Alaska State Petroleum Methods indicated that petroleum contamination does exist in the source areas. Benzene exceeded the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard at the garage facility. DRO and RRO exceeded the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard at the gas filling and debris area, oil filter area, garage facility area, and drum bunker 1. Additionally, DRO also exceeded the 18 AAC 75 cleanup standard at the electrical facility area. CONCLUSIONS Results of the SI indicate that VOCs and SVOCs may be migrating from the site into the target wetland. These VOCs and SVOCs appear to be related to fuel oils and lubricating oils used during operations of the pump station facilities. In addition, lead was detected at elevated concentrations in sediments along the Alaska Highway, and nickel was detected in three downgradient wetland sediment samples at elevated concentrations. Lead and zinc were detected at elevated concentrations in the pond water. The lead detected in the source areas is probably attributable to natural mineral deposits and to the leaded fuel that was pumped through the pipeline. The deposition of lead from the highway is most likely the source of the elevated lead concentrations detected in target samples. Zinc detected in the surface water is most likely attributable to the corrugated pipe and highway debris. Nickel concentrations in the sediments were relatively low and may not be indicative of contaminant migration from the site.	
01/25/1999	Update or Other Action	US EPA David Bennett, Site Assessment Manager letter to Ms. Ida Joe and Ms. Lucy David, c/o Mr. Robert Sattler, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc., 122 First Avenue, Ste. 600, Fairbanks AK 99701-4897. Enclosed please find a copy of the Site Inspection (SI) report for the CANOL Pump Station "J" site. Based upon the SI and other pertinent information, no further Federal Superfund action is anticipated at this time. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (206)553-2103. NOTE to File: CHAPTER 103--COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY SUBCHAPTER I--HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES RELEASES, LIABILITY, COMPENSATION Sec. 9620. Federal facilities (a) Application of chapter to Federal Government (1) In general Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States (including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government) shall be subject to, and comply with, this chapter in the same manner and to the same extent, both procedurally and substantively, as any nongovernmental entity, including liability under section 9607 of this title. Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the liability of any person or entity under sections 9606 and 9607 of this title. (2) Application of requirements to Federal facilities All guidelines, rules, regulations, and criteria which are applicable to preliminary assessments carried out under this chapter for facilities at which hazardous substances are located, applicable to evaluations of such facilities under the National Contingency Plan, applicable to inclusion on the National Priorities List, or applicable to remedial actions at such facilities shall also be applicable to facilities which are owned or operated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in the same manner and to the extent as such guidelines, rules, regulations, and criteria are applicable to other facilities. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States may adopt or utilize any such guidelines, rules, regulations, or criteria which are inconsistent with the guidelines, rules, regulations, and criteria established by the Administrator under this chapter. (3) Exceptions This subsection shall not apply to the extent otherwise provided in this section with respect to applicable time periods. This subsection shall also not apply to any requirements relating to bonding, insurance, or financial responsibility. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to require a State to comply with section 9604(c)(3) of this title in the case of a facility which is owned or operated by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States. (4) State laws State laws concerning removal and remedial action, including State laws regarding enforcement, shall apply to removal and remedial action at facilities owned or operated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or facilities that are the subject of a deferral under subsection (h)(3)(C) of this section when such facilities are not included on the National Priorities List. The preceding sentence shall not apply to the extent a State law would apply any standard or requirement to such facilities which is more stringent than the standards and requirements applicable to facilities which are not owned or operated by any such department, agency, or instrumentality.	Light, Greg
03/03/1999	Site Ranked Using the AHRM	Ranked initially.	Light, Greg
10/13/1999	Update or Other Action	Northern Land Use Research Inc. Fax to Dr. Jim Simon TCC. Pipeline Refs. With the coming of World War II, a huge network of oil pipelines was built across the North in connection with the construction of the Alcan Highway, a series of airports, and other construction projects designed for the defence of Alaska. Canol was a 4" oil pipeline from the Imperial Oil (a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey) fields at-Norman Wells on the Mackenzie River to Whitehorse. Canol 2 was a 4" gasoline pipeline constructed between the port of Skagway and Whitehorse. Canol 3 was a 2" gasoline pipeline constructed between Carcross at Watson Lake. Canol 4 was a 3" gasoline pipeline constructed between Whitehorse and Fairbanks. A Canol 5 pipeline between Fairbanks and Tanana on the Yukon River was planned but not built. This network was constructed in 1942-1943, with a labor force of 4,000 U.S. Army engineers and 10,000 clvilians, at an estimated cost of $133,000,000. The military activity in Alaska during World War II and in the following years of the Cold War transformed the economy of Alaska and of the Alaska Native people. The Alaska Native,people worked on the highways, airports and other milltary construction during World War II and later in DEW Line stations. In 1953-1955 another long military pipeline was constructed, the 626 mile multiproducts line between Haines and Fairbanks. This was a 4" line at first and was later upgraded to an 8" line. Most of this pipeline is now abandoned. In the construction of these military pipelines there was no concern for environmental safeguards; it is probabJy safe to say that little is known of their impact on the environment, although there were about 40 all spills in connection with the operation of the Haines-Fairbanks line.	Light, Greg
11/15/1999	Site Added to Database	Petroleum contamination of soil and sediments.	Halverson, Jc
11/15/1999	Site Ranked Using the AHRM	Groundwater Usage and Surface Water Exposure Index Values changed from original submittal.	Halverson, Jc
07/25/2000	Update or Other Action	ARCHIVE SITE This site has been archived from the inventory of active sites. Site Name: CANOL PUMP STATION J Street: MP 1285.5 ALASKA HIGHWAY City / State / ZIP: TANACROSS , AK 99776 NPL Status: Not on the NPL Non-NPL Status: NFRAP-Site does not qualify for the NPL based on existing information. NOTE TO FILE: a recommendation of no further remedial action planned (NFRAP) on the EPA's part will be included in our Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket tracking system. If new or additional information becomes available that suggests the facility may score high enough to be proposed for the NPL, EPA must reevaluate your facility accordingly. EPA's NFRAP designation does not relieve the facility from complying with appropriate Alaska state regulations. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986(a) (4) requires federal facilities to comply with state cleanup requirements and standards when not listed on the NPL. This facility will not be removed from the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket, but as noted earlier, will be listed for no further action by EPA. NOTE TO FILE: SEC. 120 [42 U.S.C. 9620] Federal Facilities (a) Application of Act to Federal Government.-- (4) State laws. -- State laws concerning removal and remedial action, including State laws regarding enforcement, shall apply to removal and remedial action at facilities owned or operated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States when such facilities are not included on the National Priorities List. The preceding sentence shall not apply to the extent a State law would apply any standard or requirement to such facilities which is more stringent than the standards and requirements applicable to facilities which are not owned or operated by any such department, agency, or instrumentality. EPA ID: AK0002021848 EPA Region: 10 County: SOUTHEAST FAIRBANKS C.A. Federal Facility Flag: Not a Federal Facility	Halverson, Jc
08/28/2001	Update or Other Action	Haines/ Fairbanks (ALCANGO) CANOL (CANADIAN OIL) Pipelines FUDS No. F10AK1016 CHaines! Fairbanks Pipeline CALCANGO)) - FIOAK1033 (CANOL Pipeline) Phase I Draft Technical Report. This document details the information evaluated during the literature search or Phase I Assessment of available records for: CANOL Pipeline F1 OAK1 033 and Haines / Fairbanks Pipeline, F10AK1016. Both are former used defense sites covering an area of 2+ million acres stretching from the Canadian Boarder to Fairbanks, Alaska. This assessment was completed to determine the eligibility of this site for inclusion in several evaluations under the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (NALEMP). The information contained in this report will be utilized by the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (ODUSD(I&E)) to evaluate the necessity for further assessment, restoration, or other outreach activities to assist affected Native American Communities prior to, during, and following U.S. Department of Defense (000) environmental restoration efforts. Conclusions and Recommendations: A. The site is huge, it is little known as far as the impacts from leaks at the pump stations and along the route of the pipeline. Historically the CANOL had more problems than the Haines Fairbanks Pipeline in the matter of leaks and pipeline breaks. Coordination between the Tribes and the military is key to a successful project as a major portion of the knowledge of where these activities took place is with the Tribal elders. Impacts from the activities are located on Native allotments and need to be coordinated with the regulations and procedures outlined in 25 CFR regarding Restricted Native real	Howard, Louis

		estate. B. The CANOL Pipeline was only a part of a whole project, future efforts need to coordinate with the other activities that accompanied the Highway construction and use. These activities were the Northern Staging Route and the airports supporting the Alaskan Siberian Lend Lease Program, as well as the Alaska Communications System. These were all develop simultaneously and should be considered for cleanup in the same manner. Haines I Fairbanks Pipeline was a later development that followed basically the same route as the CANOL Pipeline and the Alaska Highway and should be considered as a part of a larger project along the Alaska Highway Corridor.	
07/01/2002	Update or Other Action	Government to government letter from John Paul Woodley Jr. Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environment) to The Honorable Donald Adams, President, Native Village of Tetlin (IRA) P.O. Box TTL, Tetlin, AK 99779-9997. Dear President Adams: The Department of Defense (DoD) is making a special effort to learn more about possible environmental impacts on tribal lands attributable to past DoD activities. Based on information either reported by your tribal government or contained in our files, there may be sites affected by past DoD activities present in the vicinity of the Native Village of Tetlin. If acceptable. we would like to discuss with you the information we have about these sites. Our goal is to gather pertinent infonnation required to determine if further action is appropriate under the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program. A representative from our contractor. Keres Consulting Inc., will soon contact you regarding this matter in an effort to address the following DoD impacts: - No FUDS Assigned - Pump Station J - NO FUDS Assigned - Camp J Thank. you for your cooperation in this effort. If you have any questions or require further information. please contact Mr. Len Richeson. our Tribal Liaison at (703) 604-0518. He will gladly answer any questions you may have.	Howard, Louis
03/31/2003	Update or Other Action	Part I of II DRAFT PHASE I SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT March 2003. Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pump Station J ALIAS: CANOL Line No. 4; Station J – Northway; Pump Station J. Section 32 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East, Copper River Meridian, Alaska. 63 degrees 13'45" North Latitude, 142 degrees 12'30" West Longitude. Ms. Ida Joe, a Native Allottee, is the landowner of the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) is a landowner located downgradient from the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The Native Village of Tetlin is a landowner located downgradient from the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The total size of Ms. Joe's land located within the State of Alaska is 159.94 acres, all of which is located at the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The portion of Ms. Joe's land impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is 5.7 acres. The estimated portion of Ms. Lucy David's land impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is 1.5 acres. The total size of DOI land located within the State of Alaska is 730,000 acres, of which 0.0 acres are located adjacent to the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The estimated portion of DOI's land impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is 5 acres, which are downgradient from the site. The total size of Native Village of Tetlin lands located within the State of Alaska is 743,147 acres. (The Village owns former Tetlin Indian Reserve, surface & subsurface title to 743,147 acres of land in the former 786,000-acre Reserve, which was established in 1930—not Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA)). The total land owned by the Native Village of Tetlin adjacent to the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is 0.0 acres. The estimated portion of Native Village of Tetlin land impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is 5 acres (within the 15-mile downstream range of influence). Ms. Joe's land is on & impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The DOI land is not adjacent to but is downgradient & impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The Native Village of Tetlin's land is not adjacent to but is down-gradient & impacted by the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. The estimated size of impact is 188.64 acres. Approximately 7.2 acres are actual impacts from the former CANOL Pump Station J Site, while 181.44 acres are estimated health contamination impacts. Of the actual 7.2 impacted acres, 5.7 acres contain cement founda-tions from former buildings & other structures, scattered metal debris, used oil filters, & several 55-gallon drums in various stages of decay scattered over the property & 1.5 acres are adjacent to the site, which are impacted by engines, pumps, miscellaneous building debris, & several rusted 55-gallon drums with no discernible markings. The total estimated potential health contamination impacts from Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs), heavy metal analytes, Diesel Range Organic (DRO), & Residual Range Organic (RRO) impact an area of 181.44 acres. Previous Investigations: CANOL Pump Station J, Site Inspection Report, Milepost 1285.5, Alaska Highway, Alaska TDD: 97-09-0013, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10 Superfund Technical Assessment & Response Team, January 1999 & Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (NALEMP) Phase I Draft Technical Report. Haines/Fairbanks (ALCANGO) & CANOL (Canadian Oil) Pipelines. Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc., (TCC) August 28, 2001. Actual debris at the CANOL Pump Station J Site consists of the following: former structures & tanks, two concrete foundations, a well casing, several industrial-sized oil filters, a partially buried 2-inch pipeline, two bunkers containing seven 55-gallon drums marked "Fort Richardson", a 4-inch pipe vent potentially associated with an Underground Storage Tank (UST) & two Aboveground Storage Tank (AST) pads. An actual health risk at the CANOL Pump Station J consists of VOCs, SVOCs, heavy metal analytes, DRO & RRO contamination related to Petroleum, Oil, & Lubricants (POLs) used during the operations of the pump station facilities from 1944 through 1975.	Howard, Louis
03/31/2003	Update or Other Action	Part II of II Part I of II DRAFT PHASE I SITE ASSESSMENT REPORT March 2003. Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pump Station J ALIAS: CANOL Line No. 4; Station J – Northway; Pump Station J. CANOL PUMP STATION J SITE KCI concludes that the former CANOL Pump Station J Site is NALEMP eligible based on the following findings of fact. -The Native Village of Tetlin is a Federally Recognized Tribe as listed in the Federal Register of July 12, 2002. -DoD used the former CANOL Pump Station J Site as part of its Alaskan fuel supply line from February 1944 to August 1945. There is documented DoD debris on the former CANOL Pump Station J Site. In addition, there is potential migration of DoD-caused VOCs, SVOCs, heavy metal analytes, DRO, and RRO contamination to lands adjacent to and/or downgradient from the former site. -The impacts affect Alaska Native lands as follows. The former CANOL Pump Station J Site is on a Native Allottee parcel owned by Ms. Ida Joe. The former CANOL Pump Station J Site also potentially impacts the adjacent Native Allottee parcel owned by Ms. Lucy David and the topographically downgradient Native Village of Tetlin Tribal lands, as the EPA defined the Native Village of Tetlin to be within the 15-mile downstream range of influence for potential impacts to its lands. KCI recommends a Phase II and Draft Phase III Site Assessment be performed under NALEMP. This recommen-dation is based on KCI's concurrence with the findings of the EPA Site Inspection Report dated January 1999 and on the investigation for this Draft Phase I SAR. CAMP J KCI concludes that the Camp J Site is NALEMP eligible based on the following findings of fact. -The Native Village of Tetlin is a Federally Recognized Tribe as listed in the Federal Register of July 12, 2002. -While there is no historical ownership link between the DoD and the affected property owner, DoD debris and contaminant impacts at the Camp J Site resulted from activities occurring at the CANOL Pump Station J Site. KCI recommends a Phase II and Draft Phase III Site Assessment be performed under NALEMP. This recommen-dation is based on KCI's concurrence with the findings of the EPA Site Inspection Report dated January 1999 and on the investigation for this Draft Phase I SAR.	Howard, Louis
08/29/2003	Update or Other Action	TRIBE: Native Village of Tetlin - Camp J - Reported Impact Information: David Allotment Long -142.19800 Lat. 63.208230. Pumping equipment Concrete forms Metal debris Building debris Drums w/ unknown contents stressed vegetation Site known as Camp J associated w/ Pump Station J. Reason the Impact is believed to be DoD Responsibility: FUDs Oral history Other documentation. Joe Allotment Long -142.191000 Lat. 63.210030. Reported Impact Description: CANOL / Haines Fairbanks pipeline, Pump Station J Suspect soil / groundwater contamination Concrete foundations Misc. debris Drums w/ unknown contents in pond Fuel odor during high water table events (spring thaw).	Howard, Louis
05/10/2004	Update or Other Action	Michael J. Walsh Colonel, Corps Of Engineers, Chief of Staff issues Engineering Regulation No. 200-3-1. It is the policy of the USACE that the policies contained in this ER are the overarching USACE policy for management & execution of the FUDS program & takes precedence over previous USACE FUDS program policy & guidance. The USACE MUST comply with the DERP statute (10 USC 2701 et seq.), CERCLA, 42 USC § 9601 et seq., Executive Orders (EOs) 12580 & 13016, NCP, & all applicable DoD (e.g., DoD Management Guidance for the DERP [28 September 2001]) & Army policies in managing & executing the FUDS program. Because of the linkages between the DERP & CERCLA & the delegation of certain Presidential authorities under CERCLA to DoD, CERCLA is DoD's preferred framework for environmental restoration. Where a regulatory agency seeks to use another framework, USACE Districts shall: Seek formal approval of the decision to follow a framework other than CERCLA. Ensure that the actions undertaken also comply with all applicable CERCLA requirements, especially in the areas of the content of decision documents & the maintenance of an Administrative Record. Consistent with the statutory program goals of the DERP, DoD has established 3 program categories to classify activities at FUDS properties & projects: installation restoration program (IRP), military munitions response program (MMRP), & building demolition/debris removal program (BD/DR). 1) IRP. For the FUDS, the IR program includes the Hazardous, Toxic, & Radioactive Waste (HTRW) & Containerized HTRW (CON/HTRW) project categories. IR program category is defined as the conduct of response actions (i.e., the identification, investigation, & remedial actions, or a combination of removal & remedial actions) to address releases of: Hazardous substances or pollutants & contaminants (as defined in the CERCLA). Petroleum, oil, or lubricants (POL). Under the DoD Management Guidance for the DERP, funding appropriated to the Environmental Restoration (ER)-FUDS account may be used to remediate releases of petroleum where the release poses an imminent & substantial endangerment to the public health or welfare or to the environment [10 USC 2701(b)(2)]. DoD-unique materials. Hazardous wastes or hazardous waste constituents. Low-level radioactive materials or low-level radioactive wastes. Explosive compounds released to soil, surface water, sediments, or groundwater as a result of ammunition or explosives production or manufacturing at ammunition plants. 2) MMRP. The MMRP category is defined as response actions (i.e., the identification, investigation, & remedial actions, or a combination of removal &	Jaynes, Mike

		category is defined as response actions (incl. the identification, investigation, & remedial actions, or a combination of removal & remedial actions) to address Munitions & Explosives of Concern (MEC) or Munitions Constituents (MC). This includes the removal of foreign military munitions if it is incidental to the response addressing DoD military munitions at a FUDS property. 3) BD/DR Program. This program category is defined as the demolition & removal of unsafe buildings & structures at FUDS properties that were owned by, leased to, or otherwise possessed by the U. S. & under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense & transferred to state, local governments, or Native Corporations of AK. FUDS Project Definition. Within this Program, USACE has defined a FUDS Project as a unique name given to an area of an eligible FUDS property containing one or more releases or threatened releases of a similar response nature, treated as a discrete entity or consolidated grouping for response purposes. This may include buildings, structures, impoundments, landfills, storage containers, or other areas where hazardous substance are or have come to be located, including FUDS eligible unsafe buildings or debris. Response actions at FUDS projects fall under the Installation Restoration (HTRW & CON/HTRW), MMMRP (MEC & MC), or BD/DR program categories. An eligible FUDS property MAY have more than one project. The DoD Goals for the DERP, established for the FUDS program in the DoD Financial Management Regulation (FMR), require USACE to develop an execution strategy that includes the following. Reducing risk to human health & the environment through implementation of effective, legally compliant, & cost-effective response actions. Having final remedies in place & completing response actions. Requiring certain percentages of FUDS projects in the program to progress to specific stages of the response process by specific dates (i.e., milestones). The objective of the BD/DR program is to protect human health & safety by demolishing & removing unsafe buildings, structures, & debris resulting from past DoD operations.	
07/06/2006	Update or Other Action	Memorandum from Timothy J. Gallagher Colone, Commanding. CEPOA-PM-C FUDS (200-1f) JUL 6 2006 MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Pacific Ocean Division, ATTN: CEPOD-BTD (B. Curnyn), Bldg. 525, Fort Shafter, HI 96858-5440 SUBJECT; Defense Environmental Restoration Program - Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS) Findings and Determination of Eligibility (FDE) for Property No. FlOAK1033, Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No.4, Alaska. 1. The Alaska District has prepared a Findings and Determination of Eligibility (FDE) for the CANOL Pipeline No.4 corridor site. We determined that the property is eligible for inclusion in the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FVDS) program. Enclosure 1 is the FDE and Enclosure 2 is a property map showing the general property vicinity. 2. Real Estate and Office of Counsel have concurred with these findings. 3. I recommend that; a. CEPOD approve the enclosed FOE; b. CEPOD forward a copy of this FOE to CEMP-RF and CEHND-EO-PM. 4. Please contact me directly if I can be of further assistance. Detailed information desired by your staff can be obtained by contacting Richard Jackson, FUDS Project Manager, of my Civil Works Project Management Branch at (907) 753-5606.	Jaynes, Mike
07/06/2006	Update or Other Action	FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY, Defense Environmental Restoration Program· Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS), Inventory Project Report (INPR), Property No. F1OAK1033 Canadian Oil (CANOL) No.4 Pipeline, Alaska. 1. Construction of the Canol No.4 Project began in 1942 and was completed in February 1944. The project consisted of constructing a 3-inch pipeline extending from Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, to Ladd Field, Fairbanks, Alaska and was designed to carry petroleum products. The length of the line from the Canadian border to Fairbanks was approximately 296 miles. The pipeline was laid on tile surface, generally parallel to the Alaska Highway, and only placed subsurface where necessary to protect it from traffic or natural bazards. 2. Public Land Order (PLO) 12, dated 20 July 1942, withdrew a strip of land 20 miles either side of a centerline containing an aggregate of 8,320,000 acres for the construction of the Alaska Military Highway. PLO 270, dated 5 April 1945 reduced the withdrawal to a strip 5 miles on either side of a center line and reduced the aggregate to 2,092,800 acres. PLO 386, dated 31 July 1947 revoked both PLO 12 and 270 and further reduced the withdrawal to a strip of land 300 feet on either side of the then existing Alaska Highway from the Canadian border to Big Delta, Alaska. 3. PLO 386 defined other withdrawals, one of which was a strip of land 25 feet on either side of a telephone line generally constructed parallel to the Alaska llighway. The other was a strip of land 10 feet on either side of a pipeline generally constructed parallel to the Alaska Highway. This was the Canol Project No. 4 pipeline. Additional PLO 386 withdrawals included withdrawal of 305 acres of land for support facilities and pumping stations "I" through "M" of the Canol Project. The twenty-foot right of way for that portion of Canol No.4 pipeline, which ran from Big Delta, Alaska, to Fairbanks, was acquired by land notation under 44LD513 principles, Fairbanks Bureau of Land Management serial number 08691. 4. The United States was concemed about the safety of Alaskan petroleum supplies especially with the presence of Japaocse forces in the Aleutian Islands and considered the construction of the Canol Project to provide a safe alternate source of oil in support of the war effort in Alaska. However, after 1945 and the defeat of the Japanese forces, use of the pipeline diminished. The line was eventually replaced by the larger 8 inch Haines/Fairbanks pipeline in 1955. 5. A private contractor completed the physical removal of the Canol Pipeline #4 on 9 October 1974. However, private landowners, and others, had previously removed some sections of the pipeline. Prior to removal, some portions of the pipeline were buried during road maintenance and construction of private access roads. These sections were not removed by the contractor due to environmental considerations. 6. On 14 June 1977, the Bureau of Land Management accepted relinquishment of the pipeline right-of-way and removed the 44LD513 notation for the Canol line for the section from Big Delta to Fairbanks. BLM record 031077 notes that on 24 February 1972, PLO 386 was revoked by Section 19 (a) of Public Law 92-203, for the section of pipeline from Big Delta to the Canadian border. The final Revocation and Restoration action was complcted by the BLM on 15 June 1978. The Haines/Fairbanks pipeline, which was laid generally adjacent to the Canol pipeline, was not affected by these actions. 7. The available records and history did not provide a survey that accurately located the path of the pipeline. Although there were some records that did locate the line in a particular range and township between Delta Junction and Fairbanks. Historical documents indicated that the pipeline followed the corridor of the Alaska Highway from the border of Canada to Fairbanks and was laid close to the telephone line right of way that was generally within 50 feet of the highway. 8. Provided with available information, combined with general location and history of the pipeline, the attached listing of ownership along the pipeline right-of-way was prepared by a contractor in June 2003. DETERMINATION-Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the property has been determined to have been under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense and owned, leased to, or otherwise possessed by the United States prior to 17 October 1986. This property is therefore eligible for inclusion into the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Formerly Used Defense Sites established under 10 USC 2701 et seq.	Jaynes, Mike
07/19/2006	Site Visit	Haines-Fairbanks Pipeline Tok Site Visits - July 19, 2006 Meeting with: Sherlene Mark, Environmental Technician with Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC) in Tok and Mr. Richard Jackson of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Mr. Jackson explained the project and showed Ms. Mark the maps and as-built drawings for the Haines/Fairbanks Pipeline (HFP). He explained the various pipeline features and the difference between the Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) and Army sites. He noted that he was aware of TCC plans to complete herbicide sampling at some allotment locations. Mr. Jackson noted that TCC can contact USACE if they feel that they could help on the sampling plans. Mr. Jackson agreed to send Ms. Mark the link to the HFP history document. Ms. Mark asked to accompany the USACE on the site visits and stated that she is a landowner at Pump Station J. Mr. Jackson then showed Ms. Mark the Canadian Oil (CANOL) and Pump Station J as-built drawings. He added that he would supply the Pump Station J/Camp J Report (Keres Consulting, March 2003) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report from the late 199Os. Ms. Mark then requested copies of all information related to Pump Station 1. Ms. Mark also asked for information about Northway Airport and Moose Creek. Mr. Jackson apologized for not being aware that Ms. Mark was a landowner. Mr. Jackson stated that the USACE is trying to establish information about the Moose Creek area. He then showed the as-built drawings and real estate drawings that he had available for the Northway area, and added that more information is currently been researched for the Spur Pipeline area. Gary David and Alex Sinyon arrived at the TCC office to meet with Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson explained to Ms. Mark that Alex Sinyon had requested at the Tok public meeting in February 2006 that the Pump Station J area be visited. He then showed Mr. Sinyon a copy of a report entitled, "General Description of Facilities USARAL Petroleum Distribution System," and offered to send him a copy. Mr. Sinyon asked in what condition the CANOL pipeline was left in. Mr. Jackson replied that the line was probably left intact. Mr. Sinyon commented that Mr. David has a lot of information about the area. He added that Tetlin is not in charge of land in the Northway or Tanacross area and USACE would have to speak to these villages separately. Mr. David commented that Lucy, Myra, and LuLu David have allotments to the south of Pump Station J. Mr. Sinyon stated that he was concerned about the drums and debris in the Midway area. Meeting with: Ida Joe and Sherlene Mark, owners of the Pump Station J land. Mr. Jerry Williams explained the project to Mrs. Joe. Mrs. Joe stated that she had received letters from the Army when the Northway area was cleaned up. She added that the Army never came to complete the cleanup as the letters had stated that they planned to. Mr. Jackson entered the room and introduced himself. Mr. Jackson stated that work on the CANOL sites may not start until 2007 as the FUDS eligibility process is currently underway. Alex Simeon had brought Pump Station J to the attention of the USACE. Ms. Joe asked that she get a copy of any information about Pump Station J. Ms. Mark added that she had contacted the TCC in Fairbanks and they had stated that the Tetlin Corporation had nothing to do with the allotments and added that the Tetlin boundary is around Midway. Ms. Joe added that Lulu, Myra, and Lucy David also have land in the area and would need to know about the project. Mr. Jackson apologized for the late notice about the project. Site visits to: Gary David's land at Midway Lake. Mr. Jackson and Mr. Williams walked with Mr. David. Ms. Alex Post walked with Mr. Sinyon. Mr. Sinyon was concerned about cancer rates, four people in the family that lived next to Mr. David on the lake died of cancer. He added that he was also concerned about the effect of the site debris on the lake as there are no fish anymore; there used to be whitefish, grayling, and pike. Tetlin Corporation land across road from Mr. David's property (MP 1290.5). This property is the pipeline right-of-way. Ms. Mark commented that the vegetation is different on	Jaynes, Mike

		David's property (MP 1290.5). This property is the pipeline right-of-way. Ms. Mark commented that the vegetation is different on the pipeline area. She added that there is a valve in the gravel pit before Camp J. Pump Station J. The group then traveled to Camp J and explored the site with Ms. Mark. Several features visible in an old site photograph were located, including the upper tank pads and access stairway. Other features located included a section of pipe, pads, a well, asbestos material, a building foundation, several drainage ditches, and an open wooden septic tank structure with several drums inside. Other metal debris were scattered around the site.	
08/16/2006	Update or Other Action	Determination Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the property has been determined to have been under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense and owned, leased to, or otherwise possessed by the United States prior to 17 October 1986. This property is therefore eligible for inclusion into the Defense Environmental Restoration Program - Formerly Used Defense Sites established under 10 USC 2701 et seq. Signed John W. Peabody, Brigadier General, U.S. Army Commanding.	Howard, Louis
08/30/2006	Update or Other Action	Paul Mayo contacted by September Brod, Sundance Consulting, Inc. Subject: NALEMP. We are in the process of scheduling a site visit to the Native Village of Tetlin, September 19th and 20th, 2006, to conduct soil sampling on Mrs. Ida Joe and Mrs. Lucy David's native allotments under the NALEMP program. I'm not sure what the process is to obtain a right of entry from TCC, but Rich Jackson and Pat Roth, USACE-AK, suggested I contact you. I've been working with Mr. Sattler concerning another site - Manley Hot Springs - that NALEMP has decided will not work because of access to the site and weather conditions. Both Mr. Roth and Mr. Jackson feel that sampling for contaminants at the two native allotments would complement the work they are currently conducting along the pipeline. I've also had the opportunity to speak to Christy Young, Native Village of Tetlin who feels that these sites are a good selection for follow on work and sampling. Rich also suggested that I contact Sherlene Mark, in your TCC Tok Office, to see if she would be available to escort us to the sites, since Ida Joe is her Mother. It is also my understanding that Mrs. David's son, Gary David [883-3929] will accompany us to his Mother's site. If you could please let me know what I will need to do to obtain the right of entry permit I would really appreciate it! Thanking you in advance for your help.	Jaynes, Mike
09/08/2006	Update or Other Action	September Brod to Bob Sattler re: Draft Step I NALEMP Template. Here are the type of samples (being proposed): GRO, DRO, RRO, VOCs, PCBs/Pesticides, RCRA Metals (8 Total).	Jaynes, Mike
09/22/2006	Site Visit	Trip Report Summary Tetlin, Alaska September 18-22, 2006 Native Village of Tetlin Site Assessments Site 1: CANOL Pump Station J – Ida Joe Native Allotment Site 2: Camp J Site – Lucy David Native Allotment & Site 3: The Lulu David Native Allotment. Prepared by: Sundance Consulting, Inc. 9/18/06 - September Brod & Lisa Safford of Sundance Consulting, Inc. obtained soil sample bottles, cooler & ice packs from SGS Environmental Services, Inc. Bryan Arnold, Project Mgr., reviewed the sample kit requirements such as the soil amounts, holding temperature & packaging. -They obtained sampling equipment from TTT Environmental Instruments & Supplies. -They obtained sampling supplies from Fred Meyers. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford reviewed the SAP, QAPP, HSP. - They departed Anchorage, at 2:00 pm & arrived in Tok at 8:00 pm. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford met with Pat Roth, NALEMP Program Mgr., USACE AK District, in Tok to discuss the site investigation scheduled for Tuesday, September 19 & 20, 2006. 9/19/06 - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford organized sampling containers, supplies, & equipment for the site investigation visit to Site 1: CANOL Pump Station J– Ida Joe Native Allotment. - They picked up Larry Mark from his home. Mr. Mark is Native Allottee Ida Joe's son-in-law & served as the escort to access his mother-in-law's property. - They then met Thomas Gamza, TCC & Gary David at the Ida Joe property. Mr. David is Native Allottee Lucy David's son & served as the escort to his Mother's property. - Introductions were given & the entire group conducted a site reconnaissance for the Ida Joe, Lucy David, Lulu David & Tetlin Corp. lands. Site reconnaissance ended. - The Lulu David Native Allotment was not initially a part of the planned site investigation. However, after visiting the allotment, the assessor's felt this site should be included in this Draft Step III Site Assessment Report (SAR). - The Tetlin Corp. land, which is referred to as "Midway Lake Site", will be added to the NAETS as a newly reported impact discovery. -Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford began the site investigation, PID testing & soil sampling event for the Ida Joe Native allotment. Mr. Mark & Mr. Gamza remained at the Ida Joe property throughout the site investigation. Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford completed soil sampling for the Ida Joe Native Allotment at the CANOL Pump Station J Site. 9/20/06 - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford met Mr. Gamza at the Ida Joe property, walked across the Alaska Highway & began the site investigation & soil sampling event for the Lucy David Native Allotment. Mr. Gamza remained at the site & participated in the soil sampling throughout the site investigation. Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford completed soil sampling for the Lucy David Native Allotment at the Camp J Site. - Ms. Brod, Ms. Safford & Mr. Gamza drove to the Lulu David Native Allotment & began the site investigation & soil sampling event for the Lulu David Native Allotment. Mr. Gamza remained at the site & participated in the soil sampling throughout the site investigation. Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford completed soil sampling for the Lulu David Native Allotment. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford conducted a second site reconnaissance for the Ida Joe, Lucy David, & Lulu David Native Allotments to obtain detailed pictures & to confirm latitude & longitude readings for the sampling locations. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford conducted an interview with Mr. David to gather the information required for the land use of his Mother's Native Allotment, which will be utilized in the Draft Step III SAR. - At the conclusion of the interview, Mr. David reported another site that is impacting the Tetlin Corp.'s land. Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford agreed to meet Mr. David at 9:00 am on Thursday, September 21, 2006 to hike to the site. 9/21/06 - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford met Mr. David & Alex Sinyou, President Tetlin Corp. at the Midway Lake Site. Mr. David & Mr. Sinyou provided information on the site & photographs were taken to a accompany the newly reported impacts in NAETS. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford hiked with Mr. David to what he referred to as "the Midway Lake North Site". This site is directly across the AK Hwy., N of the Midway Lake Site & located on Tetlin Corp. land. Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford gathered information about the site to report in NAETS & took photographs. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford organized the sampling containers, supplies, & equipment in preparation for departure from the site investigations. - They departed Tok at 2:00 pm & arrived in Anchorage at 8:00 pm. 9/22/06 - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford delivered the soil samples to SGS, Inc. in a cooler to maintain proper temperatures. - They returned the sampling equipment to TTT. - Ms. Brod & Ms. Safford organized their field notes, sampling & photograph log sheets. - This concluded the site assessment for the Native Village of Tetlin Native Allotment Sites.	Jaynes, Mike
01/31/2007	Update or Other Action	Draft Step III Site Assessment Report for: CANADIAN OIL (CANOL) PIPELINE PROJECT NUMBER 4 (FUDS ID NUMBER F10AK1033): CANOL PUMP STATION J SITE – IDA JOE NATIVE ALLOTMENT (NO FUDS ID ASSIGNED), CANOL PIPELINE PROJECT NUMBER 4 (FUDS ID NUMBER F10AK1033): CAMP J SITE – LUCY DAVID NATIVE ALLOTMENT (NO FUDS ID ASSIGNED) & CANOL PIPELINE PROJECT NUMBER 4 (FUDS ID NUMBER F10AK1033): LULU DAVID NATIVE ALLOTMENT SITE (NO FUDS ID ASSIGNED). This Draft Step III SAR documents the data collected for the Phase I SAR & during the Step II Site Assessment. The information contained in this report will be used by the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (ODUSD(I&E)) to evaluate the necessity for further assessment, restoration, or other outreach activities to assist affected Native American communities prior to, during, & following U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) environmental restoration efforts. Conclusions & Recommendations CANOL Pump Station J Site – Ida Joe Native Allotment: Sundance concludes that the site is eligible for the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (NALEMP) & recommends mitigation actions. This site has known soil contaminants & Building Demolition/Debris Removal (BD/DR) impacts resulting from former Department of Defense (DoD) activity. Specific mitigation recommendations include characterization of drum contents & any other potential hazardous waste, subsequent removal of BD/DR material, delineation of contaminated soils, contaminated soil removal action, & placement of monitoring wells to determine if contamination from soils has migrated to groundwater. It is further recommended that future site investigations include speciation of chromium & sampling of the on-site pond & nearby wetlands. In addition, considering the use of this land for subsistence, it is recommended that an investigation be conducted considering potential plant uptake of contaminants. Furthermore, the responsible agency should consult with the Native Allottee to inform her of the potential health & direct contact hazards associated with issues related to this site & establish a timeline for mitigation. The assessor concludes that the Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pump Station J Site – Ida Joe Native Allotment is unsafe as is for residential development & other uses.	Howard, Louis
07/31/2007	Update or Other Action	Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge Contaminant Assessment (USF&WS). The CANOL pipeline had a 35 months lifespan from conception to abandonment, and by one account operated only 11 months. The pipeline was constructed to carry oil from Norman Wells on the Mackenzie River in the Northwest Territories to Whitehorse in the Yukon (where a refinery was built). Fuel was needed for construction of the Alaska Highway, military bases in Canada and Alaska, and airfields used to ship planes to Russia. From Whitehorse, a smaller pipeline was built alongside the new Alcan Highway to Ladd Field in Fairbanks, AK. Construction started in summer 1942 and was completed in February 1944. Between July and November of 1944, the project provided all of the motor vehicle fuel requirements for military needs between Watson Lake and Fairbanks and also exported between 20 million and 40 million liters of oil to Skagway. On March 8, 1945, eleven months after the oil first reached Whitehorse, the U.S. Army terminated the project. The U.S. government planned to sell the pipeline to the highest bidder, who would then operate the CANOL pipeline. However, no companies bid to operate the pipeline and salvage operations were undertaken by the U.S. military and later, in 1947, by Imperial Oil. Salvage operations included the removal of brass valves, power units, motors, and pipes. Environmental remediation was not part of any salvage operation. At present, sections of pipe, vehicle dumps, barrel caches, and camps remain along the CANOL pipeline route. In 1998, the EPA performed a site inspection for the CANOL Pump Station J site, adjacent to the TNWR. Surface water and sediment was sampled from two locations on the Refuge, as well as at several locations potentially upstream (north) of Refuge lands. Samples were analyzed for residual range organics (RRO), diesel range organics (DRO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and inorganics. Based on analytical results,	Howard, Louis

		Site Inspection, and "other pertinent information", the EPA anticipated no further Federal Superfund action for Pump Station J. In 2002, the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. conducted a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment on a Native Allotment in Northway Village in response to a landowner within the allotment encountering petroleum contaminated soil while excavating for a septic tank. Thirty-three soil samples were collected on the allotment and analyzed for DRO, gasoline range organics (GRO), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX), VOCs, semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and lead. Diesel range organics (DRO) and GRO were detected at concentrations above ADEC cleanup levels. DRO concentrations ranged from 880 to 12,000 mg/kg in soil samples, which exceeds ADEC Method One Cleanup Level of 200 mg/kg, Method Two Migration to Ground Water Cleanup Level of 250 mg/kg, and in several cases Method Two Soil Ingestion Cleanup Level of 10,250 mg/kg. GRO concentrations ranged from 100 to 500 mg/kg in soil, which equaled or exceeded ADEC Method One Cleanup Level of 100 mg/kg and in some cases exceeded the Method Two Migration to Ground Water Cleanup Level of 300 mg/kg. An estimated 60,000 to 70,000 cubic feet of soil are contaminated on the allotment. Due to the ongoing remediation in Northway Village, it is unclear at this time what remedial actions will be used to address these petroleum contaminated soils. Conclusions: The Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge has a range of contaminant issues, some of which have been identified and highlighted in this report. The majority of contaminant issues on the Refuge stem from past and military operations uses previous to the creation of TNWR. Future threats include expansion of mining activities and spills associated with the Alaska Highway. This Contaminant Assessment Process has gathered information to help Service personnel to make informed management decisions about contaminant threats to the Refuge Complex lands and resources. It is the responsibility of the Service to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. Utilizing the CAP is one way in which the Service can ensure that our country's National Wildlife Refuges maintain their environmental health and integrity.	
06/17/2008	Exposure Tracking Model Ranking	Initial ranking with ETM completed.	Reese, Evon
10/14/2008	Update or Other Action	Project Summary Sheet for DERP-FUDS HTRW Project No. F10AK103301 Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No. 4 Whitehorse-Fairbanks Division Alaska. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The site consists of the former pipeline right of way, possible dumps, staging areas and camps associated with construction of the pipeline, and valves, pump stations and maintenance facilities associated with operation of the pipeline. Operation of the CANOL pipeline ended in 1955, and since then much of the pipeline and associated facilities have been removed or demolished by contractors working for the Federal government or private individuals acting on their own: Fuel leaks and spills from operation of the pipeline that may pose a risk to local residents have been documented in an EPA Site Investigation Report (EPA, 1999), in reports prepared for the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC, 2003) and in reports prepared for the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (EG&G, 2003a and EG&G,2003b). PROJECT ELIGIBILITY: The U.S. Anny installed the pipeline between 1942 and 1944. The pipeline was used from 1942 to 1955. No documentation has been found indicating a beneficial use of the pipeline by others since DoD deactivated the pipeline in 1955. Several reports document contaminated soil that may have been caused by fuel releases from the CANOL pipeline. A Draft Phase II Environmental Site Assessment of Native Allotment FF-9632 (December 6, 2002) includes sampling results showing elevated concentrations of fuels (diesel) in soil around the CANOL pipeline. A January 1999 EPA SI report documents a spill at Pump Station J along the CANOL pipeline. An April 2003 Phase I Site Assessment prepared for DoD identified three additional potential sites related to the CANOL pipeline. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS: The CANOL pipeline extends for 605 miles from Whitehorse, Canada, to Fairbanks. Alaska. About 296 miles of the pipeline are in Alaska. The pipeline located in Canada is not eligible for DERP-FUDS funding. Along the 296 miles of pipeline, there are 1,079 tracts ofland separated amongst approximately 444 landowners. The landowners include state. federal, municipal and private landowners. Current owners have not beneficially used the site subsequent to Anny use. The CANOL Pipeline parallels the Haines-Fairbanks pipeline. The Haines-Fairbanks pipeline is a separate FUDS property. PROPOSED ACTIVITY: Conduct an inventory of known and suspected fuel spills along the length of the pipeline in Alaska. Once a list of spill sites has been developed and prioritized. The Alaska District can perform Site Investigations on the high priority sites. Pending outcome of the Site Investigations, Remedial Investigations will be conducted. PROJECT POINT OF CONTACT: Programs and Project Management Division, Environmental and Special Projects Branch, Mary M. Jemin, (907) 753-2754. LEAD REGULATOR: Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, John Halverson, (907) 269-7545.	Howard, Louis
01/29/2010	Update or Other Action	MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, Pacific Ocean Division, ATTN: CEPOD-PDM (H. Kekaula), Bldg. 525, Fort Shafter, HI 96858-5440 SUBJECT: Defense Environmental Restoration Program - Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS) Revised Inventory Project Report (INPR) for Property No. FIOAK1033, Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No.4, Whitehorse-Fairbanks Division, Alaska. 1. This memorandum, including enclosures, comprises the revised INPR for a Hazardous, Toxic and Radiological Waste (HTRW) project along the CANOL Pipeline No.4 property. Enclosure 1 is the Property Survey Summary Sheet with the CANOL Pipeline Vicinity Map. 2. In 2004, a Findings and Detennination of Eligibility (FDE) was approved for the property and is included here as Enclosure 2. The property was detennined to have been formerly used by the Department of Defense (DOD). This INPR revision recommends a HTRW project (FIOAK1033-01). 3. The CANOL pipeline and the Alaska-Canada (ALCAN) Highway right of ways were acquired through Public Land Orders (PLO) in Alaska. The Property Summary Sheet (Enclosure 1) contains a map showing the pipeline corridor along which project will be conducted. The FDE (Enclosure 2) includes a detailed description of how the land was acquired. It is proposed that an inventory of known and suspected pipeline fuel spills be developed followed by a site investigation (SI) and remedial investigation (RI). Enclosure 3 contains the Project Summary Sheet. As required by the FUDS program policy (ER 200-3-1), the Environmental Protection Agency Preliminary Assessment form and the INPR Checklist are included as Enclosures 4 and 5, respectively. A list of landowners is included as Enclosure 6. 4. Real Estate and Office of Counsel have concurred with these findings. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (Anne Marie Palmieri, 907-766-3184) was provided a copy of the draft HTRW project INPR revision. PROPERTY NAME: Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No. 4 LOCATION: Whitehorse Canada to Fairbanks, Alaska (605 miles). The pipeline extended 605 miles from Whitehorse, to Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks. About 296 miles of Pipeline No. 4 are in Alaska. The site covers approximately 1794 acres of land, assuming a 50-foot right of way along the length of the pipeline (see attached map). The location referenced by the Latitude and Longitude listed below is Tok, Alaska. Latitude 63° 19' 23" N Longitude 143° 02' 12" W Congressional District: Alaska, At-large U.S Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10 PROPERTY HISTORY: The CANOL Pipeline was constructed during World War II to move fuel from Whitehorse, Canada, to Fort Wainwright, Alaska (formerly, Ladd Airfield). Construction of the pipeline began in 1942 and was completed in February 1944. The Whitehorse refinery, which supplied fuel to the pipeline, shut down in April 1945. Fuel pumped through the pipeline after the refinery was shut down was supplied via a pipeline from Skagway. The CANOL pipeline ended operation in July 1946. The Alaska portion of the CANOL pipeline was turned over to the Alaska District Corps of Engineers in 1946 pending a decision on the final disposition of the pipeline. After inspections, repairs, and testing were completed, the restored CANOL pipeline was returned to service in May 1948. Fuel was transferred from Skagway to Whitehorse via the CANOL No. 2 and then on to Fairbanks via the CANOL No. 4. Use of the CANOL No. 2 and No. 4 continued until 1955 when the Haines-Fairbanks pipeline went into operation. The Haines-Fairbanks pipeline was installed roughly parallel to the CANOL No. 4. During operation, the CANOL pipeline was used to transfer aviation gasoline, motor gasoline, and diesel fuel oil. The CANOL pipeline was only operated in the summer months (April to July). PROJECT DESCRIPTION(S): Conduct a site investigation and remedial investigation to determine the nature and extent of identified contamination.	Howard, Louis
02/11/2010	Update or Other Action	Memorandum for Commander, Alaska District (POA), ATTN: CEPOA-PM-C (Mr. Kenneth Andraschko). Subject: DERP FUDS Revised Inventory Project Report (INPR) for Propery No. F10AK1033 Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No. 4, Whitehourse-Fairbanks Division, AK. 1. References: a. Memorandum for Commander, Pacific Ocean Division, ATTN: CEPOD-PDM (H. Kekaula), SUBJECT: DERP-FUDS Revised INPR for Property No. FI0AKI033 Canadian Oil (CANOL) Pipeline No.4, Whitehorse-Fairbanks Division, Alaska, dated 29 January 2010 b. Environmental Regulation (ER) 200-3-1 Formally Used Defense Site Program Policy 2. The recommendation to revise the subject INPR to add a new Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste (HTRW) project (FIOAKI033-01) is in accordance with reference Lb. and is approved. 3. My POC on this matter is Hudson Kekaula, (808) 438-6962. Signed Wendell S. Awada, P.E. Deputy Directory of Programs.	Howard, Louis
03/31/2010	Update or Other Action	Stratigic Project Implementation Plan Revion 1 March 2010. This Strategic Project Implementation Plan (SPIP) is the long-term planning document of the Tetlin Village Council for mitigation of former U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) sites that impact the Native Village of Tetlin, Alaska, under the DoD's Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program. The sites of concern described in this SPIP are located on Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act lands and Alaska native allotments. The Tetlin Environmental Program is overseeing the preparation of this SPIP and any investigation and remediation activities to be conducted. The CANOL Pump Station J Site - Ida Joe Allotment is located at Milepost 1285.5, along the 296-mile Alaska corridor of the pipeline (Figure 1). The legal description is Section 32 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East, in the Copper River Meridian, Alaska. The location is 63 degrees (°) 12 minutes (') 33 seconds (?) north latitude and 142° 11' 47? west longitude. The current landowner of this site is Ms. Ida Joe. The USACE refers to this site as the CANOL Pipeline Project Number 4 Site, and the CANOL Pump Station J Site (FUDS ID Number F10AK1033). The area potentially impacted at the CANOL Pump Station J Site – Ida Joe Native Allotment consists of approximately 60 acres. Drums, building foundations, and metal debris are scattered	Howard, Louis

		throughout the area. A site assessment was performed in 2006 (Sundance Consulting, Inc. [Sundance], 2007), which consisted of the collection of six surface soil samples and an inventory of debris and drums at the site (Table 1). Diesel range organics (DRO) concentrations exceeded Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) cleanup levels in three of the six soil samples at concentrations of 14,800 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) (L01SL); 4,310 mg/kg (L02SL); and 1,570 mg/kg (L04SL), compared to the cleanup level of 250 mg/kg. The Native Village of Tetlin's primary objectives for the cleanup and closure of the DoD sites are: - To protect and provide for the health and safety of the people, - To protect and enhance the environment and preserve Native culture in the Tetlin area, and - To provide employment opportunities for the Tetlin Native people. These debris sites have been present on the Tetlin lands for the past 40 to 50 years. In addition to being a safety hazard, these sites are believed to have caused adverse impacts to the environment and are potential risks to public health. The initial investigation will be conducted at the NALEMP-eligible sites which are the highest priority for the Village of Tetlin, as follows: - Sample of soil and groundwater in the areas of the Ida Joe Allotment, the Lulu David Allotment, and the Lucy David Allotment, to delineate soil contamination, and to determine whether impacts to groundwater or surface water exist; - Remove empty drums and debris in the Ida Joe Allotment, Lulu David Allotment, and Lucy David Allotment; - Dig trenches in drum and debris areas to assess if buried drums and debris are present; - Collect surface water and sediment samples from Midway Lake and Midway Lake North to assess if environmental impacts are present; and - Inspect the allotment sites and Midway Lake sites for evidence of other environmental impacts not yet identified. Based on the results of the initial investigation, and as other sites become eligible under NALEMP, additional work in the future may include: - Quantifying and characterizing drum wastes; - Disposing of debris and hazardous wastes; - Conduct investigations at Tetlin Army Camp, Northway Tetlin Trail, Jerry Hill, and 40-Mile Dump; - Conducting geophysical investigations for potentially buried drum locations at the various sites.	
05/23/2011	Update or Other Action	Staff received a copy of the Tetlin NALEMP Site Reconnaissance & Investigation Bristol Project No. 410030 work plan for review & comment. The scope of the work proposed under the Native American Lands Environmental Mitigation Program (NALEMP) FY11 Cooperative Agreement (CA) is to perform site reconnaissance, SI, & debris removal activities on the Lucy David & Lulu David Native Allotments. Allotments are privately owned land designated by the BIA prior to the ANCSA agreement. Both the ANCSA properties & the allotments will be referred to as "Native Alaska lands" in this document & are eligible for assistance under NALEMP. Drums, debris, & dump sites will be inspected in the field to determine if they are from military origin. Military drums & debris will be segregated from any more recent household debris which may be present. The primary focus of the current scope of work (SOW) is to identify if petroleum hydrocarbon contamination exists in soil & groundwater at the 2 allotments. In addition, excavation of trenches &/or test pits will be performed in order to assess whether or not subsurface metal & potentially hazardous debris are present. Surface debris including drums & other potentially hazardous materials from past military activities at the sites will be inspected & removed. Drum contents, if present, will be containerized & properly disposed. Lastly, temporary well points will be installed at the sites to facilitate the collection of groundwater samples for laboratory analysis. The overall goal of the SOW is to attempt to identify any remaining hazards that may be present, which may be impacting the health & welfare of the local NVT residents. Any recommendations resulting from this initial SI may be funded by the DoD under a future CA. Future CAs may allow for SI activities to be conducted at other identified sites. The summary of objectives for the NVT NALEMP FY11 Site Reconnaissance, SI, & debris removal on the 2 allotments are as follows: - Conduct a subsurface investigation utilizing a Geoprobe® direct-push drilling rig including the collection of soil samples for laboratory analysis. - Install temporary well points at each allotment to aid the collection & analysis of groundwater samples. - Dig test pits & trenches near debris fields to assess whether buried metal &/or debris is present. - Identify, containerize, & remove environmental hazards including drums & debris. The SOW is as follows: - Conduct a thorough site reconnaissance to identify all visible & potential physical & environmental hazards which may be present on the 2 allotments. - Implement an SI & sampling program to determine if environmental contamination in media (soil, sediment, debris, &/or ground water) exists on the 2 allotments within the NVT. Surface water may be sampled if field observations suspect contamination may be present. - Identify, sample, characterize, containerize, stage, & remove surface drums & debris. - Document & map field activities & conditions at the NVT using detailed notes, photographs, & a Global Positioning System (GPS). Site Reconnaissance – A site reconnaissance will be performed to determine the physical boundaries of the allotments, the number & types of visible drums & debris, & to document other potential areas of contamination. Sampling/removal options will be identified for areas that were previously undiscovered & the information will be used to guide the sampling program & estimate removal costs. - Brush & Debris Removal – Removal of brush & debris will be performed as necessary & practicable to reduce risk of contamination & improve access to areas of environmental concern. - Site Investigation – A Geoprobe direct-push drill rig will be used to drill subsurface probes to depths of 15 feet to identify the presence or absence of gasoline range organic (GRO), diesel range organic (DRO), &/or residual range organic (RRO) contamination. In areas of debris & drums, a backhoe will be used to excavate trenches &/or test pits to assess if buried metal is present. A temporary well point will also be installed at each allotment. - Sampling Program – Subsurface soil samples will be collected from the soil borings & analyzed for the presence of GRO, DRO, & RRO petroleum contamination. A surface soil sample will also be collected & analyzed for background metal concentrations. In addition, a temporary well point will be installed at each allotment to facilitate the collection of groundwater samples from areas around the perimeter of the dump sites. Groundwater samples will be analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), RCRA metals, & for the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons (GRO, DRO, & RRO). - SI Draft & Final Reporting – Document field activities & results of the SI & present the information in a detailed report.	Howard, Louis
05/24/2011	Update or Other Action	site assigned to Howard 5/24/2011.	Howard, Louis
05/26/2011	Report or Workplan Review - Other	Part I of II Staff reviewed & commented on the Draft Tetlin NALEMP Site Reconnaissance & Investigation Bristol Project No. 410030, Revision 1 May 2011. Cover page for work plans: ADEC will require a cover page with the name & signature of the "qualified person" [as defined by 18 AAC 75.990(100)] who prepared the work plan. In accordance with 18 AAC 75.990(100) A "qualified person" means a person who actively practices environmental science or engineering, geology, physical science, hydrology, or a related field & who has the following minimum education & experience: (A) a bachelor's degree or equivalent from a nationally or internationally accredited postsecondary institution in environmental science or engineering, geology, hydrology, physical science, or a related field; for purposes of this subparagraph, "equivalent" means at least 128 semester hours, 168 trimester hours, or 192 quarter hours at an accredited postsecondary institution, with at least 18 percent of those hours in a science major & at least 13 percent of those hours in upper division-level courses; & (B) at least one year of professional experience in environmental science or engineering, geology, physical science, hydrology, or a related field, obtained after the degree in (A) of this paragraph was obtained. 2.0 Site description is supposed to be focused on the site or sites being investigated as part of this work plan. The reader does not know the primary focus of the work plan is to identify petroleum hydrocarbon contamination at the Lucy David & Lulu David Allotments until Section Please add this information to the Site Description section as well as directing the reader to a vicinity map & site map(s) with legend, orientation (North Arrow) & scale, include a legal description/plat number &/ or latitude & longitude datum of the site(s), include a description of existing land use, site structures, utilities, potable water sources, locations of property lines. buildings. & nearby roads. General Comment: A preliminary conceptual site model needs to be included with the work plan. There was not one included for ADEC review & comment. A conceptual site model (CSM) is a way to describe & evaluate how people, animals, & plants might come in contact with contaminants at a location. It shows the current & possible future spread of contamination in the environment. Developing a CSM is a critical step in evaluating a contaminated site, & must be prepared during the initial stage of the cleanup process, the site characterization/investigation phase. 3.0 ADEC requests clarification on what follow up work will be done should the bottoms of the test pits/trenches/ excavations have observable contamination or if the direct push sampling from 15 ft. bgs is above applicable cleanup levels. ADEC requests sampling be conducted at each direct push boring as follows : one sample from the highest field screening result & one sample from the bottom of the boring at 15 ft. bgs (or where the drill rig meets refusal should that be shallower than 15 ft.). A minimum of two samples per boring or four samples per allotment (not including QA/ QC samples). Two borings may not be adequate to determine the presence or absence of contamination at each dump site (more than one may be present in each allotment) depending on the dump site area & whether the release went straight down or migrated away from the release site to where the borings will be placed. Appendix A Native Allotment Maps notes there is a dump site with seven (7) debris piles on Lulu David's allotment. ADEC requests soil samples also be taken from beneath any drums that are removed where staining is observed, or drums are observed to not be intact, or field screening indicates the presence of contamination. 3.1 ADEC will require analysis for PAHs, PCBs, VOCs, pesticides, herbicides, metals, EDB & 1-2 DCA from all soil samples taken as part of this analysis. EPA 8260C is required for the analysis of 1.2-dichloroethane (1.2-DCA). EPA 8011 or EPA 504.1 should be used when evaluating ethylene dibromide (EDB). EDB soil samples should be field preserved in hexane. Samples for herbicides shall be analyzed via method 8151A. Groundwater samples must also include analysis for PCBs, pesticides, herbicides, EDB & 1-2 DCA. EPA 8260 will quantify EDB in ground water; however, the detection limits do not meet the Table C cleanup level of 0.00005 mg/L (ADEC Draft Field Sampling Guidance Appendix F Determination of Sampling & Lab Analysis for Petroleum in Soil & Groundwater May 2010). Samples for herbicides shall be analyzed via method 8151A. ADEC will require all field site investigation activities & sampling be conducted by an ADEC "qualified person" or a "qualified person" shall directly supervise [as defined by 18 AAC 75.990(125)J all field personnel who do not meet the strict definition of a	Howard, Louis

		"qualified person" as defined by 18 AAC 75.990(100),	
05/26/2011	Report or Workplan Review - Other	Part II of II 3.2.1: ADEC requests resume's and work experience for all staff listed and expected to serve as a "qualified person" as defined by 18 AAC 75.990(100). This would include the Project Manger, Field Manager, and the Regulatory Compliance Manager/Transportation and Disposal Coordinator. 3.2.2 The text states the NVT field laborers may also support other SI activities as directed by Bristol. ADEC interprets this to mean that Bristol will directly supervise as required by 18 AAC 75.990(125) the field laborers supporting other SI activities. 4.3: ADEC will require the field notebooks to document all instrument calibration and changes to sampling protocols or standard operating procedures. 4.4.2: ADEC does not accept field screening results as definitive data. Only laboratory data will be accepted in determining whether "clean" soil is actually below ADEC cleanup levels. An arbitrary number of 50 ppm set as the threshold for the PIO is just that, "arbitrary" The results generated by the PID are qualitative to semi-quantitative at best and are limited to compounds that readily volatilize. There have been instances where the PIO screening results did not correlate with laboratory analysis. A PID will not detect the presence PCBs or most pesticides. ADEC will require sampling for PCBs and pesticides unless there is definitive data taken from the same sample locations from the same debris areas dump areas, drums showing PCBs or pesticides are not present above ADEC cleanup levels. Should definitive data exist, then it should be presented in the work plan. ADEC does not have cleanup levels for DRO, GRO, or RRO in surface water. ADEC will require analysis for Total Aromatic Hydrocarbons (TAH) and Total Aqueous Hydrocarbons (TAqH) if surface water samples are taken as part of this project in addition to 18 AAC 75 and 18 AAC 80 Drinking Water Regulations. 4.4.4: ADEC requests clarification on what specific analyses will be conducted on painted surfaces present on suspect debris and whether it is for determining the presence of lead-based paint or PCB-containing paint. Analyzing a bulk sample of paint removed from the surface will establish whether the paint contains PCBs, but will not establish whether the PCBs were added to the paint during manufacture or whether they were absorbed into the painted surface as a result of a spill. If you suspect that PCBs have spilled on the surface, it might be useful to wipe sample the surface before taking a bulk sample of the paint. 4.5: ADEC will require any background sampling to follow the U.S. E.P.A. Guidance for Comparing Background and Chemical Concentrations in Soil for CERCLA Sites EPA 540-R-01-003, OSWER 9285.7-41, (September 2002). Background refers to substances or locations that are not influenced by the releases from a site, and are usually described as naturally occurring or anthropogenic. 4.5.2: ADEC requests a temporary well point also be installed on the opposite side of the dump sites. This will be in addition to the well point that will be placed between the dump site and the river. The river may be a losing surface water body and the local groundwater flow may be away from the river. Without definitive data, it is all assumptions on the which way the gradient of the groundwater is actually going and how much seasonal changes impact the hydrogeology at the sites. 5.1: A lack of positive field screening results, or visual or olfactory observations will not eliminate the need to take the required soil samples from drums, debris areas, dump areas or other areas suspected to be contaminant sources. ADEC recommends not sampling peat or vegetated areas and to sample deep enough to access actual soil. 5.5: You may use a wipe sample to determine the PCB concentration of concrete that has been contaminated by a spill of PCBs LESS than 72 hours old (see §761.79(b)(4)). For concrete contaminated by older spills, you MUST determine the PCB concentration by analyzing a bulk sample of the concrete. 6.9: The checklist has been updated as of January 2010. ADEC requests the most current checklist be used and the minimum requirements for laboratory data package and QA summaries shall be in accordance with ADEC's Environmental Laboratory Data and Quality Assurance Requirements (March 2009), 8.0: Add to the list of references: ADEC, 2010 (May). Draft Field Sampling Guidance. ADEC, 2009 (March) Environmental Laboratory Data and Quality Assurance Requirements. ADEC, 2010 (January). Laboratory Data Review Checklist version 2.7. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002 (September). Guidance for Comparing Background and Chemical Concentrations in Soil for CERCLA Sites EPA 540-R-01-003. OSWER 9285.7-41.	Howard, Louis
08/17/2011	Site Characterization Workplan Approved	Email to Tyler Elingboe BERS (contractor for the CORPs of Engineers): ADEC has reviewed the responses to its comments and finds the responses acceptable. The work plan is approved by ADEC. Please note, ADEC review and concurrence on this work plan is to ensure that the work is done in accordance with State of Alaska environmental conservation laws and regulations. While ADEC may comment on other state and federal laws and regulations, our concurrence on the work plan does not relieve Responsible Persons (or agents, contractors, subcontractors that are acting on the RP's behalf) from the need to comply with other applicable laws and regulations.	Howard, Louis
07/20/2012	Update or Other Action	Site Reconnaissance & Investigation Report draft received. 2.1 Location & Climate The Lucy David Allotment is a 120-acre parcel of land located across the Alaska Highway from the Canadian American Northern Oil Line (CANOL) Pump Station J Site, adjacent to the Ida Joe Native Allotment, at Milepost 1285.5, along the 296-mile Alaska corridor of the pipeline, near Tetlin, Alaska. 2.3 U.S. DoD Sites of Potential Contamination The NVT is concerned about the following sites located near or on their land, as shown in Figure 1: • Ida Joe Allotment (Pump Station J) • Lucy David Allotment (Camp J) • Lulu David Allotment • Tetlin Army Camp Site (Tanana Bridge) • Midway Lake • Midway Lake North • Northway-Tetlin Trail (Cat Trail) • Jerry Hill • 40 Mile Dump The three privately owned Native allotment sites have had Step III Site Assessments conducted by the DoD and were determined to be eligible under NALEMP. 3.4 Land Ownership Three Native allotments containing sites of concern are presented in the SPIP: the Ida Joe Allotment, Lucy David Allotment, and Lulu David Allotment. 3.4 Site Reconnaissance Also, surface water around the culvert was noted at the Lucy David allotment in August. The culvert pipe ran from the allotment across the street (Ida [Joe]Jones) and came from a surface water pond. The SW from the allotment located directly east of the Lucy David Allotment (Ida Joe) should be sampled to determine whether contaminants are present and are impacting the Lucy David Allotment. Ideally, the Lucy David site can be cleared of brush and inspected for signs of surface contamination before additional soil sampling is performed.	Howard, Louis
01/24/2013	Exposure Tracking Model Ranking	Initial ranking with ETM completed for source area id: 74230 name: drums and debris. This is an auto action that was triggered by an administrative fix to correct reporting problems in the Unranked Sites Report. This is not an actual ETM ranking and no answers were altered within the ETM. The only part of the record affected by this fix may be the ranking dates. (Reese)	Brown, Kristi