

# Interagency Agreements, DSMOAs, and Cooperative Agreements

## *Interagency Agreements*

An Interagency Agreement (IAG) or a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) is to be entered into within 180 days of the completion of the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study for a National Priorities List (NPL) site, per SARA §120(e)(2). The IAG allows the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and frequently the state, to assume regulatory oversight over cleanup activities at Department of Defense (DoD) installations. SARA §120(e)(5) requires that the following IAG-related information be reported in an Annual Report to Congress. The information provided here is for fiscal year 1997 (FY97).

## *Installations That Conducted IAG or FFA Negotiations:*

<b>Army</b>	Fort Eustis; Redstone Arsenal
<b>Navy</b>	Allegany Ballistics Laboratory; Mechanicsburg Naval Inventory Control Point; Norfolk Naval Base; Portsmouth Naval Shipyard; Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; Quantico Marine Corps Combat Development Command; Whiting Field Naval Air Station
<b>Air Force</b>	Air Force Plant PJKS; Langley Air Force Base
<b>FUDS</b>	Hastings Groundwater; Former Pantex Ordnance Plant

## *Installations That Signed IAGs or FFAs:*

**Navy** Allegany Ballistics Laboratory; Camp LeJeune Marine Corps Base

**Air Force** King Salmon

**FUDS** Old Navy Dump/Manchester Annex

The Air Force installation Massachusetts Military Reservation amended a Federal Facility Agreement in FY97.

The four IAGs signed in FY97 bring the total number of IAGs to 105.

**Table C-1 IAG Status**

<b>Component</b>	<b>IAGs Signed in FY97</b>	<b>IAGs Negotiated in FY97</b>
Army	0	2
Navy	2	7
Air Force	1	2
DLA	0	0
FUDS	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>

Other information required by SARA §120(e)(5) is provided below.

*Cost estimates and budgetary proposals for LAGs:* Table B-1 provides (1) information on the costs that each DoD installation has incurred through FY97 and (2) estimates of each installation's costs from FY98 through Site Closeout.

*Public comments regarding proposed LAGs:* No public comments were received during FY97.

*Description of cases in which no agreement was reached:* Almost all agreements on which negotiations began in FY97 were reached or are still under negotiation within the required 180-day time period. In the case of the Former Pantex Ordnance Plant, EPA, the Department of Energy, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) discontinued negotiations because sites may be deferred to RCRA Corrective Action authority, thus making an IAG unnecessary. The deferral issue is still under discussion.

## ***Technology Cooperative Agreements***

This section summarizes the efforts involved in cooperative partnering between the U.S. Army Environmental Center (AEC), representing DoD; the California Hazardous Waste Environmental Technology Certification Program (Cal/Cert), which evaluates environmental technologies; and the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation Workgroup (ITRC), which is a federal, state, and stakeholder advisory committee. These partnerships were negotiated to facilitate demonstration, validation, and regulatory acceptance of DoD-developed innovative technologies. The following information fulfills the reporting requirements of Public Law 104-201, §206(a) of title 10, U.S.C., for the past year.

*Number of Technology Cooperative Agreements:* 3

*Number of states in which such agreements have been entered into:* 2 (two of the Cooperative Agreements are with California and the third is with the ITRC, which represents a coalition of 27 states).

*Description of the nature of the technology involved in each such agreement:*

- The two agreements with California support two Tri-Service Site Characterization and Analysis Penetrometer System (SCAPS), cone-penetrometer-deployed volatile organic compound (VOC) sensors (HydroSparge sensor and thermal desorption sampler). The HydroSparge sensor detects VOCs in groundwater, and the thermal desorption sampler detects VOCs in soil or unsaturated zone.
- The third agreement, with ITRC, promotes emerging environmental technologies for characterizing and remediating contaminated sites by creating tools and strategies that reduce interstate barriers to the deployment of these technologies, while avoiding redundant demonstration and verification efforts.

*Amount of funds obligated or expended by DoD for each such agreement during the year covered by the report:*

- \$76,039, for validation of HydroSparge by Cal/Cert
- \$91,450, for validation of the thermal desorption sampler by Cal/Cert
- \$200,000, for evaluation of tools and strategies and for initiating reciprocity among the consortium of ITRC state representatives

The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement (CA) with the ITRC, which was entered into through the Western Governors' Association, is to promote emerging environmental technologies for characterizing and remediating contaminated sites by creating tools and strategies that reduce interstate barriers to deployment of these technologies while avoiding redundant demonstration and verification efforts. The Cooperative Agreement is supported by USACE, Baltimore District.

AEC's other two FY97 agreements are with Cal/Cert and build on the experience gained in pursuing regulatory acceptance of the SCAPS deployed laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) technology. The purpose of these agreements is to obtain an unbiased third-party assessment of the two SCAPS deployed VOC-sensor systems. The Cal/Cert assessments will then be used by a subgroup within the ITRC to evaluate the technologies and to initiate reciprocity among all the states represented by the ITRC.

The use of the Tri-Service SCAPS deployed VOC-sensor systems (HydroSparge and thermal desorption) will result in site characterization that is faster, more detailed, and less expensive than current methods. Because the SCAPS VOC sensors can delineate the extent of subsurface contamination more accurately than can widely spaced monitoring wells, the cleanup effort and the cost of detection will be reduced. The Cooperative Agreement developed through this partnering effort is an integral part of the DoD Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) and can benefit the other Military Services.

## *DSMOAs and Cooperative Agreements*

As described earlier in this report, a Defense and State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) is a mechanism for reimbursing states and territories for technical services provided in support of DoD active or closing installations or Formerly Used Defense Sites. In order for a state or territory to receive DSMOA funding, it must first secure approval of a Cooperative Agreement detailing a 2-year work plan and planned projects for the following 4 years. The Cooperative Agreement also must contain cost estimates.

Of the 50 states, 1 district (District of Columbia), and 5 U.S. territories that are eligible for reimbursement under DSMOA, 43 states, the District of Columbia, and 4 territories have entered into such agreements and 42 states, the District of Columbia, and 2 territories have applied for funding through Cooperative Agreements. During FY97, no DSMOAs were signed and 36 Cooperative Agreements were extended or shortened. All Cooperative Agreements will be renewed in July 1998.

A list of the entities that are eligible to participate in the DSMOA and Cooperative Agreement program and their status as of September 30, 1997, is presented in Table C-2 of this Appendix. Table C-3 contains a breakdown of funds obligated during FY96 by state or territory and the cleanup service performed. SARA §211(d), 10 U.S.C. §2701(d), as amended by the FY96 National Defense Authorization Act, requires that the information in Table C-3 be included in an Annual Report to Congress, starting in FY98. Although this information is not required until the FY98 Report, it is included here for the purpose of responsiveness and to ensure the completeness of the information that will be reported in FY98.

**Table C-2 States and Territories Eligible for the DSMOA and Cooperative Agreement Program:  
Agreement Status as of September 30, 1997**

State or Territory	DSMOA Signed	CA Signed	CA Period	POC	POC Phone Number
Alabama	05/29/90	11/08/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Larry Bryant	(334) 271-7738
Alaska	06/04/90	09/28/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Jennifer Roberts	(907) 269-7553
American Samoa	07/10/91	NA	NA	Sheila Wiegman	(684) 633-2304
Arizona	03/13/91	09/27/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Tim Steele	(602) 207-4224
Arkansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	05/31/90	09/21/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Jennie Lewis	(916) 323-3506
Colorado	10/18/93	07/01/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Jeff Edson	(303) 692-3388
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	02/26/90	08/19/94	06/01/96 - 06/30/00*	Jamie Rutherford	(302) 323-4540
District of Columbia	05/09/94	09/25/95	09/30/95 - 06/24/98*	Jim Sweeney	(202) 645-6075
Florida	06/14/90	09/30/94	08/01/96 - 06/30/98	Eric Nuzie	(904) 921-9999
Georgia	05/08/90	NA	NA	Jim Ussery	(404) 656-2833
Guam	11/27/91	07/01/94	04/01/96 - 06/30/00*	Mark Petersen	(671) 475-1609
Hawaii	09/10/91	09/29/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Michael Miyasaka	(808) 586-4698
Idaho	02/06/91	04/04/95	11/01/96 - 06/30/98	Dave Hovland	(208) 373-0475
Illinois	12/17/92	01/06/95	09/20/96 - 06/30/98	Clarence Smith	(217) 524-1655

State or Territory	DSMOA Signed	CA Signed	CA Period	POC	POC Phone Number
Indiana	04/17/91	08/11/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Rex Osborn	(317) 308-3130
Iowa	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kansas	08/06/92	09/28/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Lloyd Dunlap	(913) 291-3250
Kentucky	06/06/91	09/28/95	09/30/95 - 06/30/98	Nini Hughes	(502) 564-2225
Louisiana	11/13/91	09/28/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Michael Vince	(504) 765-0355
Maine	06/24/91	08/01/94	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Mark Hyland	(207) 287-2651
Mariana Islands	10/18/91	09/28/95	09/30/95 - 06/30/98	Ignacio Cabrera	(670) 234-1011
Maryland	11/26/90	01/20/95	12/01/96 - 06/30/98	Bob DeMarco	(410) 631-3437
Massachusetts	10/18/91	05/02/94	05/01/96 - 06/30/98	Anne Malewicz	(617) 292-5659
Michigan	08/27/92	09/30/94	09/30/96 - 07/15/98*	Thomas Segall	(517) 373-8804
Minnesota	06/28/91	08/18/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Dave Douglas	(612) 296-7818
Mississippi	10/13/89	09/30/94	08/01/96 - 06/30/98	Mario Baroni	(601) 961-5171
Missouri	05/22/91	09/25/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Bob Geller	(573) 751-3176
Montana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nebraska	09/29/92	12/27/94	10/01/96 - 06/30/98	Jeff Kelly	(402) 471-3388
Nevada	09/12/90	09/27/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Dave Minedew	(702) 687-4670

(continued)

**Table C-2.** *States and Territories Eligible for the DSMOA and Cooperative Agreement Program (continued)*

State or Territory	DSMOA Signed	CA Signed	CA Period	POC	POC Phone Number
New Hampshire	01/22/93	09/30/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Richard Pease	(603) 271-3649
New Jersey	04/03/92	09/30/95	04/01/95 - 06/30/98	Dhruva Kanjarpane	(609) 633-1455
New Mexico	06/12/90	09/14/94	09/30/96 - 06/30/98	Julie Jacobs	(505) 827-2776
New York	06/06/91	09/30/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Marsden Chen	(518) 457-3976
North Carolina	06/06/91	08/17/95	08/01/95 - 06/30/98	Grover Nicholson	(919) 733-2801
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	10/06/92	02/02/94	01/01/96 - 06/30/99*	Graham Mitchell	(513) 285-6357
Oklahoma	12/28/92	09/27/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Hal Cantwell	(405) 271-7158
Oregon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pennsylvania	04/14/94	07/01/95	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Bill Apgar	(717) 787-6239
Puerto Rico	02/04/91	NA	NA	Miguel Maldonado	(787) 766-0368
Rhode Island	09/26/91	09/30/95	09/30/95 - 06/30/98	Richard Gottlieb	(401) 277-3872
South Carolina	05/08/91	08/18/95	07/01/95 - 06/30/98	Kathy Williams	(803) 896-4140
South Dakota	10/25/91	06/17/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Mark Lawrensen	(605) 773-5868
Tennessee	06/02/92	09/29/95	09/30/95 - 06/30/98	Bill Forrester	(615) 532-0913
Texas	04/08/91	08/30/95	09/01/95 - 06/30/98	Allan Posnick	(512) 239-2332

State or Territory	DSMOA Signed	CA Signed	CA Period	POC	POC Phone Number
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	06/22/90	08/02/94	06/01/96 - 05/31/98	George Desch	(802) 241-3888
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Virginia	08/31/90	12/27/94	01/01/95 - 06/30/96*	Erica Dameron	(804) 698-4201
Washington	02/03/94	03/03/94	03/01/95 - 06/30/98	Tim Nord	(360) 407-7226
West Virginia	05/24/90	08/22/94	08/16/96 - 06/30/98	Mike Stratton	(304) 558-2745
Wisconsin	07/22/92	09/22/93	07/01/95 - 09/30/99*	Mark Gordon	(608) 266-7278
Wyoming	06/27/90	09/26/94	07/01/96 - 06/30/98	Maggie Davison	(307) 777-7092

\* Confirmation of CA period not available at time of Report

Total Possible = 56 (50 states; 5 territories; 1 district)  
 Total Signed DSMOAs = 48 (43 states; 4 territories; 1 district)  
 Total Signed CAs = 45 (42 states; 2 territories; 1 district)

NA = Not Applicable: States or territories without DSMOA or CA programs as of September 30, 1997.



### *DSMOA Cleanup Activities and Funding*

Table C-3, which is presented below, provides data required by 10 U.S.C. §2706(a), which states that the Secretary of Defense shall include any information on the services obtained by the Secretary during the preceding year with regard to DSMOA reimbursements. Although this information is not statutorily required until FY98, DoD has taken the proactive step of including it in this report. The table presents the number of cleanup activities performed by the states and the funds obligated for these cleanups in FY96. A description of each activity, listed after the number used to represent it in Table C-3, has been included below:

1. Includes all state- and territory-reviewed documents requiring comments, concurrence, or input to support the ongoing Defense Environmental Restoration Account and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) programs within a state's jurisdiction
2. Any applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement identified by a state or territorial regulator as part of his or her regulatory rule
3. Restoration advisory board meetings attended
4. Partnering meetings attended
5. Includes technical review committee meetings; BRAC cleanup team meetings; and any other meetings with stakeholders, EPA, and DoD environmental personnel
6. Number of different times the regulators visited the cleanup location
7. Includes Records of Decision and all other types of cleanup decision documents
8. Independent quality assurance/quality control efforts by states or territories, including the taking of split samples

**Table C-3 Number of Cleanup Activities Performed by States or Territories during FY96 with DSMOA Funds Obligated**

State	Account	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Funds Obligated During FY96
Alabama	DERA	167	64	8	6	15	16	0	0	\$230,000
	BRAC	71	22	7	2	19	13	0	0	\$300,000
Alaska	DERA	400	0	67	5	197	106	43	0	\$250,000
	BRAC	66	0	12	14	31	5	3	0	\$193,574
Arizona	DERA	190	1	15	4	32	8	1	0	\$97,900
	BRAC	144	0	5	0	10	4	2	0	\$67,116
California	DERA	810	19	98	13	488	55	11	32	\$5,749,000
	BRAC	988	18	207	14	944	65	8	36	\$5,220,905
Colorado	DERA	94	73	21	0	34	40	0	3	\$250,000
	BRAC	92	28	29	5	129	21	0	0	\$1,263,000
Delaware	DERA	23	12	0	1	20	3	1	0	\$70,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
District of Columbia	DERA	1038	20	20	61	33	0	0	0	\$78,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Florida	DERA	367	0	54	79	41	30	4	0	\$440,000
	BRAC	231	0	22	67	9	25	2	0	\$322,850

State	Account									Funds Obligated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	During FY96
Guam	DERA	20	8	8	4	12	20	0	4	\$76,400
	BRAC	49	8	4	4	18	42	0	4	\$0
Hawaii	DERA	90	12	8	0	32	18	3	1	\$351,000
	BRAC	10	1	0	0	5	3	0	0	\$55,000
Idaho	DERA	5	4	2	20	19	11	1	1	\$5,600
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Illinois	DERA	416	165	5	4	104	90	1	52	\$350,000
	BRAC	327	126	28	6	70	73	0	24	\$81,000
Indiana	DERA	31	6	1	0	14	11	0	8	\$397,786
	BRAC	168	21	23	15	103	37	6	34	\$388,000
Kansas	DERA	147	3	1	0	36	27	1	7	\$80,800
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$50,000
Kentucky	DERA	35	0	4	0	22	18	4	2	\$97,000
	BRAC	34	0	8	13	37	62	1	3	\$232,000
Louisiana	DERA	56	0	2	12	3	8	0	9	\$250,000
	BRAC	50	0	4	4	17	6	0	6	\$220,000
Maine	DERA	91	0	4	0	64	28	2	0	\$276,633
	BRAC	107	0	3	0	18	10	4	0	\$0
Mariana Islands	DERA									\$45,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Maryland	DERA	174	32	24	3	94	79	4	0	\$271,200
	BRAC	58	8	26	1	54	15	0	0	\$127,000
Massachusetts	DERA	148	0	25	0	124	56	4	3	\$989,000
	BRAC	512	0	96	4	304	101	25	3	\$582,000
Michigan	DERA	123	224	0	15	4	10	4	0	\$120,000
	BRAC	432	98	7	71	17	66	1	0	\$631,000
Minnesota	DERA	173	9	12	0	50	44	0	44	\$457,760
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Mississippi	DERA	61	0	6	0	11	15	0	0	\$109,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Missouri	DERA									\$215,800
	BRAC									\$5,000
Nebraska	DERA	115	5	13	21	20	23	1	8	\$115,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Nevada	DERA	79	0	15	0	61	139	46	0	\$120,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
New Hampshire	DERA	11	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	\$48,500
	BRAC	145	5	7	0	3	126	0	0	\$0

(continued)

Table C-3. Number of Cleanup Activities Performed by States or Territories during FY96 with DSMOA Funds Obligated (continued)

State	Account	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Funds Obligated During FY96
New Jersey	DERA	153	0	13	0	24	9	2	0	\$500,401
	BRAC	29	0	4	2	16	2	3	0	\$220,000
New Mexico	DERA	59	10	5	8	28	11	12	3	\$250,000
	BRAC	2	4	3	1	11	5	0	3	\$115,508
New York	DERA	75	0	0	0	13	3	0	5	\$500,000
	BRAC	108	0	7	1	17	5	2	11	\$200,000
North Carolina	DERA	156	0	7	9	28	10	1	0	\$167,500
	BRAC	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	\$0
Ohio	DERA	116	9	11	0	62	32	1	0	\$630,825
	BRAC	72	2	10	2	50	13	0	3	\$295,018
Oklahoma	DERA	38	0	6	0	3	2	2	0	\$62,400
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Pennsylvania	DERA	15	1	6	3	92	66	2	1	\$251,100
	BRAC	206	51	31	79	61	59	0	4	\$170,000
Rhode Island	DERA	24	32	8	0	62	0	0	0	\$188,878
	BRAC	37	16	5	0	31	0	0	0	\$70,000
South Carolina	DERA	30	0	3	8	32	5	0	0	\$100,200
	BRAC	48	0	20	22	6	12	0	0	\$109,000
South Dakota	DERA	168	0	15	1	24	13	11	0	\$160,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Tennessee	DERA	28	17	12	0	22	31	1	6	\$250,000
	BRAC	69	1	20	2	34	27	1	4	\$65,940
Texas	DERA	101	18	19	8	160	26	1	0	\$810,000
	BRAC	74	0	26	3	124	12	0	0	\$430,000
Vermont	DERA	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	\$12,141
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Virginia	DERA	174	14	12	9	28	23	0	0	\$401,000
	BRAC	59	7	25	0	37	12	0	0	\$156,000
Washington	DERA	318	26	73	6	208	92	4	4	\$1,222,000
	BRAC	67	3	5	0	19	16	1	1	\$31,000
West Virginia	DERA	20	30	10	0	13	0	0	0	\$75,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Wisconsin	DERA	30	0	18	0	25	16	0	0	\$194,475
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
Wyoming	DERA	43	27	8	4	82	7	3	19	\$80,000
	BRAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>DERA</b>	<b>6,416</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>2,437</b>	<b>1,206</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>\$17,397,299</b>
	<b>BRAC</b>	<b>4,257</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>2,197</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>\$11,600,911</b>