SUBJECT: MR – BCT Meeting
August 26, 2004 9:00a.m.
BRAC Conference Room

Check ( )	Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail address
	Gail Youngblood	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-7918	Gail.youngblood@monterey.army.mil
on phone	**Roman Racca**	DTSC	916-255-6407	Rracca@dtsc.ca.gov
	Stewart Black	DTSC	916-255-3665	sblack@dtsc.ca.gov
	John Chesnutt	U.S. EPA	415-972-3005	Chesnutt.john@epa.gov
	Claire Trombadore	U.S. EPA	415-972-3518	Trombadore.Claire@epa.gov
	Martin Hausladen	U.S. EPA	415-972-3007	Hausladen.martin@epamail.epa.gov
	David Eisen	COE	831-393-9692	David.Eisen@usace.army.mil
phone	**Bruce Wilcer**	Harding ESE	415-884-3168	blwilcer@mactec.com
✓	**Gary Griffith**	Parsons ES	831-884-2309	gary.griffith@parsons.com

SUBJECT: MR – BCT Meeting
August 26, 2004 9:00a.m.
BRAC Conference Room

Check ( )	Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail address
CN	**Chieko Nguyen**	Fort Ord BRAC	831-899-7372	Chieko.nguyen@monterey.army.mil
	Juan Koponen	COE	831-884-9925 ext. 233	Juan.Koponen@usace.army.mil
late	**Lyle Shurtleff**	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-7919	Lyle.shurtleff@monterey.army.mil
	Kris Escarda	DTSC	916-255-3651	kescarda@dtsc.ca.gov
	Ed Sticker	MACTEL	707 7933892	esticker@mactec.com
✓	BILL MABEY	TECHLAW	415 291 8730	bmabey@techlawinc.com
on phone	George Siller			

Former Fort Ord
Agency Meeting Agendas
August 2004

August 26, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.
MR BCT Meeting
BRAC Conference Room

August 26, 2004 at 1:00 p.m.
HTW BCT Meeting
BRAC Conference Room

MR BCT Meeting
BRAC Conf. Room

Item	Action	Comment
Action Items	Update	
Document Deliverables	Review	
Fieldwork Update	Update	
Fieldwork Variances	Update	
MR RI/FS Track 1	Update	
MR RI/FS Track 2	Update	
FFA Schedule	Update	
Lease/transfer issues	Update	

MR BCT Meeting Handout
(Summary of action items from July 14, 2004 meeting)

	Action Item Description	Responsible Party	Due Date	Comments
Site Security/Incident Reports/Detonations				
	No action items			
Field Work/Removal Action Updates				
	No action items			
FFA Schedules and MR RI/FS				
C	**Research documentation requirements for the additional precautionary requirements on some Track 1 sites. Set up a call among BCT and legal support.**	**EPA, Army, DTSC (Chieko set up conference call)**	**~~Next BCT 4/7/04~~ As soon as possible**	**~~review text and coordinate changes~~ ~~Text being reviewed at DTSC legal~~**
C	**Tracks 1, 2 and 3 Schedules**	**Army**		**Update schedules**
*	**Update Document Deliverables Schedule to include Post-Remediation Ecological Risk Assessment Site 3 report**	**Army**		
*	**Send Claire Trombadore new proposed definition of Track 2**	**Army**		**Send via email**
*	**Feedback on Track 2 Plug-in process**	**USEPA and DTSC**	**By next BCT mtg.**	

*** indicates new action item**
"R" indicates revised action item
"C" and gray cells indicate completed items to be withdrawn from list next month

MR BCT Meeting Handout
(Summary of action items from July 14, 2004 meeting)

	Action Item Description	Responsible Party	Due Date	Comments
*	**Risk Assessment Response to Comments**	**DTSC**		**Roman to provide Army with feedback**
*	**Proposed inclusion of MRS-13B in Track 2 process**	**DTSC**	**By next week**	**Discuss with Tony Landis and provide feedback to Army**

Ongoing Actions/Other

	Quarterly Security Program Update	Army	Quarterly	Lyle Update OE Security db on web
	Document Deliverables Schedule (complete list) and list of issued reports requiring review to Agencies	Army	Monthly	Electronic copy to agencies one week prior to BCT meetings.
R	Document submission to agencies to be sent with **cover letter explaining purpose of document and review period. Document distribution.**	Army and contractors		**Check distribution list and ensure agency recipients are correct. Cover letters to include more specific information, i.e. comments due date**
	Removal Action Update and weekly meeting minutes to agencies via email	Army	Ongoing-weekly	Electronic copies to agencies

*** indicates new action item**
"R" indicates revised action item
"C" and gray cells indicate completed items to be withdrawn from list next month

Fort Ord
Military Munitions Response Program

Update
26 August 2004

As of 26 Aug 04

MMRP Fieldwork

MRS Ranges 43-48 (499 Acres)

Start work date: 24 Oct 03 Estimated date complete: 11 May 05

ACTION: MMRP removal to depth

Prescribed burn – complete
Surface Safety Sweep - complete
Target Removal - complete
Vegetation removal (cutting/survey) (complete)
Sub-surface removal on-going (390 Acres) **(44 percent complete)**
Sifting of development Range 45 (10 Acres) – scheduled (Oct 04 – May 05)

ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

1. Production Impacts for Habitat Protection
   a) **Subsurface work delays in Seaside Birds Beak (protected plant) areas (approx. 10 acres) will continue through August.**
   b) Vegetation growth is beginning to reduce efficiency of sub-surface work. Growth will eventually constrain ability to complete a removal in protected habitat areas
   c) **Cumulative subsurface removal production levels are now 17 percent below initial estimates**

MMRP Fieldwork continued

As of 26 Aug 04

Chronological by priority
Acreage is estimated

2. Special Case Areas (SCA) (defined in SSWPs)
   a) Anticipate 25 percent of the acreage will be designated SCAs (high density anomalies, hardstand (Asphalt)/interference (power lines/fences).
   b) The methodologies for remediation of SCAs in protected habitat and large size munitions areas is being assessed.
3. Other

   ROD process to recycle small arms munitions on hold pending AEC requirement to conduct on-site flashing.

Phase III Impact Area Fuel Breaks (82 acres)

Start Date: 21 Jul 03 Estimated date complete: TBD

ACTION: Removal to depth (**78 percent complete**) **Suspended work restarted 15 August 04 in anticipation of California Tiger Salamander (CTS) impact in action areas.**

Issues and Concerns:

1. **Current objective is to attack (detonate) suspected UXO and complete as much Quality Control (QC)/Quality Assurance (QA) work as possible before CTS shutdown.**
2. Possible adjustment to fuel break widths and variety may result from lessons learned from MRS Ranges 43-48 vegetation burn

MMRP Fieldwork continued

Chronological by priority
Acreage is estimated

Phase I South Boundary Fuel Break (31 acres)

Start Date: 12 Jul 04 Estimated completion date: 3 Sep 04

ACTION: Cut vegetation and remove trees 55 feet south from southern shoulder of South Boundary Road (SBR) and along north shoulder of SBR to existing fuel break to establish fuel break from York School to Laguna Seca (Wolf Hill) to support vegetation burn of MRS 16. (Est. complete 3 Sep 04)

Phase II South Boundary Fuel Break (33 acres)

Start Date: TBD

ACTION: Cut vegetation and conduct munitions reconnaissance north of SBR to establish Minimum Safe Distance (MSD) for POM fire department support vegetation burn of MRS 16 .

Issues and Concerns:

1. **Action must be coordinated with USF&W concerning cutting of Chaparral habitat**

As of 26 Aug 04

MMRP Field Work Complete

Site	Acres

2004 Fuel Break Maintenance (195 acres)

Start Date: 2 Jun 04

ACTION: Cut vegetation on established fuel breaks (**Completed 21 Aug 04**)

As of 26 Aug 04

MMRP Fieldwork Update
Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)/Munitions Debris (MD)/ Range Related Debris (RRD)
Summary

Description	UXO/DMM/TBD (Items)	MD (lbs.)	RRD (lbs.)
MR Site MOCO.2	551 (UXO/DMM)	1,545	12,471
MR Site SEA 1-4	540 (UXO/DMM)	10,154	90,169
MR Site Ranges 43-48	**8,006**	**133,251**	**126,274**
Target Debris			**1,375,870**

As of 26 Aug 04

MMRP Site Security Program

Trespass and MEC Incidents

- No trespass or MEC incidents reported this period

Community Education

- MEC Safety presentations this period:
  - Monterey County Fair 17-22 August
  - York School, 26 August 2004

Other

- Vehicle accident resulted in damage to Impact Area fence vic. General Jim Moore Road at Watkins Gate Road, 13 August. Fence repaired

PARSONS

Field Variance Form

Field Change No.:	Ranges 43-48-0002
Project:	Former Fort Ord
Project Number:	739266
Applicable Document:	Ranges 43-48 SSWP
Description Of Change:	**Section 2.3.8**- Add the following paragraph at the end of the section: "The excavation of some anomalies will require a backhoe. After removing the source of the anomaly, the excavation team will use a Schonstedt GA-52/Cx magnetometer to check the excavation to verify that no anomalies remain. UXO QC personnel will visit the open excavation and recheck to confirm that no anomalies remain. The material that was excavated will be screened and the material that passes through the screen will be used to fill the hole." **Section 5.20**- Add the following paragraph at the end of the section: "Anomalies will not be selected in areas that were excavated with a backhoe during the analog removal process. These excavations will have been checked by UXO QC personnel and the material returned to these holes will have passed through a screen." **Add section 11.1.1**: "QC check of backhoe dig sites." UXO QC personnel will conduct a QC survey with a Schonstedt GA-52/Cx magnetometer over each open backhoe dig and validate that all anomalies within the excavation area have been investigated. The perimeter of each QC accepted dig site will be defined using RTK GPS and preserved as part of the permanent project record. All QC accepted sites will be refilled using only screened soil from the spoils pile. Results of all QC inspections will be documented on QC grid operation records.
Reason For Change:	Some small metal objects that are returned to backhoe excavations will subsequently be detected during the digital geophysical survey. Selecting these anomalies from the digital geophysical data and re-excavating at these locations would expend resources without removing additional UXO from the site.
Recommended Resolution:	Implement the change.
Present And Completed Work Impact:	This change will eliminate re-excavation of previously cleared, sifted, and QC accepted sites, increasing the overall efficiency and productivity of the digital geophysical excavation process.

Prepared By: Craig Murray, Parsons Project Geophysicist — 6-7-2004 Date

Approvals:

Andreas Kothleitner, Parsons QCM — 6.7.04 Date

Gary Griffith, Parsons PM — 6/7/04 Date

Clinton Huckins, USACE QA — 6/8/04 Date

Juan Koponen, USACE PM — 6/24/04 Date

Lewis Hunter, USACE, QA Geophysicist — 6/22/04 Date

Field Variance Form

FIELD CHANGE NO.:	Ranges 43-48-0003
PROJECT:	Former Fort Ord
PROJECT NUMBER:	739266
APPLICABLE DOCUMENT:	Ranges 43-48 SSWP
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE:	**Section 11.3.1**- Add the following paragraphs at the end of the section: The QC seeding program will incorporate the following logic for the placement of QC seeds; 1. coverage along site boundaries 2. coverage at grid boundaries 3. the seeding of an item of concern at depth of concern 4. coverage of items placed along the same parallel (within 3 feet apart) 5. digital geophysical drop-outs as a result of tree coverage and/or terrain 6. the potential of one item masking another in a vertical column. All seeds placed to measure the analog geophysical removal process that were found and re-buried by the UXO team will be validated by QC prior to the commencement of the digital removal process. This validation process will include uncovering the seeded item, ensuring that it is the correct seed item(s) and number(s), and positioning it/them at the same depth and in the same orientation as originally placed. The QC geophysicist will conduct the final step of the QC seeding process validation prior to the commencement of the digital geophysical removal process. This step will involve the recording of the EM-61 channel 3 response over each re-seeded location. The QC seeding program has been developed into the GIS database which allows QC to perform a daily accountability audit on the teams conducting removal operations on Rngs. 43-48.
REASON FOR CHANGE:	To accurately document the logic of the placement of QC seeds to validate the quality of the removal process and additionally to improve the method of capturing, documenting and tracking the QC seeding program with Project GIS. The validation process prior to commencement of digital geophysical removal is required to ensure that QC maintains positive control and custody of the seeding program. This also ensures the confidence level in the ability of the QC seeding program to measure the quality and effectiveness of the dual tool removal process is maintained.
RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION:	Implement the change.
PRESENT AND COMPLETED WORK IMPACT:	This new QC GIS tool also allows the QC staff to provide the SUXO's and FOM a "real time" feedback as to how effective the UXO teams are operating. Additionally, this feedback is received by Operations while the team that may have missed a QC seeded item is still working in the area (next grid) that the seed was missed. Overall this change will increase the quality of the QC seeding program and increase the confidence of the Project's dual tool removal process.

Prepared By:	Andreas Kothleitner, Parsons QCM	5-29-04 Date
Approvals:	Gary Griffith, Parsons PM	6-29-04 Date
	Clinton Huckins, USACE QA	6/29/04 Date
	Juan Koporen, USACE PM	7/13/04 Date
	Lewis Hunter, USACE, QA Geophysicist	7/13/04 Date

Track 2 Plug-In Process Summary

Track 2 plug-in sites are munitions response sites where

(1) MEC removal was conducted, or

(2) Site investigation indicates the presence of MEC,

and not located in natural resource management area containing Central Maritime Chaparral as documented in the Habitat Management Plan.

Reuse

- Sites are designated for either Development or Habitat Reserve.
- Receptors can be grouped into surface or shallow or subsurface types.
- Since Fort Ord is a former military installation and military munitions were used during its history, there is a potential for MEC to be present anywhere on the base. The Army is implementing an on-going, basewide program to ensure safe use of the former Fort Ord lands related to potential risk of encountering MEC:
    - Basewide five-year review is conducted every five years; next in 2007.
    - Deed notice is included in every land transfer.
    - MEC incident reporting, response and recordkeeping are ongoing.
    - MEC recognition training is offered to anyone, especially anyone conducting intrusive activities anywhere on the former Fort Ord.
    - School education program educates youths on the danger of MEC and what to do if one is found.
    - Community involvement includes public meetings, newsletters and other methods.
    - Supporting local and state ordinances for better control of intrusive activities in potential/former ordnance areas.

Remedial action objectives

- Protective of human health (safety)
- Meets ARARs

Approval process

- Prepare site-specific RI/FS report (agency/public review of Draft/Draft Final)
- Specify details of proposed remedy in Approval Memorandum
- Solicit public comments on Approval Memorandum (30 days + opportunity for a public meeting)
- Receive agency approval
- Announce decision in a local major newspaper

Alternatives to be considered

- No Further Action
- Land Use Controls
  - Reuse Restrictions
    - Signs, Informational Kiosks or Display Boards – Signs would be installed at major access points to provide safety information regarding potential MEC risks in the site area.
    - MEC Recognition Training - The Army would require the landowner to notify the local permitting agency of any ground disturbing activities. The local permitting agency would notify the Army. The Army would, in turn, provide ordnance recognition and safety training to construction workers prior to the start of intrusive work. Trained construction personnel would contact the local law enforcement agency if potential military munitions are encountered. The local law enforcement agency would contact the regional Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) unit to respond to the suspected MEC item.
    - Deed, Zoning or Other Restrictions – Certain types of reuse that would be incompatible with the safe use of the site would be prohibited or restricted. Significant increases in potential MEC risks could result if the prohibited or restricted types of uses are implemented without coordinating with the enforcing agency.
  - Construction Support - During construction activities, ordnance safety personnel would be required to monitor construction activities for the potential presence of MEC. The level of effort would be determined on a case-by-case basis by qualified ordnance safety personnel. Should MEC be found during construction support activities, the Army would evaluate the specific situation and determine, in consultation with the regulatory agencies, if additional actions are required.
  - Physical Barriers – Types of barriers would be selected based on land use and potential for residual MEC risks, but would likely include four-strand barbed wire or chain link fence that may be reinforced by concertina wire. Warning signs would be multi-lingual, and would be posted in a way that will ensure a person cannot enter the area without seeing at least one sign within a legible distance. Local law enforcement agency would patrol the fenced perimeter to enforce the access restriction.
- MEC Removal
  - Use best available technologies.
  - Use vegetation clearance method appropriate for the vegetation type, based on an evaluation and screening of methods documented in *Draft Final Technical Memorandum, Evaluation of Vegetation Clearance Methods, Ordnance and Explosives Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, Former Fort Ord, California*, dated 25 October 2002.
  - Assess detonation methods and use appropriate, approved method to detonate MEC.

Screening of alternatives

- Low Risk: No Further Action and Land Use Controls

  Residual MEC risk management would likely be achievable through implementation of No Further Action or Land Use Control, where Overall MEC Risk Scores for reuse receptors are the lowest or low (e.g., a score of A or B).

- Medium to High Risk: Land Use Controls and MEC Remediation

  Residual MEC risk management would likely be achievable through implementation of Land Use Control or MEC Removal, where Overall MEC Risk Scores for reuse receptors are medium to high (e.g., a score of C, D, or E).

	MEC Risk Score				
	A	B	C	D	E
No Further Action	• **No Further Action**		*In general, No Action should not be considered for Reuse Receptors with C, D, & E MEC Risk Scores*		
Land Use Controls	▪ **Reuse Restrictions** o Signs o MEC Recognition Training o Deed, Zoning or Other Reuse Restrictions		▪ **Construction Support** ▪ **Physical Barriers** -- Fencing, signs, patrols ***+ [Reuse Restrictions as Applicable]***		
MEC remediation	*In general, MEC Remediation should not be considered for Reuse Receptors with A & B MEC Risk Scores*		▪ **MEC Removal** -- Clear vegetation to access site -- Identify & remove MEC on surface or to depth -- Detonate MEC with appropriate, approved methods		

Evaluation of alternatives

- Use CERCLA nine criteria
- Evaluate three types of scenarios:
  - Category 1 - Removal work (a) addressed the right area, (b) was coordinated with the agencies, (c) used best available technology at the time, and (d) was conducted with no QC/QA discrepancy. Potential for MEC encounter is low with low level of uncertainty. [Likely to result in Risk Score A or B] [example: receptor on surface and intruding top 1 ft of Parker Flats]
  - Category 2 - Removal work did not meet one or more of the conditions for Category 1 site. Potential for MEC encounter is low with some uncertainty. [Likely to result in Risk Score C, D or E] [example: receptor intruding 1-5 ft below surface of Parker Flats]
  - Category 3 – Site evaluation indicates presence of MEC. Potential for MEC encounter is medium or high. [Likely to result in Risk Score C, D or E] [example: reuser in uncleared area immediately north of Parker Flats]

TRACK 2 PLUG-IN PROCESS