

**BRAC Cleanup Team**  
**Munitions Response (MR) BCT Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)**  
**March 3, 2005**  
BRAC Conf. Room/conference call  
**Final Version**

**Attendees:**

Gail Youngblood, Fort Ord BRAC	Roman Racca, DTSC by phone
David Eisen, USACE	Juan Koponen, USACE
Bruce Wilcer, MACTEC by phone	Derek Lieberman, Fort Ord BRAC
Gary Griffith, Parsons	Ed Ticken, MACTEC
Chieko Nguyen, Fort Ord BRAC	Claire Trombadore, EPA by phone
Lyle Shurtleff, Fort Ord BRAC	Jeff Fenton, MACTEC by phone
Jennifer Payne, USACE	

**Agenda Items:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Action Items	Update	Discussion by Chieko Nguyen
Fieldwork Update	Update	Presentation by Lyle Shurtleff
Fieldwork Variance	Update	Presentation by Gary Griffith
Airborne Geophysics Project	Update	Presentation by David Eisen
Supplemental Report – Ranges 43-48 Air Monitoring	Info	Briefing by Dave Eisen
FFA Schedule	Update	Presentation by Chieko Nguyen
On-board Review Track 0 Plug-in C Approval Memo	Discussion	Discussion by Chieko Nguyen
Track 0 and Track 1 Schedules	Update	Presentation by Chieko Nguyen
FOST 8 and FOST 9	Update	Presentation by Derek Libermann

**Action Items List** No discussion

**Fieldwork Update:** (handout provided). An update of current fieldwork was provided.

Discussion:

- The progress of MRS-Ranges 43-48 removal was presented.
- The status and modifications to equipment and stockpile locations for Range 45 sifting were described. The current status (100% of initial grading complete) was provided.
- The possible requirement for the testing of soil that may be used for other purposes from the Range 45 sifting operation was discussed. Army will investigate reuse proposals further as well as state and federal soil testing requirements for such reuse.
- The status of the Watkins Gate Burn Area digital geophysical transect survey and the results of the completion of debris removal on MRS-MOCO.2 were provided.
- The issue of habitat survey (MACTEC) and impact on removal work was discussed. Army provided that MACTEC will restrict on-site (Ranges 43-48) habitat survey to periods when removal work is inactive in that area.

- The Site Security/Incident Reporting update provided the results of the Annual Site Security Committee Meeting, February 16.

**Fieldwork Variance Update:** A variance for the use of a single instrument to complete subsurface removal in recommended asphalt areas was described as completed (handout). EPA and DTSC requested copies of the variance.

**Airborne Geophysics Project:** A description of the onsite activity as completed was provided. Army will provide initial findings to EPA and DTSC.

**Supplemental Report on Ranges 43-48 Air Monitoring** A summary of the upcoming report was provided to include PM10 guidelines and recommendations for future air monitoring efforts associated with prescribed burns.

A discussion ensued concerning the best process for review of the report. For the purpose of expediting the review, EPA recommended a separate review by EPA, DTSC, and the Air District. Further discussion resulted in a recommendation by EPA that the subject report be reviewed before consideration of a Sampling and Analysis Plan for the prescribed burn of MRS-16. Attendees agreed to complete an informal review of the report and that the report would be sent separately to the California Air Resources Board and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

In a discussion concerning the disposition of the ATSDR report assessing the health impacts of the Ranges 43-48 burn: ATSDR completed its outreach activities in February, as planned, visiting local schools and health professionals. The ATSDR report was mailed to interested members of the public in advance of their visits. EPA volunteered to coordinate with Gwen Eng, ATSDR, for her attendance at a future CIW where the report could be discussed.

#### **FAA Schedule**

Army provided that the Track 1 ROD will be signed in March. The FFA schedule for Track 2 will be updated to reflect the extended review period for the review of Draft Track 2 MR RI/FS report.

#### **Property Transfer Update**

The Army provided the status of documents supporting upcoming property transfers and leases (handout).

#### **On-board Review Track 0 Plug-in C Approval Memorandum**

Draft Approval Memorandum C was forwarded to agencies via e-mail on 3 Dec 04. EPA comments had been provided via e-mail on 10 Feb 05.

Topics:

- (1) Wrap-up on issues on Track 0 Plug-In Approval Memorandum – Group B Parcels
- (2) Wrap-up on issues on Track 1 Record of Decision
- (3) Discussion of comments on Track 0 Plug-In Approval Memorandum – Group C Parcels

#### **(1) Wrap-up on issues on Track 0 Plug-In Approval Memorandum – Group B Parcels**

Definitions of Track 0. The issue will be clarified in a very short Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) to the Track 0 ROD. There will be no public comment period associated with the ESD (which is consistent with the requirement of NCP and EPA guidance). The Army, EPA and DTSC all agree with the approach. The Army will forward a draft ESD to the agencies on 3 March. The agencies will provide initial feedback within a week, by 10 March.

Four parcels were identified as having had incidental MEC and/or MD (E4.3.1.2, L20.13.5, E8a.1.1.2 and S2.1.2). They will now be addressed in Track 0 Plug-In Approval Memorandum for Group C Parcels, after the Track 0 ROD ESD is issued.

-After the conference call, another parcel (E4.3.2.2) was identified as having had incidental MD. This parcel will also be addressed in Group C Approval Memorandum.

Five parcels make up East Garrison Area 2. Site assessment sitewalk is planned for the area (per Site Assessment Plan) which would involve investigations of some anomalies. The work is pending the final Biological Opinion regarding the California Tiger Salamander by US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Army will bring the issue up the chain – that the absence of Biological Opinion is preventing the approximately 114 acres in EG Area 2 from being included in the FOST 8 transfer package. Potential outcomes are (1) Biological Opinion is soon issued, site assessment work is completed, and parcels remain in Group B Approval Memorandum and FOST 8 package; (2) Biological Opinion is delayed for a few more weeks, and parcels are addressed in Group C Approval Memorandum instead; or (3) Biological Opinion is delayed much longer, and parcels are addressed in a separate documentation. The agencies also stated that the site assessment work should be completed before starting the public comment period on the Approval memorandum.

A statement will be added to note that, for the purposes of Fort Ord Munitions Response RI/FS program, Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) does not include small arms ammunition (.50 caliber and below). This comment was provided by Tom Hall via phone. Everyone OK with the insertion.

DTSC is satisfied with the site walk information concerning E11a.1.

The Army will move ahead with issuing the Group B Approval Memorandum for public review. At the time of issue, the Army will also provide a version showing changes from the previous version in a redline/strikeout form, so it is convenient for the agencies to back check on their comments.

The Army would forward the newspaper notice of the public comment period for the Group B Approval Memorandum, for agency review soon.

## **(2) Wrap-up on issues on Track 1 Record of Decision**

Two changes clarifying construction worker education program were proposed in an Army e-mail dated 24 Feb. The agencies would review it and get back to the Army within a day or two.

-EPA and DTSC responded on 3 Mar that the changes were acceptable.

-RWQCB responded on 3 Mar that the changes were acceptable.

One change regarding DTSC precaution in Section 2.11.3 was requested in an EPA e-mail dated 1 Mar. EPA to check on the status and get back to the Army by 4 Mar.

-EPA followed up in an e-mail on 3 Mar that the subject section should remain where it is, but the section title should change to “Additional Precautions to be undertaken by DTSC.”

After the conference call, the Army identified that language on page 1 regarding small arms is not consistent with other parts of the ROD (e-mail on 7 Mar). The Army proposed to modify page 1 to state that, for the purposes of Fort Ord Munitions Response RI/FS program, MEC does not include small arms ammunition (.50 caliber and below). EPA and DTSC accept the proposed change in text (e-mails on 7 Mar). RWQCB accepts the proposed text (e-mail on 7 Mar). DTSC requested that each of the statements regarding small arms in Appendix A Glossary should be added an asterisk (e-mail on 7 Mar). The Army will make this format change.

The Army will move ahead with issuing the signature copy of the Track 1 ROD. At the time of issue, the Army will also provide a version showing changes from the previous version in a redline/strikeout form, so it is convenient for the agencies to back check on their comments.

### **(3) Discussion of comments on Track 0 Plug-In Approval Memorandum – Group C Parcels**

DTSC would not have comments on the Group C Approval Memorandum until they have reviewed the draft Track 0 ROD ESD. DTSC would not have significant comments on the Group C Approval Memorandum as long as they feel comfortable with the ESD.

The Army provided a list of parcels for discussion (e-mail on 3 Mar).

E15.2 – the proposed Track 0 area includes the boundary of Recoilless Rifle Training Area. The Recoilless Rifle Training Area was found to be a non-firing area per Track 1 MR RI/FS (MRS-20). Bruce Wilcer to discuss the comment with Tom Hall.

L23.5 – the proposed Track 0 area is across the street from MRS-50EXP. Three removal grids across from the parcel (two were partial grids) contained MEC (two M228 practice hand grenade fuzes and one pyrotechnic mixture). Three other grids/partial grids contained MD of pyrotechnic type munitions. The MEC removal at MRS-50EXP followed the “site expansion protocol” toward the north until the funds ran out. If the protocol were followed, the three MEC items would have resulted in recommendation for expansion across the street into parcel L23.5; but this was not done mainly because the decision was made to apply limited available funds to address the northern expansion, where high explosive MEC were being found, as opposed to the western perimeter where practice and pyrotechnic munitions were being found. The group discussed the terrain of the parcel along the road as rather steep and heavily vegetated. At the top of the hill where the buildings exist have been in use for many years and the agencies would be Okay with addressing that part of the parcel as Track 0. EPA and DTSC support changing the parcel boundary to provide some kind of buffer between Track 0 area and MRS-50 EXP where MEC were found. The Army would consider subdividing the parcel so a portion could be addressed as Track 0.

-FODIS GIS data was reviewed after the conference call. It shows that the two M228 practice hand grenade fuzes were discarded military munitions (DMM) and were found right along the

road at the edge of MRS-50EXP site boundary. Discarded items should not trigger the application of the expansion protocol (the protocol was designed to address situations resulting from normal (training) use of munitions - projected, placed and thrown). The pyrotechnic mixture (entered into the database as UXO) was found about 100 ft interior of the site boundary. A picture showing the locations of these MEC items was sent to the agencies via e-mail on 3 Mar.

E2a, E4.1.2.1, E4.1.2.2 and S4.1.1 – they contain “Mines & Booby Traps Area (1954)” where training with practice munitions could have occurred. At the time of Track 1 MR RI/FS EPA had recommended expanding MRS-6 boundary to include this area. MRS-6 was not expanded at the time, because MEC was not expected from the site. The area is currently proposed for Track 0 status but Track 1 plug-in would be the most appropriate avenue for addressing the area. The Army would prepare a Track 1 plug-in documentation for the area and include it in the Approval Memorandum, along with the Track 0 Group C parcels (i.e. 0 and 1 in the same report). The agencies support this approach as long as the Track 1 ROD is signed before the public comment period for the Approval Memorandum begins.

E4.6.1 – incidental MEC was found in the parcel. Okay to include in Track 0 after the Track 0 ROD ESD is issued.

E4.6.2 – the correct boundary of the landfill will be shown on Plate 5.

L5.6.1 – the parcel includes the Landfill Area A where several MD items were found in the refuse but the refuse was entirely excavated and removed. Okay to include in Track 0 as a Special Case Track 0 area after the Track 0 ESD is issued. Dave Eisen and Tom Hall to discuss the information/history of items found in parcels L5.6.1 and E4.3.1.2.

vls