

BRAC Cleanup Team
Munitions Response (MR) BCT Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)
April 13, 2005
BRAC Conf. Room/conference call

Final Version

Attendees:

Gail Youngblood, Fort Ord BRAC	Roman Racca, DTSC
David Eisen, USACE	Juan Koponen, USACE
George Siller, USACE	Derek Lieberman, Fort Ord BRAC
Evelyn Rudek, Parsons	Martin Hausladen, EPA
Chieko Nguyen, Fort Ord BRAC	John Chesnutt, EPA (by phone)
Lyle Shurtleff, Fort Ord BRAC	Bruce Wilcer, MACTEC
Jennifer Payne, USACE (by phone)	Kris Escarda, DTSC
Mike Coon, Parsons	Patty Velez, CDFG (by phone)
Kim Walsh, TechLaw (by phone)	Ed Ticken, MACTEC

Agenda Items:

Item	Action	Comment
Action Items	Update	Discussion by Chieko Nguyen
Fieldwork Update	Update	Presentation by Lyle Shurtleff
Fieldwork Variance	Update	Presentation by Evelyn Rudek
Site Security Program	Update	Presentation by Lyle Shurtleff
Track 0 Plug-in Approval Memo for area south of MRS-6	Discussion	Discussion by Chieko Nguyen
Track 2 MR RI/FS Report	Discussion	Discussion by Chieko Nguyen
Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA)	Discussion	Discussion by Gail Youngblood
Property Transfer	Discussion	Discussion by Derek Lieberman

Action Items: No discussion

Fieldwork Update: Army described the status of current MR fieldwork. Copies of presentation slides were provided.

Parsons provided a presentation about the results of recently conducted site assessment in East Garrison Area 2.

Fieldwork Variances: There will be a fieldwork variance for the Phase III defensible polygon work since obstacles such as culverts, tires and steel will not be deconstructed as part of this work.

Site Security Program: A description of a 4-8-05 MEC and recent MEC safety presentations to local schools was provided by Army.

Track 0 Plug-in Approval Memo for Group C: Discussed the status of parcel E4.3.1.2 where incidental munitions items had been found. The parcel is a utility corridor and next to landfill Area A. The agencies suggested the Army consider Track 1 plug-in or lease with construction

monitoring. DTSC also is concerned with incidental items found in parcel E8a.1.1.2, south of OU2 landfill. No munitions related training information has been found for the area.

Track 0 Plug-in Approval Memo for area south of MRS-6: The area south of MRS-6 where Track 0 OE RI/FS recommended site expansion will be addressed in a Track 1 Plug-In approval memorandum. Track 1, Category 3 will be assigned to the area (same as MRS-6). The area is about 26 acres. Most of the supporting information is already included in the Track 1 OE RI/FS report. Draft will be provided to the agencies by April 21.

Track 2 MR RI/FS Report: MACTEC provided a bulleted list of key points of the report to assist agency review. The extended review period ends May 30, 2005. DTSC noted that any mixed use will be viewed as “potential residential” unless specific use scenario is identified.

OU Habitat: Army outlined the areas to be addressed and process to be used to evaluate cleanup and reuse requirements.. OU Habitat would address the former Impact Area and other munitions response sites where the Habitat Management Plan identifies protective requirements such as prescribed burning. Impacts of cleanup actions on the protected habitat as well as reuse plans by Bureau of Land Management will be considered. The results of airborne geophysical survey completed earlier this year will be incorporated. EPA recommended looking at dividing the eligible areas into impact area and “other” packages. A technical memorandum outlining the approaches for the OU Habitat MR RI/FS will be provided in May.

FFA: Track 3 FFA schedule will be updated next month.

Property Transfer: DTSC offered to comment on Track 0 Approval Memo C prior to 22 April. DTSC stated it had signed the Track 0 Explanation of Significant Differences. Discussions describing comments to FOST 9 included concerns about the presence of lead-based paint and asbestos on the property. Discussion of the impact of incidental finds in Parcel E4.3.1.2 near MRS-13A. Discussion of what constitutes an “incidental item.” DTSC stated the items found in the area suggest small unit training may have occurred in the area. EPA described a requirement for determination of the intention behind the distribution of MEC and MD in the area. The Army offered other theories to explain the presence of MEC and MD in this parcel. Alternative transfer mechanisms were discussed. DTSC offered that the parcel could be leased through a FOSL or made a Track 1 Plug-in parcel as an alternative to FOST 9. EPA recommended that the priority for FOST 9 properties remain transfer.