# SUBJECT: MR BCT Meeting December 18, 2006 BRAC Conference Room

Check	Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail address
fly	Gail Youngblood	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-7918	Gail.youngblood@monterey.army.mil
RR	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
M	Claire Trombadore	U.S. EPA	415-972-3518	Trombadore.Claire@epa.gov
resent.	David Eisen	COE	831-393-9692	David.Eisen@usace.army.mil
Bu	Bruce Wilcer	Harding ESE	415-884-3168	blwilcer@mactec.com
con	Chieko Nguyen	Fort Ord BRAC	831-899-7372	Chieko.nguyen@monterey.army.mil
MV	Lyle Shurtleff	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-7919	Lyle.Shurtleff@monterey.army.mil
25	Derek Lieberman	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-4873	Derek.Lieberman@monterey.army.mil
	Jennifer Payne	COE		Jennifer.J.Payne@usace.army.mil
DKC.	Bill Collins	Fort Ord BRAC	831-242-7920	William.collins@monterey.army.mil
	Christopher Prescott	COE	916-557-7227	Christopher.E.Prescott@usace.army.mil

## SUBJECT: MR BCT Meeting December 18, 2006 BRAC Conference Room

Check	Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail address
	George Siller	COE	916/557-7418	George.L.Siller@usace.army.mil
	Linda Janssen	DTSC	916-255-3651	LJanssen@dtsc.ca.gov
	Peter Kelsall	Shaw E&I	831-883-5810	Peter.Kelsall@shawgrp.com
(55	Kevin Siemann	Shaw E&I	831-883-0103	Kevin.Siemann@shawgrp.com
	Cynthia Burris	USACE	916-557-6745	Cynthia.S.Burris@usace.army.mil
M	CLINION HUCKINS	USACE		
phone	Beth Flynn meg Stemper			
phone	megstemper			

### MR BCT Meeting December 18, 2006 BRAC conference room

Item	Action	Comment
Fieldwork Update	Update	MRS-16 Range 36A
Site Security Program	Update	
MRS-16	Update	
Investigation in E20c.1	Discussion	
Property Transfer	Update	
Track 2 Parker Flats MRA	Update	
Track 3 Impact Area MRA RI/FS	Update	
Other Planning Issues	Discuss	-DRO -Ranges 43-48 SCAs and "non-completed areas"
Report Status	Update	
FFA Schedule	Update	
Action Items	Update	
Calendar of upcoming meetings	Discuss	

# Fort Ord Military Munitions Response Program Fieldwork Update

#### MMRP Fieldwork Update MRS-16

A prescribed burn has been completed on the 79 acre area of MRS-16 in preparation for a removal to depth munitions response. Habitat management transects have been installed to support monitoring of vegetation recovery from the preparatory, prescribed burn, and munitions response actions. A surface MEC removal is in progress.

PHASES:	Start Date	Date Complete
Preparatory Actions	06-19-06	07-12-06
Prescribed burn	10-19-06	10-19-06
Surface safety sweep	10-23-06	11-03-06
Vegetation removal (remainder)	11-14-06	12-14-06
Surface Removal	12-04-06	
Digital survey		
Subsurface removal		
Digital survey/QC/QA		

#### **ISSUES AND CONCERNS:**

- 1. The prescribed burn voluntary temporary relocation reimbursement application period is complete. A report is pending.
- 2. POM FD will produce a summary of the prescribed burn action (target pub date 28 Feb).

#### **MMRP Fieldwork Update**

#### PROJECT: Range 36A

The munitions response for Range 36A is in progress. The vegetation on the 1.8-acre area of Range 36A was removed (cut) in preparation for the munitions response action. A digital (EM-61) survey of the area has identified significant subsurface anomalies. One range-related debris item has been treated (wholly inert 250-pound General Purpose practice bomb). Excavation of peak subsurface anomalies is complete. Request for extension of closure period and proposal to amend Closure Plan (Munitions Response Work Plan) has been submitted. Further work is pending DTSC approval of a proposed alternative closure plan from Army.

Start date: 5-2-06 Estimated date complete: TBD

#### PHASES:

Surface safety sweep

Vegetation removal

Digital survey

Subsurface sampling (peak anomalies)

Closure Plan Amendment

Complete

Complete

Complete

In progress

#### **ISSUES AND CONCERNS:**

1) High density of subsurface anomalies.

#### MMRP Fieldwork continued

PROJECT: Annual Impact Area Fuel Break Maintenance

Start Date: 7/06 Estimated date complete: 10/06

PHASES: Vegetation cut on existing fuel breaks adjacent to and within the impact area (MRS-BLM) (approx. 245 acres). Approximately 144 acres of those fuel breaks were scheduled for vegetation cutting in CY 2006. Cutting is suspended pending acquisition of additional equipment.

#### Issues and Concerns:

1. Habitat in the impact area may be impacted by a restart of FB maintenance. A review of remaining maintenance by POM FD is pending.

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

<b>Description</b>	UXO/DMM/TBD	<u>MD</u>	RRD
	(Items)	(lbs.)	<u>(lbs.)</u>
MRS-16	0/0/23	158	N/A
Range 36A	0/0/0	0	250
SBR	0/0/0	0	10

#### MMRP Site Security Program

#### **Trespass Incidents:**

- None

#### **MEC Incidents:**

- An 81mm mortar illumination projectile was reported by a development contractor on Marina Heights property on November 13. A response by the 787<sup>th</sup> EOD resulted in the destruction of the item. There is insufficient source data to determine the item type.
- Two ammo cans were reported in steep terrain on November 14 on BLM land. USACE OSS responded, determined the contents to be 5.56mm blank ammunition and removed the cans to the ESL for future disposition.

#### Community Education: Total recipients to date: (TBD)

- A school MEC safety presentation was provided to Washington Union School 4th grade on October 30.

MEC Rec and Safety Tng: Total personnel trained to date: 229

Other: None

#### PROPOSED INVESTIGATION APPROACH FOR PARCEL E20C.1

#### INTRODUCTION

A portion of Parcel E20c.1 requires additional evaluation because of uncertainties involving the source of munitions debris (MD) discovered within its boundaries. Of specific concern are the unexplained high concentration of Mark II fragmentation grenade fragments in grids C2B4G8 and C2B4D6 and their unidentified source training range.

As a result of this concern, the EPA proposed that a one-foot removal be conducted in the area inside the blue boundary (roughly drawn-approximately 22 acres) on the attached map to remove any munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) in the cited area. The reason for the one-foot removal request is the potential that an unidentified fragmentation hand grenade range may be present inside of the blue boundary, as evidenced by the grenade safety levers. safety pins, and high concentrations of Mark II fragmentation grenade fragments in the listed grids. The basis for the one-foot removal depth is the fact that the potential MEC that may be in the area (Mark II fragmentation hand grenades) are not penetrating munitions. As a result, any MEC present in the parcel should be on the surface or within one foot of the surface. Any grids located within the blue boundary that were previously 100 percent sampled need not be reinvestigated.

If no MEC is discovered during the removal process, or if MEC is discovered that is pyrotechnic in nature or is of the practice type that is not considered life threatening, then the EPA would agree to the designation of Parcel E20c.1 as a Track 1 Site. The EPA would consider the removal as an EPA-requested confirmation action that does not serve to disqualify the site as a Track 1 site. Should the removal result in the discovery of high explosives MEC (other that a small number of random items not related to known activities on the site). The EPA would then request that Parcel E20c.1 be classified as a Track 3 parcel or as a Track 2 if a complete removal is performed prior to conducting an RI/FS (EPA. August 2006).

#### Proposed Approach

In response to the EPA's proposed investigation of the 22 acre area, the Army is proposing the following work to further characterize a portion of the area. The Army has evaluated a number of possibilities to determine if MEC i.e. Mark II fragmentation grenades are within the investigation area. The major impediment in characterization is the large amounts of small metal fragments from the exploded grenades. In addition the dense vegetation at the site even after cutting will obscure the ground surface so that direct visual observation is not possible. Because of this situation the Army is proposing an incremental approach which first attempts to locate the area of the grenade target(s) if they existed, and then determine further actions in coordination with the BCT. The Army's approach is:

- 1. Cut the vegetation in a 10 acre area surrounding the grids where numerous fragments were found in pervious work, see Figure 1.
- 2. Using a digital geophysical device (EM -61 or G858) map the ground surface to determine where the highest densities of metallic debris are located, this should

- provide approximate target locations. All girds will be surveyed, even if previously investigated.
- 3. Process geophysical data collected to determine if any geophysical anomalies that could be MEC items are readily apparent. Post processing of the data using electronic filters could be utilized to further define if items are located beneath the surface. Based on the results of the mapping determine where excavation of anomalies would be conducted.
- 4. Excavation of anomalies and appropriate QC/QA processes
- 5. Submit report detailing work completed and findings. Include recommendations for follow on work, either additional characterization, removal, or Track 1 Approval Memorandum.

The Army will attempt to select anomalies that are indicative of the Mark II fragmentation hand grenades from the results of the geophysical survey to investigate/excavate to a depth of one-foot. The basis for the one-foot investigation depth is the fact that the potential MEC that may be in the area (Mark II fragmentation hand grenades) are not penetrating munitions, therefore, any MEC present in the parcel should be on the surface or within one foot of the surface. In parts of the investigated area where distinct anomalies cannot be identified following the EM-61 survey, mag and dig operations may be conducted.

Based on the review of the results the Army, in discussion with the BCT, will determine if additional investigation is warranted. or if a full removal action over additional area is required. The Army is taking this incremental approach since the location of any subsequent grids is unknown and vegetation removal is required prior to any geophysical survey.

If this investigation indicates that MEC is not present within the investigation area, and high density of MD is limited to the grids discussed above, the Army proposes to document this area as a Track 1 site.





