

Utah National Guard

Restoration Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Aug 18, 2010

Members Present:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-Mail:
Dave Allison	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	801-536-4479	dallison@campwilliamsrab.org
Dave Bennett	Utah County	801-851-4132	dbennett@campwilliamsrab.org
Richard Brown	Hi-Country 2	801-446-9132	rbrown@campwilliamsrab.org
Rod Flanigan	Bluffdale City	801-755-2200	rflanigan@campwilliamsrab.org
Kim Harriz	National Guard Bureau	703-607-7991	kim.harriz@us.army.mil
Lynn Jorgenson	Lehi City	801-768-7100	ljorgenson@campwilliamsrab.org
Jim McNulty	City of Saratoga Springs	801-766-9793	jmcnulty@campwilliamsrab.org
Rik Ombach	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	801-536-4164	rombach@campwilliamsrab.org
Patrick Osmond	Herriman Community	801-716-9082	posmond@campwilliamsrab.org
Robert Price	Utah National Guard	801-432-4454	rprice@campwilliamsrab.org
Gaylord Scott	Salt Lake County	801-824-3704	gscott@campwilliamsrab.org
Sig Szoke	Lehi Community – Alt	801-766-2672	sszoke@campwilliamsrab.org
John Waldrip	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	801-536-0238	jwaldrip@campwilliamsrab.org
Will Weaver	Lehi Community	801-520-8760	wweaver@campwilliamsrab.org
Facilitator:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-Mail:
Michele Straube	CommUnity Resolution Inc.	801-583-6362	mstraube@campwilliamsrab.org
Members Absent:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-Mail:
Boyd Dansie	Unincorporated Salt Lake County	801-254-0428	bdansie@campwilliamsrab.org
Steve Mumford	Eagle Mountain City	801-789-6603	smumford@campwilliamsrab.org
Heather Ohmie	Herriman City	801-446-5323	hohmie@campwilliamsrab.org
John Roberts	Bluffdale Community	801-254-2200	jroberts@campwilliamsrab.org
Sandra Steele	Saratoga Springs Community	801-653-2434	ssteele@campwilliamsrab.org
Tom Williams	Hi-Country Estates 2 HOA	801-253-1024	twilliams@campwilliamsrab.org
Other Attendees:	Organization:	Telephone:	E-Mail:
Jeff Fitzmayer	Parsons	801-572-5999	jeffrey.fitzmayer@parsons.com
David Harris	Concordia Communications	801-825-3570	dharris@campwilliamsrab.org
Melissa Porter	Concordia Communications	801-825-3570	mporter@campwilliamsrab.org
Ed Staes	Parsons	801-572-5999	ed.staes@parsons.com

Handouts Distributed at Meeting:

Handouts:

Updated RAB contact list

Site map

Agenda Item #1. Welcome

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) co-chair, Robert Price, Utah National Guard (UTNG) opened the meeting, thanked everyone for their attendance and welcomed all RAB members. Mr. Price introduced Jim McNulty, the new RAB member for the City of Saratoga Springs and Kim Harriz from the National Guard Bureau. He then turned the meeting over to Michele Straube, the RAB facilitator. Meeting agenda is attached (**Attachment 1**).

Agenda Item #2. RAB Business

Ms. Straube briefly went through the packet distributed at the meeting.

Action Items

Ms. Straube noted that the current action item list was included in the packet (**Attachment 2**). She said that all action items complete are highlighted in gray and open items are white.

Training

Ms. Straube explained that a training presentation called UXO 101 was provided by Mr. Price and has been posted on the Web site, www.campwilliamsrab.org, for RAB member use. She mentioned that RAB members had the opportunity to participate in an equipment demonstration on June 18, 2010. She asked for input from RAB members who attended the equipment demonstration. Mr. Lynn Jorgenson and Mr. Sig Szoke who attended said that it was a good demonstration.

Mr. Patrick Osmond explained that he was able to secure a date for an artillery demonstration at Camp Williams. He explained that the demonstration could take place on Saturday, November 6th or Sunday, November 7th. RAB members voted that November 6, 2010 would be the best date for the artillery demonstration. [Post RAB meeting note: The artillery demonstration has been postponed until spring.] Ms. Straube explained that Melissa Porter, the RAB coordinator will work with Mr. Osmond to arrange the artillery demonstration.

Operating Procedures

Ms. Straube explained that the operating procedures will be finalized and posted on the RAB Web site soon. She summarized the main points of the operating procedures as follows:

- The term of office for RAB community members is two years. Community members can serve more than one term. If a member wishes to continue for another term, he/she may do so without opening up the seat to other candidates with a 2/3 majority vote of the RAB. If a 2/3 majority is not achieved, the seat will be advertised and an open selection process is opened with the winner being selected by a simple majority. The incumbent is still eligible to be re-elected to the seat.
- The Community co-chair term of office is also 2 years. Community co-chairs may serve more than one term. The selection process will be the same as that of community members.
- Conflicts of interest are outlined in the operating procedures. Mr. Osmond explained that he works for the UTNG, but that he is serving on the RAB in a personal capacity for Herriman

community. The RAB agreed they do not consider this a conflict of interest. RAB members should identify any potential conflicts of interest via email or at the next RAB meeting.

- Technical assistance is available to RAB members who would like assistance in understanding technical information or documents. More information about this process is available on the RAB Web site.
- RAB member presentation and representation guidelines are also outlined in the operating procedures. These guidelines are to be used when RAB members are speaking with community members or to city officials.

Budget Information

Mr. Price explained that the Southwest Area and Southeast Area Munitions Response Sites (MRS) have completed the Site Inspection fieldwork. He said that the Site Inspection report is currently being reviewed by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality. Mr. Price said that based on the findings of the Site Inspection, the UTNG's intention is to move these two sites into the Remedial Investigation phase. He said that they requested funding for the Remedial Investigation and have received the funding. He explained that work for the Remedial Investigation should take place sometime in the fall.

Mr. Price explained that the Installation Action Plan, a budgetary document that will be posted on the RAB Web site soon, doesn't outline exact funding amounts. He said that this document is more of a forecast of future work and that it outlines potential funding that will be in place for future work. He explained that the Installation Action Plan is still under review and should be completed in the next few weeks.

Project Update

Mr. Price gave RAB members a brief update on what has happened in the three months since the last meeting. He explained again that the Site Inspection report for the Southeast Area and Southwest Area is almost finalized. Mr. Price said that the sites participating in the Remedial Investigation have almost completed the fieldwork. He said that fieldwork at the Southeast Simulated Attack Area is complete. He explained that fieldwork at the Wood Hollow Training Area is almost complete, but they are still working to determine the nature and extent of munitions contamination. He explained that the Wood Hollow Training Area appears to have been an impact area for munitions.

Mr. Price explained that the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone and the Rose Canyon Training Area are also almost done with the fieldwork. He explained that they have been able to access 80 to 90 percent of the acreage they desired, but there are about 50 landowners who haven't agreed to provide Right-Of-Entry (ROE) to their land. Mr. Price explained that he would like RAB members to help obtain the missing ROE agreements if possible.

Agenda Item #3 Right-of-Entry Agreements

Mr. Fitzmayer summarized the efforts that have been made to obtain access to lands that the UTNG wanted to include in the Remedial Investigation, slide two of (**Attachment 3**). He explained that some landowners have been hard to contact because they live out-of-state. He explained that Mr. Price has been calling landowners and making door-to-door visits with some landowners to try and obtain access to their land. Mr. Fitzmayer asked the RAB members for help to obtain the remaining ROE agreements.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide three of (**Attachment 3**) that outlined the missing ROE agreements. He explained that the southern area of the map shows the most critical agreements that they would like to obtain. Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out slide four of (**Attachment 3**) that showed a zoomed-in version of the southern area of the previous map. Mr. Fitzmayer asked if RAB members had any ideas of ways that the UTNG could obtain the remaining ROE agreements. Mr. Richard Brown said that they could include the map found on slide four of (**Attachment 3**) in the next monthly mailing that Hi-Country Estates II will send out the beginning of September. Mr. Fitzmayer indicated that because of time constraints the September mailing might be too late. Mr. Fitzmayer asked if the UTNG could post the map on the Hi-Country Estates II Web site. Mr. Brown said that could be a possibility.

Mr. Szoke asked what would happen if the ROE agreements for the missing areas were not obtained. Mr. Fitzmayer said that when the project is complete, those areas would be indicated on maps as areas not investigated. Mr. Price explained that if there is reason to believe those areas have a high potential of containing Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) or MEC-like items, they can go through other avenues to obtain ROE to the property. Mr. Price said the UTNG could provide a list of missing ROE agreements to RAB members who are interested in helping. He said that if RAB members know someone on the list, landowners may feel more comfortable speaking with the RAB member rather than the UTNG.

Mr. Fitzmayer reminded RAB members to practice the three Rs, found on slide five of (**Attachment 3**), if they encounter old munitions. The three Rs are: Recognize, Retreat, and Report. He also asked RAB members to remind community members to practice the three Rs.

Agenda Item #4 MMRP Field Work Update

Mr. Fitzmayer gave an overview of his presentation agenda on slide two of (**Attachment 4**). He then pointed out slide three of (**Attachment 4**), which showed some commonly used acronyms. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) follows the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA, process. Slide four of (**Attachment 4**) showed the process that the MMRP will follow.

Ms. Harriz explained the main difference between a Site Inspection and a Remedial Investigation is that sites will participate in a Site Inspection to determine if munitions are present on the site and if there has been any type of hazardous release from munitions. She explained that during a Remedial Investigation, sites are investigated to determine the nature and extent of contamination because the Site Inspection has already determined that there was a type of release at the site.

Mr. Fitzmayer summarized the Site Inspections on slide five of (**Attachment 4**) that were completed at the Southwest Area and Southeast Area MRSs in March and April of this year. He then pointed out a map on slide six of (**Attachment 4**) that showed the location of the Southeast Area and Southwest Area MRSs.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that there are four MRSs currently participating in a Remedial Investigation. He explained that the Site Inspections for these four sites were completed in 2008. He explained that the work plan was developed and field work for these four sites began in May of this year. Mr. Fitzmayer then pointed out the locations of the four sites on a map found on slide eight of (**Attachment 4**).

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the field work for the Southeast Simulated Attack Area MRS was completed this summer. He pointed out slide ten of (**Attachment 4**), which showed maps and a summary of the site. He

explained that the past training activities at the Southeast Simulated Attack Area were simulated training activities. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the simulated nature of the training caused them to believe that any munitions present at this site would be stationary munitions or blanks. He summarized the field work proposal for the Southeast Simulated Attack Area on slide 11 of (**Attachment 4**).

Mr. Fitzmayer summarized the results from the field work and explained that the items discovered consisted of small arms munitions and simulated items, which is what they thought might be found. He explained that more sophisticated investigation techniques like Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) and soil sampling were not necessary at this site because the items discovered showed no release or explosive hazard.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out the track that crews followed while investigating the Southeast Simulated Attack Area MRS on slide 13 of (**Attachment 4**). He explained that the crews would stop every 800 to 1,000 feet and record any information that had been collected up to that point. Mr. Fitzmayer said that if munitions debris or range-related-debris were discovered, that point was also noted with photographs and notes.

Mr. Szoke asked if the Southeast Simulated Attack Area will be closed because nothing of significance was found. Mr. Price explained that the UTNG still needs to review the data that was collected during the field work and make a recommendation for the site. He said that the UTNG anticipates that the site will be recommended for no further action based on the findings of the field work.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that field work for the Rose Canyon Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone began in May of this year. He summarized the proposed field work for these two sites and explained that sophisticated investigation techniques such as DGM have been used due to the nature of training that may have taken place. Mr. Fitzmayer said that they will conduct soil sampling as needed at these two sites.

Ms. Kim Harriz asked if any RAB members have seen the field work. RAB members commented that they had not seen the investigation crews conducting field work. Mr. Price explained that some of the regulators have observed the field work. He said that RAB members could also observe the field work and asked RAB members to contact Ms. Porter or Mr. Fitzmayer if they are interested. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that field work is taking place Monday through Friday and will continue three to four weeks.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map found on slide 15 of (**Attachment 4**) that outlined the Rose Canyon Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone. The UTNG has stated the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone was never known to be the actual buffer zone at any time. He said that a map error had the buffer zone shifted northwest on a map from the 1980s. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that subsequent maps have shown the impact area and buffer zone in the current location.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 16 of (**Attachment 4**) that outlined the tracks proposed for the field work at the Rose Canyon Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone. He explained that the tracks are 310 feet apart and pointed out items that were previously found at these two sites.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the field work that has been completed at these two sites thus far by pointing out slide 17 of (**Attachment 4**). He explained the process for DGM and said that they are still completing some DGM field work. Mr. Fitzmayer said that they have intrusively investigated about 80 anomalies and said that most of the items found during the intrusive investigations were cultural debris (wires, horse shoes, cans, bolts, and other small objects). Mr. Fitzmayer said that a piece of artillery fragment and an expended 155mm illumination candle

were discovered in the area where previous artillery rounds were found in 2007. He explained that 155mm illumination candles were used to illuminate broad areas for infantry or ground troops and that when fired; these munitions released a brightly burning illumination mechanism that was attached to a parachute and slowly floated to the ground. Mr. Fitzmayer stated that it is not uncommon for illumination candles to float off course.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 18 of (**Attachment 4**) that shows the DGM field work completed so far. He also pointed out the area where the artillery fragment and the 155mm illumination candle were found. Mr. John Waldrip asked if a more extensive investigation would be done in the area where the artillery fragment and 155mm illumination candle were found. Mr. Fitzmayer said that they are trying to locate impact areas. He explained that the way they try to locate impact areas is by looking at the amount of anomalies in an area. Mr. Fitzmayer said that areas that have 50 or more anomalies within a square mile are suspect impact areas and they will investigate those areas further. He said that they have not yet collected all of the data for the area where the artillery fragment and illumination candle were found so they have not determined if it is a suspect impact area or not.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that field work is still being done in the Wood Hollow Training Area. He said that the data collected thus far indicates that this MRS may have been a 75mm impact area. He explained that most of the 75mm rounds found thus far are shrapnel rounds that were most likely used sometime between 1920 and 1940. Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the proposed field work for this site on slide 20 of (**Attachment 4**).

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 21 of (**Attachment 4**) that outlined the tracks proposed for the field work at the Wood Hollow Training Area. He explained that they decided to extend the field work outside of the MRS boundary and pointed out the actual tracks that have been investigated on slide 22 of (**Attachment 4**). Mr. Fitzmayer explained that a lot of land near the Wood Hollow Training Area has been disturbed by an active gravel mining operation. He said that field work was not done at areas that have been disturbed by mining.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map found on slide 23 of (**Attachment 4**) that showed the DGM that was completed for the Wood Hollow Training Area. He explained that many different anomalies were identified and that some of the anomalies appeared to be MEC-like objects, but that once the anomalies were excavated, only munitions debris and cultural debris were present. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the colors on the map found on slide 23 of (**Attachment 4**) show the anomaly density of the Wood Hollow Training Area. He explained that they will be doing additional work in the areas with a high anomaly density.

Ms. Harriz asked if the map on slide 23 of (**Attachment 4**) indicates which anomalies have been investigated and which have not been investigated. Mr. Fitzmayer said that the map shows all of the anomalies discovered but it does not indicate which anomalies have been investigated further. Ms. Harriz asked what percentage of anomalies investigated were munitions debris. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that 90 percent of the anomalies investigated ended up being munitions debris and ten percent were cultural debris. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that when a suspect target area is identified the work plan requires investigation of the areas more thoroughly in 100-by-100-foot grids. He said that six areas in the Wood Hollow Training Area have been investigated in this manner.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out some pictures on slide 24 of (**Attachment 4**) that show the type of munitions debris that have been discovered at the Wood Hollow Training Area. Ms. Harriz asked what was being done with the munitions debris that is discovered. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that they have been leaving the munitions debris on site because the Remedial Investigation doesn't cover cleanup. In discussion on this topic after the meeting, it was noted that the Work Plan requirement is for all munitions debris encountered during the investigation to be

inspected, certified as free from explosives, and disposed. Parsons acknowledged the need to comply with this requirement.

Agenda Item #5 Break/Breakouts

RAB members were able to break into small groups to ask questions about the Munitions Response Sites involved in the MMRP investigation.

Agenda Item # 6 Web Site Demonstration

Mr. Dave Harris outlined the content that is available on the project Web site, www.campwilliamsrab.org. He encouraged RAB members to provide the Web site address to community members who are interested in learning more about the MMRP taking place at Camp Williams. Mr. Harris explained that there is an online repository on the Web site that contains all project-related documents.

Mr. Harris explained there is a special section of the Web site for RAB members. He showed RAB members how to login and explained the different sections that are available for RAB members. Mr. Harris explained that one section of the Web site specifically designed for RAB members, called documents for review, is the section where draft documents will be posted. He explained that RAB members are able to make comments on draft documents and this is the place where those documents will be made available to RAB members.

Mr. Price explained that RAB members can request a hard copy of any document. Mr. Harris explained that the draft reports are generally long and technical and that RAB members may be more interested in having a hard copy of the executive summary rather than the entire report. He said that physical copies of all project-related documents are also available for viewing at the Riverton city library.

Mr. Harris showed RAB members how to upload a picture to their online profile. He then showed RAB members the other functions of the Web site. Mr. Harris explained that each RAB member has a campwilliamsrab.org email address that is linked to their personal email address. He explained that this allows RAB members to be accessible to the public without giving out their personal contact information. He encouraged RAB members to contact Ms. Porter with any email address changes.

Agenda Item #7 Public Comment Opportunity

Ms. Straube asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the audience. No one responded.

Agenda Item #8 Agenda Items for August 18, 2010 Meeting

Ms. Straube noted that the next meeting will be held November 17, 2010. [Post RAB meeting note: The November RAB meeting was changed to November 10, 2010 due to scheduling conflicts.]

Agenda Item #9 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Action items
3. Presentation Slides – Right-of-entry agreements
4. Presentation Slides – MMRP field work update