

Utah National Guard Restoration Advisory Board Draft Meeting Minutes

October 3, 2012

Members Present:

Robert Price
Michael Storck
John Waldrip
Dave Allison
Marlon Jones
Michael McKinley
Noell Nelson
Sandra Steele
Walter Gee
Richard Bell

Organization:

Utah National Guard
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Bluffdale Community
Herriman Community (Alt.)
Bluffdale City
Saratoga Springs Community
National Guard Bureau
Bluffdale Community (Alt.)

Members Missing:

Richard Brown
Boyd Dansie
Alan Paxton
Mark Reid
Gaylord Scott
Heather Upshaw
Tom Williams
LTC Hank McIntire
Jerry Iacopini
Ted Asch

Organization:

Hi-Country Estates II Community
Unincorporated Salt Lake County
Herriman Community
Bluffdale City
Salt Lake County
Herriman City
Hi-Country Estates II HOA
Utah National Guard Public Affairs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Geological Survey

Other Attendees:

Jeff Fitzmayer
Amy Phelan
Jory Howell
Dave Harris
Lindsay Mabry

Organization:

Parsons
Parsons
Herriman City
Concordia Communications
Concordia Communications

Agenda Item #1: Welcome

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) community co-chair, Sandra Steele, opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m., thanked everyone for their attendance and welcomed all RAB members and community members.

Agenda Item #2: RAB Business

Mr. Robert Price, the installation co-chair, went through the RAB Business. Meeting agenda is attached (**Attachment 1**).

Action Items

Mr. Price explained that the RAB has an action item list and currently there are no outstanding items.

New RAB Representatives from Herriman

Mr. Price introduced Mr. Michael McKinley, who was present at the meeting, as the new Herriman community alternate. Mr. Price explained that Mr. Alan Paxton had been selected as the new Herriman community representative but could not attend the meeting.

Potential Training/Tours

Mr. Price said that there are no training or tours currently scheduled, but if any RAB members would like a tour of the sites to please contact him and he would arrange the tour.

RAB Member Terms

Mr. Price explained he would like to table this discussion until after the presentation on public involvement opportunities and the RAB's future role. Mr. Price said that the presentation would outline the future of the RAB and the roles of its members.

Utah County Sites

Mr. Price said that since the last RAB meeting in January, Camp Williams visited the city councils in Eagle Mountain, Lehi, and Saratoga Springs to give them a project update. He explained to the councils that the sites in Utah County were recommended for no action and gave the cities the option of whether or not they would like to continue to be a part of the RAB. All the cities in Utah County decided they would no longer be part of the RAB.

Agenda Item #3: Project Update (Attachment 2)

Mr. Price outlined the agenda for his presentation on slide 2 and added that Camp Williams sent out letters to landowners last week.

Mr. Price went over the project schedule and budget of the project on slide 3. He said that currently Parsons is contracted through April 23, 2013 to complete the Feasibility Studies, Proposed Plans and Decision Documents. He noted that Camp Williams is working to have a contract in place for the Remedial Design and the Remedial Action some time in 2013 and for the work to be completed about December 2014. Mr. Price said that the budget has been approved for fiscal year 2013 which will include monies to be used to conduct the Remedial Design and Remedial Action.

Mr. Price explained the map on slide 4 shows the new boundaries of the munitions response sites and pointed out the sites that were in his presentation.

Mr. Price went over the current status for the Southeast Simulated Attack Area, Southwest Area and the Southeast Area on slides 5 through 7. He said that Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) has concurred with the findings from the Remedial Investigation and that no action will be taken at these sites. Comments on the Southeast Simulated Attack Area Decision Document

have been provided by UDEQ; however, the Southwest Area and Southeast Area Decision Documents are still both being reviewed.

The status of the Wood Hollow Training Area is shown on slide 8. Mr. Price explained that the acreage of the munitions response site was expanded from 78 to 241 acres based on the results of the Remedial Investigation. He said that a Feasibility Study is currently underway at this site, and that Mr. Jeff Fitzmayer, Parsons, will go over that in detail in the next presentation.

Mr. Price reviewed the current status of Rose Canyon Training Area and Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone (AIABZ) on slide 9. He said that after the Remedial Investigation was completed, the boundary between these sites was adjusted such that the land now included in the Rose Canyon Training Area requires no action. A Decision Document specifying No Action has been prepared for the Rose Canyon Training Area. He said that the AIABZ is currently undergoing a Feasibility Study, and this site that has the most potential for public interest.

On slide 10, Mr. Price explained that the boundary of the AIABZ was expanded based on the results of the Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA). During the TCRA, PIKA, the contractor responsible for performing the action, found an item outside of the then-current boundary. Based on this finding, a slight variation was made to the site boundary to include this additional area of concern. As a result an additional three to four parcels were added to the site.

Lastly, Mr. Price went over the landowner notifications that had been sent out. Mr. Price said that he tried to contact the newly included parcels' owners by phone to inform them that they would be getting a letter. All of the landowners in the AIABZ received a letter updating them on the work done on their property and informing them that additional work may be necessary in the future. Mr. Price predicted that Camp Williams will be granted Right-of-Entry (ROE) for all of the parcels in the AIABZ except one. The letter also informed the landowners of what to expect in the future and what to do if munitions are found in the interim. Mr. Price said that they are trying very hard to identify and notify every landowner.

Mr. Marlon Jones, Bluffdale Community, asked Mr. Price if it was possible for the Unified Fire Department to get a map or Geographic Information System (GIS) information showing the location of potential risks and cleared areas, in case there is another fire. Mr. Price said that GIS data could be provided to the fire department. Both Mr. Price and Mr. Fitzmayer gave Mr. Jones their cards and said that they will have someone contact Mr. Jones. Mr. Noell Nelson, Bluffdale City, requested that information be shared with the Bluffdale Fire Department and Mr. Price agreed.

Mr. Richard Bell, Bluffdale Community, asked if a Remedial Action had been already done in Rose Canyon. Mr. Price answered that some munitions clearance was performed in Hi-Country Estates II. Mr. Bell then asked what areas were cleared. Mr. Price referred to a poster in the room and pointed out that the areas that had been cleared were those portions of land within the AIABZ that were burned by the machine gun fire. Clearance was performed over 100 percent of the ground surface throughout 166 of the 176 acres burned within site; 10 acres of burned land were not cleared because ROE was not granted. Mr. Price said that four artillery rounds were found during the TCRA. These rounds either had no fuze or only a partial fuze and were transported to Camp Williams for detonation,

Agenda Item #4: Feasibility Study Findings (Attachment 3)

Mr. Fitzmayer began with a brief background discussion of Parsons' involvement with the Camp Williams Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) project and informed the RAB that Parsons is currently on schedule.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that Parsons is conducting Feasibility Studies for two of the sites associated with Camp Williams to evaluate alternatives for cleanup. He then outlined his presentation on slide 2. Of the six munitions response sites at Camp Williams, only two, the AIABZ and the Wood Hollow Training Area, will require Remedial Action. The remaining four sites require no action.

Mr. Fitzmayer went over the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process on slide 3, explaining that the CERCLA process is what drives the MMRP. Currently the project is in the Feasibility Study stage.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out some of the key features that were used to decide what cleanup remedies would be proposed for the AIABZ on slide 5. He further explained that because of the rocky surface, Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) could not penetrate the subsurface; therefore, subsurface cleanup would not be needed at this site.

Mr. Fitzmayer went over the proposed remedial alternatives for the AIABZ on slide 6. He explained these alternatives have been selected based on the Remedial Investigation and public input. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that efforts have been made to gather public input as the alternatives were being developed. Mr. Fitzmayer went on to explain that whatever Remedial Action is chosen it will be applied evenly to all sites within the AIABZ.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the potential alternative of "No Action" on slide 7. He explained the pros and cons of this alternative. If "No Action" was selected, there would be no short-term impacts to the landowners, but MEC could potentially remain on the property. Mr. Fitzmayer noted that this alternative has to be included as a baseline for the Feasibility Study.

The hazard management alternative is outlined on slide 8. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that this is an administrative approach to address munitions-related hazards. If this alternative were chosen, Camp Williams would develop and implement a community educational awareness program. In addition, Camp Williams would conduct Five-Year Reviews (FYRs) to ensure the programs were sufficiently protective of human health.

The full surface clearance alternative is outlined on slide 9. Mr. Fitzmayer explained this alternative would include a complete clearance of all munitions identified over the entire site and would require a ROE agreement for all parcels. A community education awareness program and FYRs would also be included as part of this alternative. He went over the pros and cons of this alternative on slides 10 and 11.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that landowners preferred the full surface clearance alternative but had some concerns regarding brush removal. Because of these concerns, Mr. Fitzmayer and Mr. Price evaluated the brush in an area of concern. On slide 12 he outlines a few of their findings. After inspecting the brush, it was concluded that brush removal would not be necessary, provided the crews conducted operations carefully (at a slower pace) and at the right time of year (spring).

Mr. Howell, Herriman City, asked if Camp Williams has or will flag property deeds indicating the possibility that munitions are present. Mr. Price said that right now there are no flags on properties. Mr. Price explained that once the remedial action was complete, the munitions hazard would be gone, except for parcels where ROE is not granted. Mr. Price explained that Camp Williams is doing everything they can to contact landowners and fully explain why ROE and cleanup are necessary. A few landowners are refusing ROE for a number of reasons. Mr. Price explained that for those properties, there are some alternatives Camp Williams can take, but no additional action has been currently taken.

Mr. Fitzmayer covered some key features that were used to develop the Remedial Alternatives for Wood Hollow on slide 13. He noted that the Wood Hollow area started out being 78 acres, but due to the findings of the Remedial Investigation, has been expanded to 241 acres.

Mr. Fitzmayer went on to explain the proposed Remedial Alternatives for Wood Hollow outlined on slide 14. He pointed out that there was no hazard management alternative, because too much MEC exists at the site for hazard management to be a viable alternative. Mr. Fitzmayer stated that the preferred alternative would be the surface and subsurface clearance of MEC to a specified depth. He clarified that just because an alternative is identified as the “likely preferred alternative” does not mean that it is the alternative that will be chosen. The alternative will be selected based on public input during the Proposed Plan phase.

Mr. Fitzmayer went over the “No Action” and full service clearance alternatives on slide 15. He pointed out that if either of these alternatives were selected that there would still be a potential for subsurface MEC.

Mr. Fitzmayer described the details of the surface and subsurface clearance alternative on slide 16. He explained that under this alternative contractors would use equipment with the ability to precisely map where an item is found using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, so the item can later be relocated and removed. Mr. Fitzmayer also explained that, based on the results of the Remedial Investigation, it was agreed that the maximum specified depth of investigation for subsurface MEC would be a maximum of two feet.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that though the surface and subsurface clearance alternative would reduce the risk of MEC on properties, it would be more intrusive than the other alternatives. He explained that evacuations, closed roads and trails, removal of brush and intrusive diggings are all possible. The entire list pros and cons for this alternative is on slides 17 and 18.

Mr. Price discussed a map on slide 19 showing the parcels where ROE was denied during the Remedial Investigation. Mr. Fitzmayer explained on the next slide what the Utah National Guard (UTNG) may do for parcels where ROE is not granted for MEC clearance. Mr. Price reiterated the UTNG commitment to obtain ROEs for as many properties as possible, and said that additional actions, such as flagging deeds for uncleared properties, were a last resort.

Mr. Fitzmayer asked Mr. Price to explain why Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) construction support was no longer a viable alternative for the project, as shown on slide 21. Mr. Price explained that Congress has mandated that work at all MMRP sites be completed by 2020, and that having an uncertain remedy, such as future construction support in out-years, is not consistent with this congressional mandate.

Mr. Fitzmayer concluded his presentation with the upcoming schedule for the MMRP work on slide 22. He said that Parsons should have the Feasibility Study finalized by the end of the October 2012. He noted that Parsons is only contracted through preparing the Decision Documents, which ends April 2013.

Agenda Item #5: Break

RAB members were able to break into small groups to ask questions about the Feasibility Study.

Agenda Item #6: Public Involvement Opportunities and the RAB's Future Role (Attachment 4)

Dave Harris, Concordia Communications, gave an overview of his presentation, which included the role of the RAB over the next few months and after the Record of Decision (ROD) is in place.

Mr. Harris first summarized what the role of the RAB is right now on slide 3, followed by upcoming opportunities for RAB participation on slide 4. He then explained that the Proposed Plan is the next milestone of the project and that it is important for the RAB members to stay informed, read the Proposed Plan and inform their represented group on what is being proposed for the cleanup. He explained the details of RAB participation in the Proposed Plan on slides 5 and 6.

Mr. Harris explained that there will be a public meeting for the Proposed Plan, probably in February 2013, and that will be the formal time to accept public comment. Mr. Harris advised RAB members to become familiar with the Proposed Plan, attend the public meeting and encourage others to the same. He urged the RAB members to voice their opinions and concerns, and ask questions. Mr. Harris explained that it is a lot easier to change something at this stage than to address it after the Proposed Plan is finalized and presented to the public.

Mr. Harris went on to talk the ROD on slide 7 and about the future of the RAB post-ROD on slides 8 through 9. Mr. Harris clarified that just because a decision is in place does not mean that the RAB has nothing left to do. Mr. Harris explained that even though the RAB's role will be different, it is still an important role to have. The RAB's role at that time would be making sure the cleanup is being done properly and with respect for the community.

Mr. Harris explained on Slide 10 that the next RAB meeting is scheduled for early February 2013. He suggested that, at that time, the RAB should discuss whether they will continue to meet, and if so, how often.

Agenda Item #7: Public Comment Opportunity

Ms. Steele explained that due to increased responsibilities with her city, and since no work is being done in her city of Saratoga Springs, she has decided to resign from the RAB.

Agenda Item #8: Adjourn

The next RAB meeting was tentatively scheduled for February 6, 2013. The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Attachments

1. Meeting agenda
2. Presentation Slides – Project Update
3. Presentation Slides – Feasibility Study Findings
4. Presentation Slides – Public Involvement Opportunities and the RAB's Future Role