

Utah National Guard

Restoration Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

February 20, 2013

Members Present: Organization:

Dave Allison	Utah Department of Environmental Quality (Alternate)
Jory Howell	Herriman City (Alternate)
Michael McKinley	Herriman Community (Alternate)
Noell Nelson	Bluffdale City
Robert Price	Utah National Guard
Sandra Steele	Saratoga Springs Community
John Waldrip	Utah Department of Environmental Quality

E-Mail:

dallison@utah.gov
jhowell@herriman.org
mmckinley@campwilliamsrab.org
nnelson@campwilliamsrab.org
rprice@campwilliamsrab.org
ssteele@campwilliamsrab.org
jwaldrip@campwilliamsrab.org

Members Absent: Organization:

Richard Brown	Hi-Country Estates II Community
Boyd Dansie	Unincorporated Salt Lake County
Walter Gee	National Guard Bureau
Jerry Iacopini	US Army Corps of Engineers
Marlon Jones	Bluffdale Community
Alan Paxton	Herriman Community
Gaylord Scott	Salt Lake County
Heather Upshaw	Herriman City
Tom Williams	Hi-Country Estates II Homeowners Association

E-Mail:

rbrown@campwilliamsrab.org
bdansie@campwilliamsrab.org
walter.f.gee.ctr@mail.mil
jerry.c.iacopini@usace.army.mil
mjones@campwilliamsrab.org
apaxton@campwilliamsrab.org
gscott@campwilliamsrab.org
hupshaw@campwilliamsrab.org
twilliams@campwilliamsrab.org

Other Attendees: Organization:

Jeff Fitzmayer	Parsons
Dave Harris	Concordia Communications
Amy Phelan	Parsons
Melissa Porter	Concordia Communications

E-Mail:

jeffrey.fitzmayer@parsons.com
dharris@concordiacommunications.com
amy.phelan@parsons.com
mporter@concordiacommunications.com

Agenda Item #1 - Welcome

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) installation co-chair, Robert Price, opened the meeting, thanked everyone for their attendance, and welcomed all RAB members and community members. The meeting agenda is attached (**Attachment 1**).

Agenda Item #2 - RAB Business

Mr. Price briefly went through the packet distributed at the meeting.

Action Items

Mr. Price noted that all action items are complete.

Selection of New Community Co-Chair

Mr. Price explained that a new community co-chair needs to be appointed. He recommended the appointment of the community co-chair take place via email because there were not enough voting RAB members present at the meeting. RAB members agreed to this recommendation.

Status of Remedial Design/Remedial Action Contract

Mr. Price explained that he would provide details of the future Remedial Design/Remedial Action contract during his presentation.

Agenda Item #3 - Project Update (Attachment 2)

Mr. Price outlined the agenda for his presentation on slide 2 and pointed out topics covered at the last RAB meeting (held October 3, 2012), as well as topics he would cover during this meeting. He outlined the project schedule on slide 3 and explained this tentative schedule is based on acceptance of the Proposed Plans for the Wood Hollow Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone (AIABZ). The 30-day public comment period for the Proposed Plans will begin the first part of April and conclude the first part of May. A meeting to present the Proposed Plans to the public is scheduled to be held April 18, 2013 at Silver Crest Elementary School in Herriman.

Mr. Price said he hopes to have the Remedial Design/Remedial Action contract in place no later than September 5, 2013. He said he may push to have the contract awarded a few weeks earlier than September 5, 2013 so monies are awarded several weeks before the end of fiscal year, which is September 30, 2013.

Mr. Price pointed out a map on slide 6 showing the six Munitions Response Sites associated with the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) at Camp Williams and explained that two sites, the Wood Hollow Training Area and the AIABZ, require Remedial Action.

Mr. Price outlined the status of the Southeast Simulated Attack Area, the Southwest Area, and the Southeast Area on slides 5 through 7. He explained that UDEQ has concurred with a recommendation of No Action for these sites. The Decision Documents for these sites have been accepted pending a legal review by the National Guard Bureau.

Mr. Price explained the Feasibility Study for the Wood Hollow Training Area was completed October 2012. As shown on slide 8, the Proposed Plan for this site is currently being reviewed internally and will be sent to UDEQ for review soon.

Status of the Rose Canyon Training Area was presented on slide 9. Mr. Price explained this site was recommended for No Action following a boundary revision. He explained UDEQ has concurred with a recommendation of No Action for this site, and the Decision Document has been accepted pending a legal review by the National Guard Bureau.

Mr. Price explained the Proposed Plan for the AIABZ is currently being reviewed by UDEQ, as shown on slide 10. He said the details of the Proposed Plan will be addressed by Jeff Fitzmayer during the next presentation.

Maps for the AIABZ and the Wood Hollow Training Area were provided to RAB members (**Attachments 3 and 4**). Mr. Price pointed out key features on the maps and provided information about munitions items that have been found at the sites during various stages of the MMRP. Mr. Price explained the boundary for the AIABZ has been revised three times. The final boundary, shown on the map, includes a zone that is believed to have been a light impact area. The boundary for the Wood Hollow Training Area has also been revised through the various stages of the MMRP. The final site boundary is shown on the map and encompasses 241 acres.

Agenda Item #4 - Break

RAB members did not take a break in favor of ending the meeting early.

Agenda Item #5 - Overview of Proposed Plans (Attachment 5)

Mr. Fitzmayer reviewed the agenda for his presentation on slide 2 and explained that the Remedial Investigation began with six sites. Four of those sites require no action and have Decision Documents complete. The two remaining sites, the AIABZ and Wood Hollow Training Area, require Remedial Action. Feasibility Studies for these two sites have been written and the Proposed Plans are being reviewed.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or CERCLA, process on slide 3 and explained this is the federally-approved cleanup process being used during the MMRP. He explained that the Wood Hollow Training Area and AIABZ are currently in the Proposed Plan stage of the CERCLA process. He said that a public meeting presenting the Proposed Plans to the public will be held April 18, 2013, and a 30-day public comment period for the Proposed Plans will begin the first part of April.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that a Proposed Plan is a report identifying the Preferred Alternative for remediating a site where hazards have been identified, as shown on slide 4. The objective of a Proposed Plan is to present the Preferred Alternative to the public and solicit their comments on this recommendation. Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the process for selecting the Preferred Alternative on slide 5. He explained the Feasibility Study used data from the Remedial Investigation to identify risks at the Wood Hollow Training Area and AIABZ and evaluate ways to mitigate those risks.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that remedial alternatives are evaluated against nine criteria to determine which alternative is preferred, as shown on slide 6. The nine evaluation criteria come from the CERCLA process developed to address water and soil contamination. The MMRP follows the CERCLA process, which provides the framework for the MMRP. However, Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the CERCLA process can be more complex than necessary when addressing munitions contamination because munitions contamination is usually less complex than water and soil contamination.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained various ways for members of the public to participate in the public comment period for the Proposed Plan, as shown on slide 7. He said that RAB members can assist during the public comment period by getting the word out to their constituents. Mr. Fitzmayer stressed that the public is encouraged to comment on the Proposed Plan, per slide 8.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 9 showing the six sites associated with the MMRP at Camp Williams. He explained that the Proposed Plan for the Wood Hollow Training Area is being reviewed internally and will be sent to UDEQ for review soon. The Proposed Plan for the AIABZ is currently being reviewed by UDEQ.

Mr. Fitzmayer discussed three features of the Wood Hollow Training Area shown on slide 10 that influenced which remedial alternatives were developed for the site. He said that three remedial alternatives were originally developed for this site per the details shown on slide 11. He explained that the Preferred Alternative selected for the Wood Hollow Training Area was surface and subsurface clearance to a specified depth of 2 feet below ground surface. Mr. Fitzmayer said that the maximum depth at which munitions were found at this site is 10 inches below ground surface. Munitions debris, which does not present an explosive risk, was found at a maximum depth of 15 inches below ground surface at the site. As such, the specified depth of 2 feet below ground surface for subsurface clearance encompasses the interval over which munitions and munitions debris are expected at the Wood Hollow Training Area.

Details of the Preferred Alternative for the Wood Hollow Training Area shown on slide 12 were discussed. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that during the subsurface clearance only anomalies that provide a geophysical signature above a set threshold will be dug up. This will eliminate the need to dig up items that are too small to be munitions. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the Preferred Alternative for this site includes an educational awareness program. This program would include presenting munitions safety information to schools, homeowners associations, and the Staker-Parson Company that is mining land adjacent to the site.

Mr. Michael McKinley, the Alternate for Herriman Community, asked what would be done if an item is found below the specified subsurface clearance depth of 2 feet below ground surface. Mr. Price explained that the clearance crew would dig deeper in such instances until bedrock was encountered or until there were no additional anomalies.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a table on slide 13 showing a summary of the evaluation criteria for the remedial alternatives developed for the Wood Hollow Training Area. He explained that the Preferred Alternative consisting of surface and subsurface clearance to specified depth is expected to meet all nine of the evaluation criteria. He pointed out that the No Action alternative for this site does not meet all of the evaluation criteria, but is required as a baseline for comparison with other alternatives. Mr. Dave Harris pointed out that the first two evaluation criteria are threshold criteria, and if these two criteria are not met, an alternative cannot be implemented.

Mr. Fitzmayer noted that the surface and subsurface clearance activities that would be implemented under the Preferred Alternative were successfully conducted during the Time Critical Removal Action that took place in the winter of 2011. He outlined the advantages of the Preferred Alternative as shown on slide 14.

Mr. Fitzmayer discussed three features of the AIABZ shown on slide 15 that influenced which remedial alternatives were developed for the site. He said that three remedial alternatives were originally developed for this site per the details shown on slide 16. He explained that the Preferred Alternative selected for the AIABZ is full surface clearance.

Details of the Preferred Alternative for the AIABZ shown on slide 17 were discussed. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the Preferred Alternative for this site includes an educational awareness program. He also noted that new Right-of-Entry agreements would need to be obtained from landowners prior to surface clearance. Mr. Fitzmayer said that if a landowner does not grant Right-of-Entry to their property for surface clearance, a non-binding deed notice may be placed on the property warning current and future landowners of the potential for munitions on this

uncleared land. He explained that possible implications of a deed notice may provide an incentive for landowners to sign Right-of-Entry agreements.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that feedback was solicited from residents living in the area of the AIABZ during the early stages of the Feasibility Study. Several comments were received from residents, which were taken into consideration during development of remedial alternatives. Many residents indicated that brush removal was not desired. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the need for brush removal was reevaluated based on this feedback. Per slide 18, brush removal is no longer necessary for surface clearance at this site based on this reevaluation.

Mr. McKinley asked how crews would survey through the brush without cutting it down. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that crews would have to conduct their surveys much more slowly than usual and would follow a very stringent quality control process to ensure the areas where brush is present are surveyed adequately.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a table on slide 19, showing a summary of the evaluation criteria for the remedial alternatives analyzed in detail for the AIABZ. He explained that the Preferred Alternative consisting of full surface clearance is expected to meet all nine of the evaluation criteria. He pointed out that the No Action alternative for this site does not meet all of the evaluation criteria, but is required as a baseline for comparison with other alternatives.

Mr. Fitzmayer noted that the surface clearance activities that would be implemented under the Preferred Alternative were successfully conducted during the Time Critical Removal Action that took place in the winter of 2011. He outlined the advantages of this Preferred Alternative as shown on slide 20.

Mr. Harris asked how the crews will deal with a munitions item that needs to be blown in place. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that during the Remedial Investigation, an exclusion zone was established based on a munition-specific fragmentation distance prior to the excavation or demolition of such items. After advance notice and coordination, residents living within the exclusion zone were required to evacuate the area for a few hours while excavation and/or demolition of munitions occurred. Mr. Fitzmayer said that work plans for the Remedial Action will include specific procedures for excavation and demolition of munitions that are expected to be similar to the procedures used during the Remedial Investigation.

Following the public comment period for the Proposed Plans, a Decision Document will be prepared for each site presenting the Record of Decision. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the Record of Decision for each site will outline the Utah National Guard's (UTNG) final decision regarding future cleanup actions, per Slide 21. He said that a responsiveness summary providing a written response to comments received on the Proposed Plan during the public comment period will be included in each Decision Document.

Mr. Fitzmayer summarized activities that will occur after the Record of Decision is complete, as shown on slide 22. An overview of the upcoming project schedule was shown on slide 23. Mr. Fitzmayer reminded RAB members that a public meeting to present the Proposed Plans will be held April 18, 2013 and encouraged them to attend.

Agenda Item #6 - Feedback and Discussion of Proposed Plans

Mr. McKinley asked if a final report will be prepared after the Remedial Action. Mr. Fitzmayer said that an After Action Report will be prepared following the Remedial Action. Mr. John Waldrip asked if the Remedial Action will be complete at the sites within a year. Mr. Price explained that the contract may allow 24 months to complete the Remedial Action. Mr. McKinley asked if the Remedial Action at the two sites will be completed simultaneously. Mr. Price explained that the work will be done simultaneously.

Mr. Howell asked if the contractor performing the Remedial Action is responsible for contacting landowners for Right-of-Entry. Mr. Price explained that the US Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for writing the official request for Right-of-Entry, but that collecting the signed Right-of-Entry agreements is a combined effort by the contractor, UTNG, and state regulators.

Mr. Howell asked if landowners are asking for compensation from the UTNG because of the Right-of-Entry requests. Mr. Price explained that one resident filed a claim to the UTNG based on Right-of-Entry, and the claim is still in litigation. He said the property in question is not located within the area that will be addressed during the Remedial Action. No other claims have been filed based on the requests for Right-of-Entry.

Mr. McKinley asked if there will be major surface disturbance during the Remedial Action. Mr. Price explained that there will be brush removal at the Wood Hollow Training Area, but there will not be surface disturbance at the AIABZ. Mr Price explained that landowners in the Wood Hollow Training Area have indicated plans for the area to be used for residential development in the future, so the disturbed areas will be graded to prepare the land for development after the Remedial Action is complete.

Agenda Item #7 - Public Comment Opportunity

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

Agenda Item #8 - Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Presentation Slides – Project Update
3. Map – Items Found to Date at Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone Munitions Response Site
4. Map – Items Found to Date at Wood Hollow Training Area Munitions Response Site
5. Presentation Slides – Overview of Proposed Plans