

Utah National Guard

Restoration Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

April 16, 2014 – 7:00 PM

Members Present: Organization:

Richard Brown	Hi-Country Estates II Community
Walter Gee	National Guard Bureau
Jory Howell	Herriman City - Alternate
Alan Paxton	Herriman Community
Robert Price	Utah National Guard
Michael Storck	Utah Department of Environmental Quality
John Waldrip	Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Tom Williams	Hi-Country Estates II HOA

E-Mail:

rbrown@campwilliamsrab.org
wgee@campwilliamsrab.org
jhowell@herriman.org
apaxton@campwilliamsrab.org
rprice@campwilliamsrab.org
mstorck@campwilliamsrab.org
jwaldrip@campwilliamsrab.org
twilliams@campwilliamsrab.org

Members Absent: Organization:

Boyd Dansie	Unincorporated Salt Lake County
Marlon Jones	Bluffdale Community
Noell Nelson	Bluffdale City
Gaylord Scott	Salt Lake County
Heather Upshaw	Herriman City

E-Mail:

bdansie@campwilliamsrab.org
mjones@campwilliamsrab.org
nnelson@campwilliamsrab.org
gscott@campwilliamsrab.org
hupshaw@campwilliamsrab.org

Other Attendees: Organization:

Jeff Fitzmayer	Parsons
Dave Harris	Concordia Communications
Amy Phelan	Parsons
Melissa Porter	Concordia Communications
Dave Allison	Utah Department of Environmental Quality (Alternate)
LTC Steven Fairbourn	Utah National Guard Public Affairs

E-Mail:

jeffrey.fitzmayer@parsons.com
dharris@concordiacommunications.com
Amy.phelan@parsons.com
mporter@concordiacommunications.com
dallison@utah.gov
steven.a.fairbourn.mil@mail.mil

Agenda Item #1 Public Open House

Preceding the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting, the Utah National Guard (UTNG) hosted a public Open House to discuss the upcoming Remedial Action and associated fieldwork. Representatives from the UTNG and Parsons were available to answer questions. The Open House information packet is attached (**Attachment 1**).

Open House attendees were as follows: Alan Paxton, Victor Chavez, Kerry Judd, Jeff Bernson, and Ren Egbert.

Agenda Item #2 Welcome

RAB installation co-chair, Robert Price, opened the meeting, thanked everyone for their attendance, and welcomed all RAB members and community members. Meeting agenda is attached (**Attachment 2**).

Agenda Item #3 RAB Business

Mr. Price turned the time over to Mr. Dave Harris for RAB business.

Action Items

Mr. Dave Harris noted there are not any open action items.

Discussion of New Community Co-Chair

Mr. Harris explained a new community co-chair needs to be appointed. He recommended the appointment of the community co-chair take place via email. RAB members agreed to this recommendation. Nominations for the community co-chair position will also be accepted via email.

Agenda Item #4 Project Update (Attachment 3)

Mr. Price outlined the agenda for his presentation on slide 2. He explained that President Woodrow Wilson formally established Camp Williams via executive order in 1914. The map on slide 3 shows the Camp Williams installation as it was in 1914, which encompassed almost 19,000 acres. Mr. Price explained the 1914 installation boundary map was used during the Historical Records Review to establish Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) site boundaries, especially for the Rose Canyon Training Area.

Mr. Price said that the next significant event that impacted the MMRP was the Camp Williams Land Exchange Act (CWLEA) signed into law in 1990. Prior to this land exchange, there were privately held lands inside the installation boundary. As shown on slide 4, the CWLEA turned those lands over to the Department of Defense, and in exchange, the Department of Defense gave land outside the installation boundary to various landowners.

Mr. Price outlined the Camp Williams MMRP history on slide 5. He explained the MMRP follows a cleanup process similar to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process, and said that the investigation must be done sequentially. He pointed out a map on slide 6 showing the sites previously included in the MMRP. Four of the six MMRP sites require No Action, and two sites, the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone (AIABZ) and the Wood Hollow Training Area, require Remedial Action and will be discussed in more detail.

Mr. Price explained that the boundary for the AIABZ was based on historical range maps. Mr. Price pointed out a map on slide 7 and noted that the lines represent transects that have been walked with geophysical equipment, which provided information used to characterize the site. The red lines show where surface and subsurface investigations have been completed previously, and yellow lines show where surface investigations have been completed.

Mr. Price pointed out a map on slide 8, which shows items found to date at the AIABZ. He said with the exception of one 8-inch artillery round, everything found at this site has been safe to move. He pointed out the site boundary and explained that the site boundary will be adjusted if items are found on the edge of the site boundary or outside of the current boundary.

Mr. Price outlined the investigation history for the Wood Hollow Training Area on slide 9 and explained that the site boundary has been modified during the MMRP as new data have been collected. He said this site is believed to have been an impact area. He explained that surface and subsurface artillery rounds have been found at this site. He pointed out a map on slide 10, which outlines items that have been found at this site.

Mr. Price explained that part of the Wood Hollow Training Area contains an active sand and gravel mining operation. He said there was a removal action in 2011 to assist the mine in developing a haul road. He explained that Parsons will complete a 100 percent clearance of identified MEC to a depth of two feet over approximately 200 acres. This will enable the land to be used for mining activities and future development.

Mr. Price outlined the MMRP project team on slide 11. He explained that since the last RAB meeting (February 2013), the Proposed Plan and Decision Documents for the project have been completed, and Parsons has been contracted to complete the Remedial Action phase of the project.

Mr. Price outlined the status of Right of Entry (ROE) agreements on slide 12. The UTNG has obtained 100 percent of ROE agreements for the Wood Hollow Training Area. He said the UTNG would like to obtain 100 percent of ROE agreements for the AIABZ and will continue to work on getting those agreements over the next month.

Mr. Price pointed out conditions of the ROE agreements on slide 13. He explained that the UTNG will complete a 100 percent surface clearance of MEC identified over approximately 634 acres of uncleared land in the AIABZ, and noted that all landowners need to participate in order to apply the remedial action over the entire site. He said that the UTNG has discussed the possibility of putting notices on property deeds for landowners who do not participate in the Remedial Action. Upon completion of the Remedial Action, the UTNG will provide a written record to landowners who have had their property cleared during the Remedial Action. Mr. Michael Storck said it is important to provide landowners with that documentation, especially if landowners sell their property in the future.

Agenda Item #5 Remedial Action Field Activities (Attachment 4)

Ms. Phelan outlined her presentation on slide 2 and explained she will focus on the day-to-day activities for the Remedial Action fieldwork. She pointed out a map of the AIABZ on slide 3 and said the fieldwork will focus on a surface clearance of approximately 634 acres of land. The surface clearance will be conducted in 100-foot by 100-foot grids shown on slide 4, which will be staked out by professionally licensed surveyors.

Ms. Phelan explained that dense oak brush shown on slide 5 is present at approximately half of the AIABZ. Homeowners have requested there be no brush removal. To avoid brush removal, field operations are beginning this spring before the vegetation has leafed out.

Ms. Phelan outlined the surface clearance operations on slide 6. She explained the Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) teams will be conducting a visual survey of the ground and will be assisted with the survey by a Schonstedt metal detector. The Schonstedt will detect metal objects on the ground surface and the UXO crew will stop and determine what the metal object is.

Ms. Phelan explained that three large UXO teams will work concurrently, but in different locations at the AIABZ. She pointed out a graphic slide 7 that shows how the UXO teams will sweep each grid. She said 20 UXO technicians will walk in a sweep line, with the technicians about three to five feet apart, holding Schonstedts. Technicians will be visually inspecting the surface looking to the right, left, and in front of them. The first and last technicians in the sweep line will carry GPS units to track the path.

Ms. Phelan explained the last person in the sweep line will drop flags to mark the path they have walked. When the sweep line reaches the end of the grid, the entire sweep line will pivot around the last person in line so they are facing the opposite direction and will begin sweeping the adjacent grid. The last person in the previous grid becomes the first person in the adjacent grid and will pick up the flags that were just dropped. She said the reason for this is to prevent any gaps in between the grids. This will ensure a 100 percent surface clearance is performed. Two personnel will walk behind the sweep line to ensure that technique and pace of personnel in the sweep line are correct. They will also halt the sweep line if something is found.

Ms. Phelan emphasized the importance of quality control during the fieldwork. She outlined quality control procedures on slide 8 and said each grid will have a quality control check by a UXO quality control technician, as well as an on-site government representative, before the grid is considered complete. Ms. Phelan pointed out ways landowners may be impacted by the fieldwork on slide 9. Mr. Tom Williams recommended that the UTNG post a notice in the Hi-Country Estates II common room letting residents know about the fieldwork. Ms. Phelan said they will provide something to let residents know about the fieldwork.

Ms. Phelan pointed out a map on slide 10, which shows the two residential areas in the AIABZ. She said that all field activities within the residential areas will be conducted at the end of the fieldwork schedule to minimize disruption to homeowners. She said homeowners will receive advanced communication and ongoing communication throughout the fieldwork.

Mr. Williams asked if there is a medical plan in place if someone were to get hurt. Ms. Phelan said there is a plan in place. Mr. Price said there is a new urgent care medical facility in Herriman that is the closest medical facility to the site.

Ms. Phelan pointed out a map on slide 11 showing the boundary for the Wood Hollow Training Area. She explained that a surface and subsurface clearance of Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) to a depth of two feet will be completed at this site. She said that MEC has been found previously on the ground surface and in the shallow subsurface. Ms. Phelan pointed out slide 12, showing the 100-foot by 100-foot grids that will be surveyed during the fieldwork.

Ms. Phelan said that 29 acres of brush will be removed at the Wood Hollow Training Area. Brush will be cut to leave approximately six inches of the main stem remaining above the ground surface, as shown on slide 13. She said this will protect the crew and equipment from potential MEC and will help with re-growth of the vegetation.

Ms. Phelan explained that Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) will be utilized to conduct the surface and subsurface investigations at the Wood Hollow Training Area. She pointed out a graphic on slide 14 and said the DGM operator will use a hand-held F3 electromagnetic sensor to walk the 100-foot grids with two feet of line spacing. She said a hand-held F3 electromagnetic sensor will be safer for the DGM operators to use because it will move more easily through the rocky, rugged terrain at the Wood Hollow Training Area. A UXO escort will walk in front of the DGM operator to identify surface MEC.

Ms. Phelan pointed out slide 15 and explained that surface clutter of military-related items may interfere with the DGM surveys and will be removed from approximately 20 acres of land before the DGM surveys begin. She said the surface clearance will be conducted by three UXO technicians who will use hand-held metal detectors.

Ms. Phelan pointed out an example anomaly map on slide 16, which is produced from the DGM data. She said that the green on the map represents background conditions and the pink/red areas on the map represent anomalies, or potential munitions/metal objects. Anomalies that represent munitions will be intrusively investigated, or dug up.

Ms. Phelan outlined the intrusive investigation procedures on slide 17. She said 10 percent of anomaly locations where an item is removed will be checked with a hand-held F3 electromagnetic sensor for quality control. She said that 100 percent of anomaly locations where nothing is removed will be checked with a hand-held F3 electromagnetic sensor to confirm there is no response.

Ms. Phelan outlined the operations for analog, or “mag and dig” surveys on slide 18. This survey method will be used in areas where terrain is more hazardous or where the DGM method is unsuitable. Quality control methods are outlined on slide 19. Ms. Phelan explained they will bury simulated items, or “seed items” in the 100-foot grids to ensure the DGM equipment identifies those seed items and they are dug up. This ensures the equipment is working correctly and UXO technicians are properly investigating the site. The fieldwork schedule is outlined on slide 20.

Agenda Item #6 Munitions Removal Procedures (Attachment 5)

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the agenda for his presentation on slide 2. He pointed out pictures of MEC items found at the AIABZ and the Wood Hollow Training Area on slide 3. He explained that MEC items can look different, but are essentially military-related items that pose an explosive hazard. Unexploded ordnance, or UXO, refers to rounds that were fired but did not function as intended.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out pictures of Munitions Debris (MD) on slide 4 and explained that MD refers to debris left over from munitions that functioned as designed, and does not usually pose an explosive hazard. He said the presence of MD indicates an area was used for military training. MD must be inspected and certified to be free of explosive hazards. Mr. Fitzmayer said the Remedial Action will focus on removing MEC and MD.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out slide 5 and explained that Range Related Debris (RRD) and civilian debris may also be present at the AIABZ and Wood Hollow Training Area. He explained that RRD is military debris not associated with munitions, and will be removed. Civilian debris refers to non-military debris such as horseshoes or cans. Mr. Fitzmayer said civilian debris will be removed from the Wood Hollow Training Area but will not be removed from the AIABZ.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the disposal methods for MEC, MD, and RRD on slide 6. He said the safest way to dispose of MEC items is to detonate them. He explained MEC items will either be blown-in-place or will be moved to a safer location to be detonated. Munitions debris will be brought to a central location to be inspected and certified safe. The certification and inspection process is well documented and follows regulation processes. If during the inspection, MD is found to be potentially explosive, the MD will be treated as MEC and will be detonated. Once the MD is certified as safe and non-explosive, it will be taken to a scrap metal dealer or smelter and destroyed.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the process for disposing of MEC found in the AIABZ on slide 7. He said that because of the residential community in this area, there is no plan to blow MEC in place unless items are unsafe to be moved to Camp Williams for disposal. Mr. Fitzmayer explained if MEC needs to be blown-in-place, the detonation will take place under controlled conditions. He pointed out slide 8, showing a list of stakeholders that will be notified if a MEC item needs to be blown in place.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the implications of a blow-in-place scenario for the community and residents of Hi-Country Estates II on slide 9. He explained that Minimum Safe Distances (MSDs) will be established when MEC is discovered and said MSDs create safety exclusion zones. The MSDs will vary depending on whether MEC items can be safely moved to Camp Williams, or if those items need to be blown-in-place. Minimum safe distances for items that need to be blown-in-place are based on the maximum fragmentation distance of MEC items. Mr. Fitzmayer said MSD procedures and evacuation procedures are outlined in the Remedial Action Work Plan.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained there could be potential for home evacuations if a MEC item needs to be blown-in-place. He pointed out the potential MSDs for 8-inch and 155mm projectiles on slide 10. He said engineering controls are not used with larger rounds like the 8-inch and 155mm projectiles so MSDs for these MEC items will be very large. If homes have to be evacuated, the evacuation could last several hours, or overnight. Mr. Fitzmayer said every situation is different.

Mr. John Waldrip asked if the MSD will change if there is MEC at multiple locations. Mr. Price said he does not believe it will be an issue at the AIABZ because they will be addressing one MEC item at a time. He said that for the Wood Hollow Training Area, the MSD could change if multiple MEC items are detonated together. Mr. Fitzmayer said that the MSD is based on the explosive net weight, so that could increase the MSD if multiple items are detonated together.

Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 11, which shows the potential MSD if a MEC item were found near the residential area in the AIABZ. The smaller rings represent the hazardous fragmentation distance, which will be enforced as a safety exclusion zone when a MEC item is being investigated. The larger rings represent the MSD, which would be enforced if a MEC item needed to be blown-in place. He said the exclusion zones center around the location of the MEC item.

Mr. Fitzmayer said animals/pets, home security, work and school schedules, and disturbance of ground and landscaping will be considered if an evacuation is necessary. He explained they will communicate and coordinate with residents. Mr. Fitzmayer said in lieu of an overnight evacuation, they may be able to have a security guard positioned to guard the MEC item overnight, so the evacuation could take place during the day.

Mr. Jory Howell asked if the UTNG will provide relocation for homeowners and animals in the event of an evacuation. Mr. Price said the UTNG is looking into some solutions. He explained that there is housing at Camp Williams that could be made available for \$25 a night. He said they are looking at other alternatives and response techniques involving military Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) teams and other technology to respond to the MEC items. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that military EOD teams could attempt to render a MEC item safe to move, which will eliminate the need for a large-scale evacuation.

Mr. Williams said an EOD team responded to a MEC item in 2007, and tried to render the item safe, but had to blow the item in place. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the fuze on the round found in 2007 was too rusted, and the EOD team was unable to render the MEC item safe. Mr. Williams said the Hi-Country II homeowners association will develop a community response plan to help residents move animals. Mr. Fitzmayer said they will work closely with the homeowners association if any MEC items are found. Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the cleanup procedures after a MEC item has been blown-in-place on slide 12.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained there are no homes or buildings at the Wood Hollow Training Area MRS; however, there is an operating mine, with which Parsons and the UTNG will coordinate closely. The expected munitions at this site are small and medium caliber artillery, 37mm and 75mm projectiles. Examples of those munitions are shown on slide 13.

Mr. Fitzmayer said MEC discovered at the Wood Hollow Training Area can and will be detonated within the site. He outlined the disposal procedures on slide 14 and said engineering controls will be used at this site because the potential MEC items are smaller. Minimum safe distances will be enforced, but will be smaller than those at the AIABZ, due to both the size of the munitions and the engineering controls used. Slide 15 shows a map of the Wood Hollow Training Area. Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out the Staker Parson mining operation and Mountain View Corridor, both of which could be impacted if MEC is found at the site.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the three R's on slide 16 and encouraged community members to recognize items that could be munitions, retreat from the item, and report the item to local authorities.

Mr. Dave Allison said community members could get the impression that the sites have a high density of munitions because of the large size of UXO teams that will be conducting the Remedial Action. He said community members need to understand the reason for the large UXO teams, is to ensure that the sites are investigated thoroughly. Mr. Fitzmayer explained the reason for the large UXO teams is to ensure that 100 percent of the ground is visually inspected. Mr. Fitzmayer said that data from the Remedial Investigation suggest the MEC density for the AIABZ is about one round for every 25 acres of land. He said that during the Time-Critical Removal Action conducted at the AIABZ in 2011, the MEC density was also one round for every 25 acres. Mr. Fitzmayer said most MEC items found at the AIABZ have been concentrated near the installation boundary, and they do not expect to find a high density of munitions.

Mr. Alan Paxton asked if the fire departments will be notified when a MEC item needs to be blown-in-place. Mr. Fitzmayer said Parsons will notify and coordinate with the fire and police departments. He said they are aware of the wildfire potential when a MEC item is blown-in-place. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that a MEC item was found in September 2011, during a red-flag fire warning. He said the MEC item was guarded by security personnel for a number of days until the fire danger was lowered. He said when the round was detonated, the ground was watered down and a water truck was on hand.

Mr. Williams said he could put a paragraph in the Hi-Country II community newsletter announcing the Remedial Action fieldwork. Mr. Harris said a fact sheet will be mailed to all Hi-Country II residents as well.

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 Discussion of Agenda Items and Date for Next Meeting

Mr. Price asked RAB members when they will like to meet again. RAB members indicated they will like to meet when the fieldwork is complete. Mr. Price said they will tentatively plan the next RAB meeting in the fall of this year (2014).

Agenda Item #9 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Attachments:

1. Open House Information Packet
2. Meeting Agenda
3. Presentation Slides – Project Update
4. Presentation Slides – Remedial Action Field Activities
5. Presentation Slides – Munitions Removal Procedures