

These minutes were approved as written November 16, 2011

Utah National Guard

Restoration Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

Sept. 28, 2011

Members Present:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Dave Allison	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	dallison@campwilliamsrab.org
Richard Brown	Hi-Country Estates II	rbrown@campwilliamsrab.org
Kim Harriz	Army National Guard Directorate	kim.harriz@us.army.mil
Jerry Iacopini	Army Corp of Engineers	jerry.c.iacopini@usace.army.mil
Jim McNulty	City of Saratoga Springs	jmcnulty@campwilliamsrab.org
Robert Price	Utah National Guard	rprice@campwilliamsrab.org
Sandra Steele	Saratoga Springs Community	ssteele@campwilliamsrab.org
Michael Storck	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	mstorck@campwilliamsrab.org
John Waldrip	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	jwaldrip@campwilliamsrab.org
Tom Williams	Hi-Country Estates II	twilliams@campwilliamsrab.org
Facilitator:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Michele Straube	CommUnity Resolution Inc.	mstraube@campwilliamsrab.org
Members Absent:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Dave Bennett	Utah County	dbennett@campwilliamsrab.org
Mike Dalley	Staker Parson Companies	mdalley@campwilliamsrab.org
Boyd Dansie	Unincorporated Salt Lake County	bdansie@campwilliamsrab.org
Marlon Jones	Bluffdale City	mjones@campwilliamsrab.org
Lynn Jorgenson	Lynn Jorgenson	ljorgenson@campwilliamsrab.org
Steve Mumford	Eagle Mountain City	smumford@campwilliamsrab.org
Patrick Osmond	Herriman Community	posmond@campwilliamsrab.org
Gaylord Scott	Salt Lake County	gscott@campwilliamsrab.org
Heather Upshaw	Herriman City	hupshaw@campwilliamsrab.org
Other Attendees:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Kathleen Anthony	PIKA	kanthony@pikainc.com
Jeff Fitzmayer	Parsons	jeffrey.fitzmayer@parsons.com
Amy Phelan	Parsons	amy.phelan@parsons.com
Melissa Porter	Concordia Communications	mporter@campwilliamsrab.org
Caitlin Wall	Concordia Communications	caitlin.wall.ctr@hill.af.mil

Handouts Distributed at Meeting:

Handouts:

Site map, Action item list, and updated RAB member contact sheet

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. He introduced Michael Storck from the Utah Department of

Environmental Quality (UDEQ), who replaced Rik Ombach on the RAB. 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 all action items are complete.

Training

Ms. Straube explained the RAB will have an opportunity to observe a Live Fire Exercise on either November 4th at 12:00 p.m. or November 5th at 9:00 a.m.

New UDEQ Regulator

Ms. Straube explained that Mr. Michael Storck has replaced Rik Ombach on the RAB.

RAB Community Co-Chair

Ms. Straube asked the RAB if they had any nominations for the open co-chair position. Mr. Jim McNulty nominated Sandra Steele for the position and she accepted the nomination. No other nominations were received. Ms. Straube explained that because a quorum of RAB members was not present at the meeting, appointment of Ms. Steele as the community co-chair, will take place with a vote by email.

Moving the Repository

Ms. Straube explained that a repository for the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) - is currently located at the Riverton library, and holds physical copies of all project-related documents. She explained that the Utah National Guard (UTNG) has recommended No Further Action at the three Utah County MMRP sites. If regulators concur with those recommendations, there will no longer be MMRP sites in Utah County. Ms. Straube explained that the project team feels relocating the repository to the Herriman library will be more convenient to community members who will still be impacted by the MMRP. Ms. Straube asked the RAB if this change was acceptable and all agreed.

Agenda Item #3 Project Update (Attachment 3)

Mr. Price explained that the writing and review of the Remedial Investigation reports are still ongoing. The Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) for the Wood Hollow Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone has been contracted with PIKA, and will commence this fall. Mr. Price introduced Kathleen Anthony, PIKA, and explained that she would provide a detailed presentation on the TCRA later in the meeting.

Mr. Price pointed out a map on slide 3 and explained the map shows the current boundaries of the Munitions Response Sites (MRS) as well as two proposed boundary changes. Mr. Price said that the boundary changes, proposed in the Remedial Investigation reports for the Wood Hollow Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone, still need to be reviewed by UDEQ.

Mr. Price outlined the status of the Remedial Investigation for the Southeast Simulated Attack Area MRS on slide 5. He explained that UDEQ has concurred with the recommendation for No Further Action at this site. The next step for this site will be the drafting of a Decision Document.

Mr. Price explained that expended small-arms munitions and artillery fragments were found at the Southwest Area MRS during the Remedial Investigation field work. Mr. Price stated that the artillery fragments are likely from a 155mm projectile that detonated on Camp Williams northwest of the Southwest Area MRS. He said that they don't believe the artillery fragments are from a projectile landing off-post. The UTNG is seeking concurrence from UDEQ for a No Further Action resolution for this site.

During the Remedial Investigation fieldwork, nine artillery firing points were identified at the Southeast Area MRS based on visible ground disturbance features and the presence of Munitions Debris (MD) and/or range-related debris. Mr. Price pointed out slide 8, which shows a re-creation of a suspected artillery firing point. Expended percussion primers associated with the firing of 155mm and 8-inch artillery rounds were discovered during the Remedial Investigation. Mr. Price explained the potential hazards of percussion primers and pointed out a cross-section of the two types of primers found at the site on slide 10. Mr. Price explained that the primers did not have projectile tips and no live primers were discovered. After careful deliberation about the potential hazards of the primers, the UTNG has recommended, and is seeking concurrence from UDEQ regulators for a No Further Action resolution at this site.

Mr. Price pointed out a map of the Rose Canyon Training Area and Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone MRSs on slide 12. He explained that MD and Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) were concentrated near the installation boundary. The MEC were discovered during various stages of the project, with one being discovered during the September 2010 wildfire. The source of MEC/MD has not been identified, but is likely the result of overshooting, ricocheting, or skipping of artillery projectiles intended for the nearby Camp Williams Artillery Impact Area. Mr. Price pointed out a proposed new boundary for the Rose Canyon Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone MRSs on slide 13. The new boundary was created using a density contour map, which is based on the location of MEC and MD items that were found during the Remedial Investigation fieldwork.

Slide 14 shows a map of the proposed new boundary for the Wood Hollow Training Area MRS, which will increase the acreage of the site from 78 to 241 acres. The irregular shape of the proposed boundary is based on surface area that has been mined. Mr. Price pointed out a target and impact area near the Wood Hollow Training Area in the photo found on slide 15.

Mr. Price explained that PIKA will complete a clearance at the Wood Hollow Training Area MRS in areas where a mining access road is being built by Staker-Parson Companies. Mr. Price pointed out photographs of the site on slide 17 and explained where the mining access road will cut through the MRS.

Mr. Price pointed out the areas at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone MRS that will have a 100 percent surface sweep completed by PIKA. The UTNG is seeking Right-of-Entry (ROE) agreements for approximately 30 parcels of land and has received access to half of those parcels. Mr. Price discussed some alternative ways to obtain the ROEs. Mr. Tom Williams and Mr. Richard Brown said they would be happy to help the UTNG contact property owners about the ROEs. Mr. Dave Allison said that UDEQ would be willing to send a letter to property owners if needed.

Mr. Williams asked if roads will be closed while PIKA completes the surface sweep. Mr. Jeff Fitzmayer said the road was closed during intrusive investigations and may be closed during the Time Critical Removal Action

(TCRA). Slide 19 shows the rocky terrain of the wildfire-impacted area at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone MRS. Mr. Price explained vegetation is growing again.

Agenda Item #4 Time Critical Removal Action (Attachment 4)

Ms. Kathleen Anthony provided background on the MMRP on slide 3 and outlined the objectives for the TCRA on slides 4 and 5. Ms. Anthony explained they will follow several different regulations during the TCRA project. The work approach for the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone MRS is outlined on slide 6. Ms. Anthony explained how the area will be investigated with Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) teams. The work approach for the Wood Hollow Training Area MRS is outlined on slides 7 and 8. Ms. Anthony explained that they will go back and intrusively investigate, or dig up, any subsurface anomalies that are discovered. Ms. Anthony explained that crews will begin work at the Wood Hollow Training Area and will then move to the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone, with some of the work being done concurrently.

Ms. Anthony outlined the equipment that will be used to investigate the sites and explained how crews will collect data. The sites will be investigated in 100-foot by 100-foot grids to help organize the data. Ms. Anthony outlined the Quality Control (QC) process on slide 11 and explained that a QC specialist will ensure that the investigation is conducted thoroughly and accurately.

Slide 12 outlines the Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) equipment that will be used. Ms. Anthony explained that the DGM equipment takes readings while crews walk the site and said that data will be tied to GPS points. Ms. Anthony outlined the data processing on slide 13 and explained that maps for each 100-foot by 100-foot grid will be included in the final report.

The DGM equipment will be tested every day to ensure the equipment can accurately detect items. Methods used to test the DGM equipment are outlined on slide 14. Ms. Anthony outlined the plan for demolition of MEC items on slide 15 and explained that the explosives required for the detonation will be brought in as needed. Crews will not have explosives with them at all times.

Ms. Anthony explained they will provide detailed information for the MEC items discovered. Ms. Kim Hartz asked if detailed information about MD items would be provided. Ms. Anthony explained that MD will also be documented and will be entered in the log book. The procedure for disposal of discovered MD is outlined on slide 17. Ms. Anthony explained MD will be taken to a smelter for disposal. Safety will be overseen by the UXO safety officer and operations will be conducted in accordance with all safety regulations.

Ms. Anthony outlined the reporting process on slide 19 and asked for any questions. Mr. Williams asked when the TCRA would begin. Ms. Anthony said it would depend on the approval process, but said they are hoping to be in the field this fall. Mr. Williams asked that he be informed when work begins so he can let residents know. Ms. Anthony said they would keep him informed. Mr. Williams said he would put information in the Hi-County Estates II newsletter and on the Web site to let residents know about the project. He also invited the project team to present at an upcoming board meeting. Mr. Price said he could send Mr. Williams an article for their newsletter and will discuss having a presentation made at one of their board meetings. Mr. John Waldrip, UDEQ, asked if the TCRA will be completed this fall. Ms. Anthony said they hope to complete the TCRA this fall, but may have to finish in the spring, depending on the weather.

Agenda Item #5 Break

RAB members were able to break into small groups to ask questions about the status of the MMRP investigation.

Agenda Item # 6 MRSP Scoring (Attachment 5)

Ms. Harriz explained that the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSP) came from a statute that had two requirements. The first requirement was to create an inventory of sites that were known or suspected to contain UXO, Discarded Military Munitions, or Munitions Constituents. The second requirement was to create a protocol, the MRSP, for prioritizing the sites. The MRSP was designed based on actual site conditions, potential hazards, and risk.

Ms. Harriz pointed out the three modules used to evaluate the unique characteristics of each potential hazard; the Explosive Hazard Evaluation, the Chemical Warfare Materiel (CWM) Hazard Evaluation, and the Health Hazard Evaluation. Mr. Williams asked if smoke grenades would be addressed in the MRSP. Ms. Harriz said smoke grenades would be addressed in the MRSP.

The three modules are used to create a number, which indicates the MRS priority for each individual site. The MRS priority will be used in instances where there is not enough funding to address all sites. If this happens, sites with the highest MRSP scoring will be addressed first. The MRSP is based on a priority scale of one to eight with priority one indicating the highest potential munitions hazard and priority eight indicating the lowest potential munitions hazard.

Ms. Harriz pointed out slide 5, which shows table 10 from the MRSP scoring packet (**MRSP scoring packet included as attachment 6**). She explained tables one through nine are used to generate the Explosive Hazard Evaluation, and then scores are tallied up on table 10 to produce the final Explosive Hazard Evaluation module rating. Tables 11 through 19 are used to generate the CWM Hazard Evaluation, and then the scores are tallied up on table 20 to produce the final CWM Hazard Evaluation module rating. Tables 21 through 27 are used to generate the Health Hazard Evaluation, and then the scores are tallied up on table 28 to produce the final Health Hazard Evaluation module rating.

The scores from tables 10, 20, and 28 are then used to complete table 29, which is used to determine the MRS's priority. The module with the highest score is used as the MRSP scoring for the site. Mr. Price asked if nuclear or biological munitions are addressed by the MRSP. Ms. Harriz explained that they are not considered military munitions and are not addressed by the MRSP.

Ms. Harriz explained that the MRSP is important, especially with Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS), because those sites usually do not receive full funding at the beginning of a cleanup project. The MRSP ensures that the priorities and sequencing of response actions is based upon how hazardous the site is.

Ms. Harriz explained that she would walk RAB members through an example of MRSP scoring for the Wood Hollow Training Area. She encouraged RAB members to follow along and fill out the example MRSP packet provided to them.

When scoring tables for each individual module, the highest overall score, not a cumulative score is used. Mr. Williams asked why a cumulative score is not used. Ms. Harriz explained that the Department of Defense wanted to keep the scores simple, and using cumulative totals would make the scoring much more complicated. Also if scores were totaled, too much weight would be applied to those sites that have both a MEC and chemical contaminant issue, and decrease the priority of sites with an Explosive Hazard only.

Ms. Harriz went through all of the tables with RAB members and showed them how the MRSPP score for the Wood Hollow Training Area was reached. In regards to chemical weapons, Ms. Harriz explained that when a site does not have known or suspected CWM, the CWM Hazard Evaluation Module can be marked as “no known or suspected” and forgoes a scoring for that module. No CWM was found at the Wood Hollow Training Area; therefore, the alternate score of “no known or suspected hazard” was applied. Ms. Harriz explained that a risk assessment was completed for the Wood Hollow Training Area. Based on the results of the human health and ecological risk assessments, there are no unacceptable risks to receptors at this MRS. Therefore, the results from the risk assessment over-ride the scoring for the Health Hazard Evaluation module and the alternate score of “no known or suspected hazard” was applied. Since the alternate score of “no known or suspected,” was applied for both the CWM Hazard Evaluation Module and the Health Hazard Evaluation Module, the overall MRSPP score relied on the Explosive Hazard Evaluation Module.

Ms. Harriz explained that the MRSPP score for the Wood Hollow Training Area was a three. She said that ones, twos, and threes are the highest priority and explained that sites scoring a one or two are not very common. Mr. Williams asked how many MMRP sites there are and which ones are the worst. Ms. Harriz explained there are thousands of MMRP sites across the country and said that the Camp Williams MMRP sites have a low density of munitions when compared to other sites across the country.

Ms. Harriz explained that the scoring is independent of the number of MEC items at a site; rather it is primarily influenced by the type of MEC items that are found and were used during training. She said that the MRSPP scoring can change with new information. She explained that if PIKA were to find new information during the TCRA, the MRSPP score for the Wood Hollow Training Area could change.

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 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Action items
3. Presentation Slides – Project Update
4. Presentation Slides – Time Critical Removal Action
5. Presentation Slides –MRSPP Scoring
6. MRSPP scoring packet