

These minutes were approved as written March 30, 2012

Utah National Guard

Restoration Advisory Board

Draft Meeting Minutes

Jan. 25, 2012

Members Present:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Dave Bennett	Utah County	dbennett@campwilliamsrab.org
Richard Brown	Hi-Country Estates II	rbrown@campwilliamsrab.org
Boyd Dansie	Unincorporated Salt Lake County	bdansie@campwilliamsrab.org
Kim Harriz	Army National Guard Directorate	kim.harriz@us.army.mil
Marlon Jones	Bluffdale Community	mjones@campwilliamsrab.org
Lynn Jorgenson	Lehi City	ljorgenson@campwilliamsrab.org
Noell Nelson	Bluffdale City	nnelson@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
Members Absent:	Organization:	E-Mail:
Ted Asch	US Geologic Survey	tasch@usgs.gov
Mike Dalley	Staker Parson Companies	mdalley@campwilliamsrab.org
Jerry Iacopini	US Army Corps of Engineers	jerry.c.iacopini@usace.army.mil
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
Dick Bell	Bluffdale Community – Alt	richardbell@comcast.net
Jeff Fitzmayer	Parsons	jeffrey.fitzmayer@parsons.com
Weldon and Robin Fox	Land owner	dharris@concordiacommunications.com
Dave Harris	Concordia Communications	
Alex Kostera	NAEVA Geophysics	
Melissa Porter		mporter@concordiacommunications.com
Ed Staes	Parsons	Ed.staes@parsons.com
LTC Tyler Smith	UTNG Installation Manager	
Travis Van Ekelenburg	Salt Lake County	

Handouts Distributed at Meeting:

Handouts:

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

Agenda Item #1. Welcome

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) community co-chair, Sandra Steele, opened the meeting, thanked everyone for their attendance, and welcomed all RAB members and community members. She explained she was recently appointed to the Saratoga Springs planning commission and asked if anyone felt that her position on the planning

commission would be a conflict of interest. No RAB members expressed having a problem with her recent appointment. She then turned the meeting over to Robert Price, the installation co-chair. Mr. Price asked Melissa Porter, the RAB coordinator, to discuss RAB business. Meeting agenda is attached (**Attachment 1**).

Agenda Item #2. RAB Business

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

Action Items

Ms. Porter noted that the current action item list was included in the packet (**Attachment 2**). She said all action items are complete.

RAB Community Member Terms of Office

Ms. Porter explained the terms of four RAB community members expire in February. Three of the four have elected to continue on the RAB. Voting for RAB members who wish to continue their terms will take place by email. Ms. Porter explained the Herriman community member, Patrick Osmond, decided not to continue serving on the RAB. Solicitation for a new Herriman community representative will take place soon.

Open House

Ms. Porter explained that a community open house will be held in April or May.

Site Visit

Ms. Porter explained that a request for a site visit was made. Several RAB members indicated interest in a site visit.

Agenda Item #3 Project Update (Attachment 3)

Mr. Price outlined the agenda for his presentation on slide 3 and explained that the Remedial Investigation reports have all been submitted to the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) for concurrence and should be completed soon. The Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) for the Wood Hollow Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone, which was contracted with PIKA, was completed in December 2011. Mr. Price introduced Kate Anthony, PIKA's project manager for the TCRA, and explained that she would provide a detailed presentation on the TCRA later in the meeting.

Mr. Price explained the map on slide 3 shows the current boundaries of the munitions response sites as well as proposed boundary changes for the Wood Hollow Training Area and the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone. Mr. Price said the Remedial Investigation Reports have been completed for the Southeast Simulated Attack area and the Southwest Area MRSs. UDEQ has concurred with UTNG's recommendation for No Further Action at the sites and Decision Documents will be drafted for both sites.

Mr. Price explained the UTNG has recommended, and is seeking concurrence from UDEQ regulators for a No Further Action resolution at the Southeast Area. He said they have also been working with the property owner, the Bureau of Land Management, and hope to have the Remedial Investigation report finalized soon.

The boundary revision for the Wood Hollow Training Area will increase the acreage of the site from 78 to 241 acres. Mr. Price explained the Remedial Investigation report is being finalized and the TCRA was completed December 2011.

Mr. Price explained the Rose Canyon Training Area and Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone are being combined into a single site, based on the results of the Remedial Investigation. New boundaries have been drawn based on the location of Munitions Debris (MD) and Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC). Mr. Price explained the Remedial Investigation report is being finalized and the TCRA was completed December 2011.

Mr. Price explained the UTNG will be sending letters to property owners informing them of the completion of the Remedial Investigation. He pointed out the information that will be included in the letters on slide 9. Mr. Price outlined the 2012 schedule on slide 12 and asked for any questions. Noell Nelson asked if the UTNG was involved in the re-vegetation of the burn area from the 2011 wildfire. Mr. Price explained that Herriman city coordinated the re-vegetation with another entity, but that the UTNG provided a recommended seed list.

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

Ms. Kate Anthony provided background on the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) on slide 2. She outlined the purpose of the Time-Critical Removal Action (TCRA) on slide 3. She explained that a surface removal was completed at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone and a subsurface removal was completed at the Wood Hollow Training Area.

Ms. Anthony pointed out a map of the area that was burned during the September 2010 wildfire at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone on slide 5, showing areas that were included in the surface clearance. The survey and grid installation began on October 28, 2011, to establish the site boundaries for the TCRA.

A map on slide 8 shows the burn areas, designated the west and east burn areas by the TCRA crew, in relation to the boundary of the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone. Ms. Anthony outlined the surface clearance that took place at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone on slides 9 and 10. She explained that seven-man teams walked side-by-side to cover the entire surface area in the burn areas.

When MEC items were found, they were guarded until they could be safely transported to Camp Williams for safe disposal. This was because the MEC items found at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone were too large to detonate on-site without impacting home owners. Ms. Anthony explained that some MEC items were carried one-half mile to Camp Williams property for disposal. Three MEC items were found in the west burn area and are shown on slide 12.

One MEC item was found near the east burn area, shown on slide 13. Ms. Anthony explained that this MEC item was found outside the burn area, but was seen by the crew as they were walking to the east burn area. The item was moved to Camp Williams for disposal.

Ms. Anthony outlined the items found during the surface clearance of the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone on slide 14. Ms. Kim Harritz explained that the intact MD items did not pose an explosive hazard, but because they look like items that could pose an explosive hazard, they were removed. She reminded the RAB that the UTNG encourages the 3 Rs, Recognize, Retreat, and Report. She explained that members of the public may have recognized the items as potential munitions and would have been encouraged to report finding them.

Ms. Anthony explained that the results of the TCRA support the conclusions of the Remedial Investigation. She said there was a low density of MEC items (four), and the items found were 155mm projectiles, which were the same type of items found during the Remedial Investigation.

The map on slide 16 shows the area of the Wood Hollow Training Area where Staker Parson Companies plan to install a road. Ms. Anthony explained that during the road construction, top soil will have to be excavated, which was the reason for the subsurface investigation at the Wood Hollow Training Area. Ms. Harriz explained that subsurface items have been found at the Wood Hollow Training Area previously, which is another reason for the subsurface investigation. She said subsurface items have not been found at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone.

Ms. Anthony outlined the tasks included in the Wood Hollow Training Area subsurface clearance on slide 18. She explained that Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) was completed covering an area of approximately 31 acres, and that anomalies, or potentially buried munitions, identified during the DGM were intrusively investigated, or dug up. Ms. Anthony explained that some of the areas had DGM completed on a Saturday to minimize interference with the Staker Parson mining operation and 4,815 anomalies were identified during the DGM.

Ms. Anthony explained that of the 4,815 anomalies that were intrusively investigated, 127 were designated as “No Finds,” meaning nothing metallic was found at the location. She explained “No Finds” were often an indicator of volcanic rock, commonly found in the hills near Camp Williams. Volcanic rock’s high metal content will often appear as metallic objects on the DGM survey. A map on slide 22 shows blue shaded areas where volcanic rock was picked up during the DGM survey.

Ms. Anthony outlined the items found at the Wood Hollow Training Area on slide 23. She said that the intact MD items looked like MEC and only a trained unexploded ordnance technician would know if the items were safe to pick up. The recovered MD was sent to a recycler. Slide 24 shows pictures of the six MEC items that were found, as well as their location. Ms. Anthony explained that most of the MEC items were found on the surface and one item was found about six inches below the surface.

Ms. Anthony explained debris items resulting from the demolition of MEC items were collected and sent to a recycler. Ms. Anthony explained that the results of the TCRA for the Wood Hollow Training Area support the conclusions of the Remedial Investigation. She said there was a low density of MEC items (six), and the items were found on or within six inches of the ground surface.

Ms. Anthony summarized the reason for the TCRA on slide 27. She explained they kept residents informed of the field activities and also worked closely with the Staker Parson mining operation. Mr. Alex Kostera of NAEVA Geophysics, the company that performed the DGM survey at the Wood Hollow Training Area, said that they took a very conservative approach to make sure they did not miss any potentially buried munitions.

LTC Tyler Smith asked what type of explosives were used to dispose of the rounds and if the explosives were detonated inside the rounds. Mr. Jeff Fitzmayer explained the process that is typically used to dispose of rounds. He said jet perforators; small explosive charge devices attached to the round, are initiated remotely and are used to detonate munitions. Once initiated, the jet perforators cause the explosives inside the munition to detonate. LTC Smith asked if the whole munition gets destroyed. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that yes, the process usually causes the round to go “high order.”

Ms. Anthony explained that explosives were successful in detonating the explosive components of rounds. Mr. Ed Staes asked if all of the MEC items found at the Artillery Impact Area Buffer Zone were found on the surface. Ms. Anthony explained that all MEC items were found on the surface.

Agenda Item #5 Break

RAB members were able to break into small groups to ask questions about the results of the TCRA.

Agenda Item # 6 Overview of Feasibility Studies (Attachment 5)

Ms. Harriz outlined the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA process on slide 2. She explained that the MMRP investigation follows the CERCLA process. The Remedial Investigation was recently completed and information from the Remedial Investigation will be used in the next phase of the project, the Feasibility Study.

The definition of a Feasibility Study is outlined on slide 3. Ms. Harriz explained that the Feasibility Study is used to evaluate different alternatives to remediate a site. There are two basic steps to a Feasibility Study. Ms. Harriz explained the first step is to develop and screen potential alternatives, outlined on slide 4. She said that reduction of hazards, in this case, munitions, is the primary goal of the selected alternative.

Mr. Boyd Dansie said he would encourage property owners in the Rose Canyon area to participate in the cleanup. He said that he had an experience with his property (unrelated to the current MMRP) where institutional controls were placed after an environmental investigation. He explained the institutional controls remained on his property after funding for the cleanup was gone. He said the institutional controls state what he can and can't do with his property. He re-emphasized the importance of participating in the cleanup while funding is in place so property owners don't have the risk of having institutional controls placed on their property.

Ms. Harriz explained that the Department of Defense can't place institutional controls on a property that they don't own. She said that cleanup is their primary goal and UDEQ is overseeing the MMRP to ensure that happens. Mr. John Waldrip, UDEQ, explained that if there is known contamination on a property, they push to have the contamination cleaned up so there is no long-term impact. He said that UDEQ does not want or intend to support the UTNG suggesting institutional controls for a property. Mr. Waldrip said that the National Guard is responsible for funding the cleanup and their number one concern is to remove explosive hazards.

Ms. Harriz explained that the National Guard is not looking at institutional controls as a potential alternative. Mr. Tom Williams asked what will happen to properties that are not investigated during the MMRP. Ms. Harriz explained that the National Guard assumes the liability for properties that are investigated. For those properties that are not investigated, the owners become responsible. Mr. Williams asked if many property owners have declined to participate in the MMRP, or if they have been hard to contact. Mr. Price explained that most property owners not participating in the MMRP have been hard to contact.

Ms. Harriz outlined basic alternatives that may be considered for a site on slide 5. She explained that land use controls will be considered for commercial properties, and not for private properties. She also explained that a combination of alternatives may be used.

The second step of the Feasibility Study is to perform a detailed analysis of the alternatives. Ms. Harriz explained that during this step, the alternatives are analyzed against nine evaluation criteria, outlined on slide 7. The first

two evaluation criteria must be met for an alternative to be considered. Criterion three through seven are known as the balancing criteria and criterion eight and nine are known as the modifying criteria.

Community relations requirements are outlined on slide 8. Ms. Harriz explained that they may modify or select a different alternative based on public comments obtained during the 30-day public comment period.

Agenda Item # 7 Impact of Potential Alternatives for Property Owners (Attachment 6)

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the Remedial Investigation began with six sites and two of those sites have been recommended to proceed to the Feasibility Study phase of the investigation. Possible Remedial Alternatives that may be considered are outlined on slide 2. Mr. Price said that at this point, decisions regarding the alternatives have not been made because they are in the process of seeking feedback from property owners.

Mr. Fitzmayer outlined the feedback they would like from property owners on slide 3. Slide 4 outlines the potential alternative of “No Action.” Mr. Fitzmayer explained the pros and cons of this alternative for property owners. If a “No Action” alternative were selected for a property, there are no short-term impacts to property owners, but MEC could potentially remain on the property, and the property owner would be required to disclose the MEC potential in future real estate transactions. The disclosure form is shown on slide 5.

The hazard management alternative is outlined on slide 6. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that this is an administrative approach to address munitions-related hazards. He outlined the pros and cons to this alternative on slide 7 and explained that this alternative is usually used in conjunction with other alternatives. There is no short-term impact to property owners or impacts to land or habitat, but again, MEC could potentially remain on the property, and the property owner would be required to disclose the MEC potential in future real estate transactions.

The surface removal alternative is outlined on slide 8. Mr. Fitzmayer discussed the pros and cons, found on slide 9. The potential hazard of MEC is greatly diminished with this alternative, but if subsurface MEC is present, it is not addressed. He explained that brush-cutting would be necessary with this alternative because of the dense oak brush that is present. Crews could be on site for months and roads and trails may be temporarily closed during the surface removal. Residential evacuations are also probable with this alternative. Mr. Fitzmayer pointed out a map on slide 10 showing evacuation zones from the 2010 Remedial Investigation. He said that evacuations could happen during a surface or subsurface removal.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained that the subsurface removal alternative would also include surface removal. He discussed the pros and cons of this alternative, found on slide 12. The MEC hazard is greatly diminished in areas where the clearance is performed. This alternative also provides the greatest certainty that explosive hazards are mitigated, and provides the best assurance for Real Estate actions. This alternative would have the most impact to residents and property owners because of an increased chance of residential evacuations and road closures. Mr. Fitzmayer explained that vegetation removal would be necessary with this alternative and pointed out before and after pictures of vegetation removal on slide 13.

Mr. Fitzmayer explained the final potential alternative, UXO construction support, found on slide 14. He said that this alternative can be used on a case-by-case basis and is usually combined with other alternatives. The pros and cons of this alternative are outlined on slide 15. With this alternative, MEC clearance is synchronized with construction projects. Crews are only on site for the duration of specific project, which may provide less disruption to residents. This alternative is sustainable, as funds are expended only as needed. This alternative

could also involve resident evacuations and pre-planning usually takes six months to one year. Also, funding for this alternative is not guaranteed to be available when needed.

Mr. Fitzmayer concluded by asking if RAB members or property owners had comments or feedback on the presented alternatives. Mr. Lynn Jorgenson asked if any decisions regarding the alternatives have been made. Mr. Price said that no decisions have been made because they want to get feedback from property owners first. He also said that there are some parcels of land included in the investigation that are developed and some that are not. He said that the approaches for developed and non-developed properties may be different.

Mr. Williams said that he would recommend hosting a special meeting where Hi-Country II residents can see the potential alternatives and provide feedback. Mr. Price asked what time of day would be best. Mr. Williams indicated that evening meetings will be convenient for the most people and recommended sending a postcard to announce the meeting.

Ms. Steele asked how the UTNG will handle requests from property owners that may want different alternatives used to clean up their property. Ms. Harriz explained that the best alternative for the greatest number of people will be selected.

Mr. Dansie asked if funds are available for all of the cleanup work. Ms. Harriz explained the funding process and said they forecast the budget for a minimum of five years. She said that as of now, the money is reserved and they expect the next phase of the project to be fully funded. Mr. Dansie again encouraged property owners to take advantage of the cleanup while funding is available. Ms. Steele asked if funding happened to not be available one year, could cleanup happen another year? Ms. Harriz said that the National Guard will always have the liability and would continue the cleanup the next year if funding happened to be cut the previous year.

Mr. Richard Brown said that the real estate disclosure form will get property owners attention and said that they should be aware of the implications if they don't participate in the investigation.

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 8:30 p.m.

Attachments:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Action items
3. Presentation Slides – Project Update
4. Presentation Slides – Time Critical Removal Action Update
5. Presentation Slides – Overview of Feasibility Studies
6. Presentation Slides – Impact of Potential Alternative for Property Owners