

**Workshop Summary Notes
Fort Ord Environmental Cleanup
Technical Review Committee (TRC)**

July 16, 2013

Fort Ord BRAC Office, Building 4463 Gigling Road, Seaside, CA

The below listed material was provided to attendees:

- An agenda
- Presentation Slides – Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) Remediation Program (RP) Update
- Presentation Slides – Fort Ord Prescribed Burn Program 2013
- Presentation Slides – Fort Ord Groundwater Cleanup Update
- Fact Sheet: 2013 Annual Review of the Fort Ord Munitions Response Site Prioritization

Agenda Topics

- Update: Fort Ord ESCA
- Presentation: U.S. Army Prescribed Burn Program
- Presentation: U.S. Army Military Munitions Response Program

Fort Ord Cleanup Team

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Bill Collins, Fort Ord Base Realignment and Closure Office (BRAC) | • Peter Spiro, Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) |
| • Ben Strumwasser, Circlepoint | • Patty Velez, California Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| • Ed Walker, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) | • Stan Cook, FORA |
| • Tom Lindberg, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) | • Peter Kelsall, Shaw Environmental (Shaw) |
| • Bob Bates, Monterey County Health Department (MCDoh) | • Lyle Shurtleff, BRAC |
| • Olga Vargas, MCDoh | • Tim O'Halloran, City of Seaside (on phone) |
| • Eric Morgan, Bureau of Land Management | • Chieko Nozaki, Chenega |
| | • Melissa Broadston, Chenega |
| | • Christine Duymich, Chenega |
| | • Bart Kowalski, Chenega |

Opening Remarks

Bill Collins noted that the Community Involvement Mobile Workshop scheduled for July 13, 2013, was postponed due to directed furlough. After all TRC participants introduced themselves, the facilitator, Mr. Strumwasser, gave a summary of the purpose of the TRC. The four agencies involved in the Fort Ord Cleanup – the U.S. Army, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the California Department of Toxic Substance

Control and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Coast Region -- have clarified the groundrules for Technical Review Committee meetings.

The purpose of Technical Review Committee meetings is to have a dialogue with the technical staff of local governmental agencies about the cleanup program at Fort Ord. A separate forum, the Community Involvement Mobile Workshops, has been established for similar dialogue with community members and groups.

Members of the public and leaders of community groups are all welcome to observe the meetings of the Technical Review Committee. Individuals who wish to make more extensive comments are encouraged to attend the Community Involvement Workshops and make their comments in that forum. Individuals are free to submit written comments. The meeting proceeded with the ESCA presentation.

FORA ESCA RP Presentation

Mr. Cook of FORA provided an update of the ESCA project including field work updates for the Interim Action Ranges Munitions Response Area (MRA), the California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Off-Campus Group 2 MRA, the 2013 document schedule, and ESCA's community involvement activities in 2013. He provided a review and orientation to the various munitions response areas by group, then provided an overview of the key elements of the ESCA program.

The presentation continued with an update of activities related to the Interim Action Ranges MRA (formerly a portion of ESCA Group 3 properties). The ESCA work at this area includes investigation of special case areas (SCAs) where the Army did not conduct subsurface removals. Mr. Cook provided the history/background of Range 47 SCA and reviewed the elements of the remediation activities specific to this area which included establishing transects to define the limits of the contamination, sifting, followed by subsurface clearance. Mr. Cook described habitat restoration activities that are on-going in the Range 47 area. The excavated/sifted materials were separated by strata, sifted, then, the cleared soil material was placed back into the area with the topsoil on top, to facilitate habitat restoration. Using photographs, he presented the recovery of the habitat since the plants were installed in early 2013.

In the CSUMB Off-Campus Group 2 MRA, ESCA issued the final Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study in February 2013. The ESCA team supported the Army in issuing the Proposed Plan and public comment meeting for this area. The Army conducted a removal action over the entire MRA. The proposed reuse for the area includes a small area for residential development and a larger area for open space that may include a track for cross country. The public comment period ended on July 12, 2013 and the next step is the preparation of the Record of Decision that includes a responsiveness summary.

The presentation continued with a review of documents that will be issued in the next several months. Mr. Cook summarized the key 2013 ESCA outreach activities that included two informal community workshops. The ESCA team also supported two

Proposed Plan public meetings for the Army. Other ESCA 2013 outreach events included participation in Army Open Houses and Bus tours, having an information booth at the Sea Otter Classic and sharing an information booth with the Army at the CSUMB Earth Day. Mr. Cook concluded his presentation with a brief review of places to access ESCA resources, including the ESCA information Hotline (831-883-3506) and the ESCA web site (www.fora-esca-rp.com).

Mr. Lindberg, MPWMD, asked if the Range 47 habitat restoration project required irrigation. Mr. Cook responded that irrigation is used; however, moisture indicators are used by the project biologists to determine when irrigation is necessary.

Ms. Valez, California Fish and Wildlife, asked if the results of the restoration efforts are reported. Mr. Cook responded the monitoring results of the restoration efforts are provided in annual reports.

Overview: Fort Ord Prescribed Burn Program

Ms. Chris Duymich, Chenega supporting Presidio of Monterey Fire Department and Fort Ord BRAC, gave an update on the 2013 prescribed burn program. She noted the reasons why the Army has a prescribed burn program and provided a background on the Superfund process leading to the decision to use prescribed burns as the preferred method to remove vegetation so that after the prescribed burn is complete, unexploded munitions can be located and safely removed. The Impact Area covered by the Track 3 Record of Decision is approximately 6,500 acres mostly covered by vegetation called Central Maritime Chaparral. Ms. Duymich showed photos of the rare, threatened, and endangered species in the Maritime Chaparral habitat which is a fire dependant plant community. Ms. Duymich noted that alternatives to burning had been evaluated and burning was determined to be the best method because it was the safest method of vegetation clearance prior to munitions clearance activities, and also promotes the preservation, enhancement, and restoration of the Central Maritime Chaparral habitat. She summarized the goals of a prescribed burn.

She then continued with a brief review of how the prescribed burns are planned and executed. There are several considerations for the schedule of a burn including: the burn season, specific weather conditions, availability of local emergency services, and availability of contract resources. She provided a review of the weather conditions and described the meteorological support and coordination with the local air district -- the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. She noted that the decision to conduct a prescribed burn is made on the morning of the proposed burn because it depends on the weather conditions. The presentation continued with a description (accompanied by photographs) of the key elements of prescribed burns including the meteorological equipment, air monitoring, test burns, smoke behavior, and plume height. The presentation continued with photos and descriptions of good smoke behavior, which is characterized by a smoke plume that rises, creating convective inflow around the burn area that the smoke channels upward in a column.

Ms. Duymich's presentation continued with a review of the plan for Units 7 and 10 – which are proposed for burning in 2013. Since the Impact Area is such a large area, it is divided into units. The unit size is contingent on existing fuel break roads, topography, fuel loading but most importantly, on the fire department's ability to manage the fire safely. Specific burn units are prioritized for prescribed burning to create a safety buffer for fire fighter safety. Maps showing the 2013 burn unit locations, location of air monitoring equipment, and road closures were also provided. Before and after photos were also presented to demonstrate the extent of the fuel breaks. She provided a list of documents related to the 2013 prescribed burn program.

Ms. Broadston, Chenega supporting BRAC, provided information on the activities related to the Direct Notification Program as well as an overview of the community notification program specific to prescribed burns. The Army provides notification via e-mail, text messages, or telephone when the burn team is mobilized to the site; when the burn is started; when the burn operation ends; and with information about the second burn. This is the first year that the direct notification program includes text messages. Also new in 2013 is the availability of on-line registration at www.FortOrdCleanup.com.

Mr. Spiro, MCWD, asked if there were any issues with water runoff during a prescribed burn. Ms. Duymich responded that there have been no erosion issues during previous burn preparation and execution activities. The only notable erosion is on the roads and even then efforts are made to channel water off the roads and into the vegetation. Mr. Spiro also asked if the Army knew of any adverse effects from masticating the primary containment line on the habitat, and how would the Army know if there were any protected species being cut during the mastication. Ms. Duymich explained that one of the many pre-burn preparation tasks includes a biological survey. Biologists conduct transect surveys of any area to be cut. An inventory is taken of plant type and quantity present prior to any cutting. Additional transect surveys are conducted throughout the years following a disturbance to ensure that the habitat is recovering as well or better than it was prior to the disturbance. Ms. Duymich also stated that Central Maritime Chaparral is a fire-dependant habitat and an attempt to burn the primary containment line occurs during burn day to promote the habitat.

Overview: Fort Ord Prescribed Burn Program

Mr. Shurtleff continued the meeting with an update of the Army's Military Munitions Response Program. The presentation provided a review of the steps involved with the Munitions and Explosives of Concern or MEC removal as well as the status of recent and current munitions removal actions from 2010 through 2013. He noted that the mission of the munitions response program is public safety and safety during reuse of the former Fort Ord. He showed the areas of Fort Ord that are classified as munitions response sites. His presentation continued with descriptions of the portions of the MEC removal process including: site identification and evaluation (via a Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study) leading to a Decision Document, followed by development of a work plan, then field work, and finally, the production of reports related to all aspects of project completion. He provided photos and maps that related to each element of the field work. The habitat assessment includes plant surveys before and after MEC work. The preferred

method for vegetation removal is prescribed burning; however, the method is determined by munitions likely in the area as well as the presence of habitat, and proximity to populations. If the area is cut, it must still be burned to facilitate habitat management. Each MEC area is surveyed and subdivided into 100 foot by 100 foot grids with unique names to organize data collected. Field activities include quality control which includes placing “seeds” in the site to test the removal process. Quality control is also used for non-field/administrative activities as well. Both analog and digital methods are used in MEC removal field activities. The presentation included a photo of MEC removal workers using a Schonstedt (analog) instrument in a portion, or lane, of a grid to locate MEC. Once the surface MEC clearance is complete, the area is mapped using digital geophysical equipment. The data collected is used to produce a map of the area showing the subsurface density of anomalies (as depicted in the presentation). These maps provide information that can be used as a general guide for reuse and for possible additional, future removal actions.

The presentation continued with a review of the MEC clearance activities in Units 15, 21, 32, and 34 which had a prescribed burn in 2010 followed by MEC removal and geophysical mapping activities. Mr. Shurtleff provided a map of the surface removal results for these units and provided the resulting reports related to the clearance activities. The removal activities are complete for these units with the issuance of the Remedial Action report on June 6, 2013. While a prescribed burn was planned for Units 11 and 12, the prescribed burn was cancelled due to the presence of several large artillery projectiles found on the surface during the preparation and investigation of the fuel breaks for these units. These areas were cut and a MEC removal and digital geophysical mapping were conducted following the mechanical clearance of the area. These units will be burned at a later date to facilitate habitat restoration. Mr. Shurtleff provided a list of the associated reports for the activities at these units.

The presentation continued with a review and map of MEC removal in areas that do not require burning. These non-burn areas include the fuel breaks inside the Impact Area, where subsurface MEC removal is conducted within a 45 foot width. Another example of non-burn areas is an area surrounding the Military Operations in Urban Terrain site also called the MOUT site or Impossible City, where subsurface MEC removal was conducted within a 100 foot width to provide for safety. Maps for each of these areas were presented.

The Army has also been evaluating areas outside the Impact Area. A map of these areas, called the Remaining Sites Remedial Investigation / Feasibility Study areas was provided. One of these areas, Munitions Response Site 34 was the subject of a recent Proposed Plan. Another area, called BLM area B has an evaluation in progress. Mr. Shurtleff concluded his presentation with a review of recent MEC-related documents, how to find the documents on the Fort Ord cleanup web site (www.FortOrdCleanup.com), and the points of contact for the Army’s MEC cleanup project.

There was one question related to this presentation. Mr. Spiro asked about the depth for removal process. Mr. Shurtleff responded that the depth of removal depends on several

circumstances: depth and type of the subsurface items, type of detection equipment, and terrain. Mr. Shurtleff described the “to depth” subsurface removal as the use of application equipment and procedures as necessary to provide a level of MEC safety suitable for the reuse of the property.

What Happens Next

The following events were noted:

August 30, Fort Ord cleanup Information booth at the Monterey County Fair

Other events, not yet scheduled include information booth at CSUMB student orientation and BLM National Public Lands Day.

The next TRC meeting will cover groundwater cleanup, landfill, and ESCA and will be scheduled in February 2014. A calendar will be provide to all TRC members.

The meeting concluded at 11:30 a.m.