

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Community Interest Group Members and Project Staff Attendees:

Debra Deis	John Rossey	Jo Anderson, Pennsylvania Army National Guard
Terry Fetterhoff	Martha Ruff	Kim Harriz, National Guard Bureau
Randall Hurst	Lou Samsel	John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Donald Kleinfelter	Jay Saylor	Marty Holmes, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Mike Kneasel	Dorman Shaver	Deb Volkmer, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Thomas McKinne	Paul Shoop	Demaree Hopkins, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Josh McKinney	Joseph Smith, Jr.	
Jim Rice	Ruth Smith	

Other Attendees:

Mark Cain	Rick Miller
Bob Doren, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club	Shirley Shoop, Stoney Mountain
Frank Eckert	Elwood Smith
Gerald Eversmeyer	Gary Smith
Terry Fetterhoff	Pauline Smith
JoEllen Litz	Wil Smith
Annette Logan	Tom Powers
Jim Logan, Save Stony Valley Coalition	Sam Varnicle, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Jay Megonnell	Brandy Watts

Handouts from the meeting:

1. Final Agenda for the June 2010 Community Interest Group meeting
2. Draft Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group, Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA, May 5, 2010
3. Technical Review Committee (TRC)/Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)/ Summary of Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) voting ballot
4. Community Interest Group/Public Meeting Evaluation Form

Welcome – Jo Anderson, Pennsylvania Army National Guard, welcomed the group, introduced the project team, and presented the agenda. The agenda is provided in Appendix A.

A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the May 5, 2010 meeting minutes.

Meeting attendees were encouraged to take the cultural debris items that were found at State Game Lands 211. The items were available at the back of the room. The Lebanon County Museum curator has already looked through the items and they have already selected the ones they want. The rest are available for you to look through and take with you. Brandy Watts stated that she would take home whatever items people didn't want.

Discussion of Community Interest Group, Technical Review Committee or Restoration Advisory Board – Deb Volkmer, Weston Solutions, Inc. reviewed the differences between the three types of organizations: Community Interest Group, Technical Review Committee and Restoration Advisory Board. She focused on items 1, 3, 4, and 13. The full presentation of the comparison of the types of groups is provided in Appendix B.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Comparison of Organizations

Item 1 – *Restricted to federal environmental restoration activities-Installation Restoration Program or MMRP* – These groups are for environmental restoration issues only. Other issues will be dealt with separately. These organizations are for the Installation Restoration Program or the Military Munitions Response Program.

Kim Harriz – I just want to add that the only program that would be applicable [for the TAPP funds] at this time at Fort Indiantown Gap is the Military Munitions Response Program. Any of the groups would only address the MMRP program, with the potential of Installation Restoration Program issues. The Military Munitions Response Program is relative to munitions releases and the Installation Restoration Program is if there are underground storage tank issues or some other type of environmental contamination, unknown to us at the moment. In the foreseeable future, we only see that whatever type of organization we have will address the Military Munitions Response Program.

Item 3 – *Membership selection process* – The selection process is different between the three types of organizations. Anyone can belong to a Community Interest Group. The Technical Review Committee is selected through the installation's invitation, including inviting local government and area organizations to provide a representative. The RAB process is open and publically advertised. Anyone can fill out an application and local government and area organizations would be approached to provide a representative.

Item 4 – *Requires membership representative of community's diverse interests* – The TRC and the RAB have a process to ensure a diverse group representative of the area. In the case of the Community Interest Group, it is assumed that any of the diverse groups who are interested in the process or the issues would be attending.

Item 13 – *Eligible for TAPP funds* – Only the TRC and the RAB are eligible for TAPP funds. In the April meeting minutes, we noted that 218 active Army installations are involved in the environmental restoration program. Seventy-nine of these have RABs, 10 of which were awarded TAPP funds. These are large installations that have multiple environmental restoration sites.

Question – What is TAPP funding?

Deb Volkmer – TAPP funding provides funds to hire independent technical consultants to advise TRC and RAB members regarding the scientific and engineering issues that are pertinent to the installation's environmental restoration activities. The members complete an application for the TAPP funds. The Guard approves or denies the application. If they approve it, it goes through the Guard procurement procedures. The Guard sends out a notice that the process is available and that consultants can apply to receive the funds. Members of the committee can also nominate consultants to assist them. Again, it is the Guard that makes the contract with the consultant. The funding is managed through the Guard. There are some requirements for individuals who would apply to be independent technical consultants. They need to have knowledge of the issues and the laws that are pertinent to the environmental restoration program. They need training in these areas to communicate this to the public. They have to demonstrate the ability to review, understand, and put technical information into layman's terms. They need to be able to communicate with a non-technical audience so they understand what the process is, what the technical staff is proposing to do.

Kim Harriz – I want to re-emphasize that the TAPP funding would be through a contract that the Army National Guard would have. Maybe at the previous meeting or the meeting prior to that, I had indicated that the TAPP funds would be given to the RAB or the TRC, but the funds remain in the government's hands and they are dispersed through a Guard contract. The consultant would not really be someone who advocates for the group. They are a liaison between the Guard and the group to help the group understand the technical aspects of the project. They are more of an interpretive group that you can rely on and

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

develop a relationship with, but they are not necessarily going to say, oh no, this is wrong, it should be this, and go to the Guard and represent you in that fashion. We did not want to misrepresent what the TAPP assistance is really supposed to be about. They are just supposed to be a liaison organization or consultant between the more technical consultant, which is WESTON as the Guard's consultant, and the Community Interest Group.

Question – John Rossey – If you have a RAB, nobody can go in on a meeting then? It is not open to the public any more.

Deb Volkmer – Yes, RAB meetings are open to the public. It is the TRC where it is optional if the group wants to have their meetings open to the public or not.

Question – John Rossey – That's the grant money you're saying?

Deb Volkmer – The TAPP funds? The TRC and RAB can both apply for TAPP funds.

Question – Jim Rice – I thought maybe we could do this from a Community Interest Group, rather than as a RAB or TRC. The RAB has essentially split chairmen, DOD and community, right? It also has government officials, and state agencies? So far we haven't seen anybody at any of these meetings. I don't even know if they were at the open house in February. Is there supposed to be an EPA representative? DEP would be a representative, or the Game Commission. If they are going to be a part of the RAB, they haven't even taken the time to come to a meeting yet.

Kim Harriz – The Environmental Protection Agency would not be involved. The regulatory lead on a site like Fort Indiantown Gap, which is not a National Priorities List site, is the state. If EPA Region III shows interest, they could attend or you could write them and ask them to attend, if you felt it was necessary. But they are not typically a member of a non-National Priorities List site.

Question – Think of the budgets. Are you going to pay them?

Question – Jim Rice – I'm just saying, it's a couple of hours of their time. Still, though, they are going to be representatives and so far they haven't even been to any of the meetings at all, or the open house or anything, that's all I'm asking.

Kim Harriz – I don't know that there is a requirement for them to be on the board.

Question – Jim Rice – Actually, has anybody been here from Schwanger's office? Have you called any of the representatives? They are all from the politicians' offices. There hasn't been anybody here. If you have asked anybody to come to the meetings.

Deb Volkmer – Yes. We have sent postcard and e-mail announcements to all the elected officials in the two counties.

Kim Harriz – As far as Pennsylvania DEP, we have actually specifically requested that they come and they have said that they don't work after hours, they are not paid to work after hours. They would be welcome to come to a RAB, but I don't know that it would make any difference. They don't have to come, I imagine. So I don't know if it makes any difference as to what organization we have and whether we would have regulatory representation. We would prefer that there was regulatory participation. But they don't work for us. We can only offer that we are having a meeting and would like them to attend.

Deb Volkmer – Does anyone feel strongly about one group over the other? Does anyone want to speak to the group in favor of one group over the other? (No response from the attendees.) Does everyone have a ballot?

Question – Will you please put the slide back up that showed the [comparison] chart?

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Deb Volkmer – You'll have some time to think about your vote. We are not going to collect the ballots right now.

Jo Anderson – We will pass the basket around and take your ballots now if you are finished.

Question – Bob Doren – Depending on what the assessment recommendation is, what if the group finds it too technical for the open forum and wants technical assistance after we see what the geo-assessment is and what the recommendations are? Is there an opportunity to change our minds or seek further help?

Kim Harriz – Yes. There is always the opportunity to form a RAB at any point. Now, the problem would be that once you get the report, and you decide that you want to form a RAB and you want to apply for TAPP [funds], it is going to take some time. So, in the time it will take to complete the report, you may not actually be able to get a consultant onboard to talk to you about it. That might not mesh if you are waiting to get that report before you make that decision.

Question – Bob Doren – I think I have my basic answer. If circumstances are such that the group decides that we want to change our minds or we want a more formal organization, it is possible, it just delays the process. You're saying that the policy will accept it.

Kim Harriz – Yes. It is absolutely possible. Anytime that you decide that you want a RAB, we can form a RAB. In fact we have to, actually.

Question – Jim Rice – How long do you foresee these meetings going on?

Kim Harriz – We actually discussed this a little bit before this meeting and we thought we need to make reservations for the hall, depending on when we want to have the next meeting. The consensus was that we are really not going to have any more information until the Remedial Investigation report is completed. So we are looking at September or October for the next meeting.

Question – Debra Deis – If it's a Community Interest Group and we like your suggestion as far as the solution, does that mean that's the last meeting?

Deb Volkmer – When following the CERCLA process, there are certain specific community involvement activities that we need to do, that are required under CERCLA, and that is meetings and information that will be posted, like the meeting to present the proposed plan. We'll be talking about that later in tonight's session. There are other meetings for information and meetings that will take place following the CERCLA process.

Kim Harriz – You have to understand that once we do the proposed plan and select the alternative, there are still more steps. There will be the actual remedial action phase, where we actually go out and remove stuff, if that's what the alternative says. But whatever alternative we institute, there will be some community activity involved with that, so we can have meetings to discuss the results or progress at a frequency that you would like.

Vote for Community Interest Group or Technical Advisory Committee or Restoration Advisory Board – Jo Anderson – Deb will pass around the basket. If you need more time, the basket will be on the table and you can drop your ballot in there. We will tally them up after the next presentation.

Field Work Update – John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc. presented an update of the field work through the end of May. The field work update presentation is provided in Appendix C.

Of the munitions debris items found, 11 items were turned over to the Fort Indiantown Gap museum and then the remaining items were turned over to a recycler to either be shredded or melted and founded.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

The Lebanon County Museum accepted several cultural debris items of interest, including a railroad wrench, a Boy Scout pocket knife, three different sizes of railroad spikes, several horseshoes, pliers for pulling shoe nails, and a connector plate associated with the railroad. They also took some of the firing point debris. WESTON is still performing ongoing housekeeping and policing of areas.

Transects were placed in Areas A and E, which had been previously identified as possible areas of interest. We did not find anything in Area A. Area E is the Cold Spring Firing Point and we did find items. Eight UXO were found within the project boundaries and one 155 HE explosive round was found on the Fort Indiantown Gap property or adjacent to it. The items were disposed of. We also found four Mark 24A primers at the Cold Spring Firing Point, which also has an explosive safety hazard. All those items have been detonated in accordance with our procedures. There appears to be a greater accumulation of items in one area of the project and there were some items in the firing point area.

Of the total items, 124 were munitions debris, 4 were discarded military munitions, and 8 were UXO.

We are in the process of assembling the draft Remedial Investigation report. We will be giving a version of that document to the National Guard in August. The government will have a review period. Then we will address their comments and create a draft final version, which would then be put out for the State regulatory agency's review. Then we will issue a final Remedial Investigation report. We envision that sometime in the February to April [2011] timeframe.

Question – John Rossey – How many miles did you Mag and Flag?

John Gerhard – I believe the original blue lines were about 258 miles. The blue lines I know were about 250 to 270 miles.

Question – John Rossey – That's about 8 miles from that line to that line. And you found 8 UXO that you had to destroy.

John Gerhard – That's correct.

Question – John Rossey – So, there were maybe one or two in Stony [Valley]. The rest of them sat on the top.

John Gerhard – Three of them were on the top of Second Mountain.

Question – As John Rossey pointed out, of the 8 [UXO] locations, where are you guessing you will concentrate your efforts now to get the cleanup more in the larger suspect areas that you found?

John Gerhard – In the Remedial Investigation report, we will report where we think there are higher density areas. We need to have some discussions with the Guard on how we proceed with some of that. WESTON is going to present some ideas to them and the Corps. But the Remedial Investigation will lay out where there are areas of higher density, if we determine there are areas, and if there is risk associated with some of these areas. Then the CERCLA process will carry on through it.

Question – What was the closest to a home that you found a UXO?

Marty – It is probably 4 or 5 miles.

Question – Brandy Watts – There are 3 houses in Cold Spring Township.

Question – How long will the signs be up?

John Gerhard – The project signs at the entrances have been removed.

Question – John Rossey – So now you are going back to those eight ones we did and then do a more extensive, thorough search or you are done with Mag and Flag?

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

John Gerhard – We are done with our investigation at this point.

Question – Ed Rossey – And you found eight within 8 miles.

John Gerhard – We found eight.

Kim Harriz – Remember, we only looked at 6% of the area, of the 8,000 acres, or of any of this. So looking at 6% of the area, we found eight.

John Gerhard – It wasn't 100% coverage of the investigative area. The blue lines are 300 feet apart, and there is a lot of space in between them.

Question – How close was the closest UXO you found to the rail trail?

Marty Holmes – It was about 500 feet out from the rail trail. It was just east of Rattling Run.

Question – Would your hypothesis extrapolate from eight and 6% x 16 to get 128 ordnances in the entire area? Am I making sense?

John Gerhard – We will use a statistical tool to evaluate what kind of confidence level we have in the data that we found to date, based on our investigative analysis. That tool will tell us whether we have a high degree of confidence in what kind of numbers per acre to expect.

Kim Harriz – We will be evaluating the concentration of UXO in terms of density per acre. They won't say, oh there are 103 more items that we want to find out there. It doesn't really work that way. Rather we will be stating this is the density we are seeing, such as one item per 1 acre.

Question – And you drawing your own conclusions? Is that what you are saying?

Kim Harriz – No. That's not the conclusion. It is not a refined process that you can say there are 103 items still out there. The statistical evaluation just doesn't work that way. We will say what the risk is and they do an evaluation that is a little too detailed to discuss here. But it is called MEC HA, a hazard assessment of munitions and explosives of concern. That will be an assessment of the risks posed by the density that we are going to come up with as a result of the data.

John Gerhard – The MEC hazard assessment also takes account of the depths and types of items that were found, as well as what kind of land use, what kind of recreational exposure receptors, are present in the area.

Kim Harriz – One of the problems we're having here and one of the things WESTON and the Guard have to talk about is what to do about the munitions debris. Because even though we only found eight MEC items, but we found over a hundred munitions debris items. They don't present a risk for you, but at the same time, they present an obstruction for you in terms of enjoying the property. Because if you run into one of these debris items, you don't know whether it's MEC or not. You don't know whether it presents an explosive hazard or not. We are telling you have to retreat, and call us, so for us, that's still a burden of response that we have to look at. So, actually, while not in terms of an impact area, there is a density of munitions debris that you don't know if it is MEC or not, but we might have to deal with.

Question – One final question, if I may. How many of these [actions] have you done before? And what is the outcome? Is the public accepting of them?

John Gerhard – We have done numerous remedial investigations for hazardous and toxic waste. We have done one military munitions remedial investigation at the Tobyhanna Army Depot, at the Tobyhanna Formerly Used Defense Site. There are others that the company has worked on, but here in Pennsylvania, Tobyhanna is the other site we have worked at. You had multiple questions.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – What was the public acceptance or confidence level with your findings?

John Gerhard – I think the public at the Tobyhanna site was comfortable with the work that we did. It was through the Army Corps. We did not have any negative feedback.

Kim Harriz – I just want to follow up with John's explanation. The Military Munitions Response Program is actually fairly new for the Army and actually for all of DOD. There haven't been a lot of completed removal actions to date. For us, the National Guard, this is actually our first program and our furthest along program or site under the Military Munitions Response Program. We have, as a result of State Guard activity that is unrelated to federal activity, like this installation, we have over 400 sites that we will be investigating coming next year and moving on from that. Now, some of those are just small arms ranges. But a percentage of them, maybe 15%, are similar to this site. We really find that they run the gamut of response across the community. It is one of the things we talked about at last month's meeting. We have a similar site to this one in Utah where there is actually very little public interest. It is similar to this in that we found overshoot, a ricochet area where we have an impact area, like you have at Fort Indiantown Gap, on the northern boundary of the installation. Munitions fired into the impact area ricocheted over a mountain ridge into private property. As part of the site inspection for that area, an individual found an item in their back yard and EOD came out and blew it up. There was absolutely zero public reaction. We actually have a Restoration Advisory Board established for that installation and we had a community involvement meeting where we only got 20 people. And this is a site where we've actually found munitions items in people's back yards. So that is Utah.

On the other hand, we have a site in Colorado where a gentleman has a park behind his house called Green Mountain Park in Lakewood, Colorado, which is a suburb of Denver. He found some munitions debris items, 75-mm rounds, much like the ones we are finding here, typical 1930s apparently Guard munitions items. He took it to the museum at the Denver Federal Center and said I found these, would you like them for the museum? The museum, being smart, called the Colorado Health Department. The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment was extremely concerned and they called the Guard and requested we investigate the site. They put out all sorts of press releases about it. There were several interviews on the television of people who were using the park and they said they would no longer let their children play in the park. And this is where they just found six munitions DEBRIS items. Where there has been no explosive hazard, no UXO found at all. So we are sort of getting the range of response from people, simply based on what their perception of the risk might be and maybe their level of comfort with the National Guard or military activity. It really all depends on, I think, the cultural sense of the local area.

Question – Along those same lines, the Tobyhanna cleanup, was that also on game lands?

John Gerhard – It was on State game lands and state park.

Kim Harriz – I'd just like to say that Tobyhanna isn't a National Guard site. That is an Army Corps site. We don't have experience with that. WESTON has another contract with the Army Corps of Engineers or is it the Pennsylvania DEP?

John Gerhard – It is with both. Some work at Tobyhanna was under the Corps contract and some under DEP.

Question – And the areas in general from these 400 sites that are being cleaned up, are they basically public lands, like parks and state parks?

Kim Harriz – The sites that I am talking about, which are the State Guard, Army National Guard sites, they are actually all sorts of different properties. There are a lot of private properties. There are areas where the Guard trained informally. They may have had a contract with a private property owner or they

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

might have been in a forest, a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property, we actually have a lot of BLM or national forest service properties, maneuver areas, especially out West. We have one site now that is a Home Depot that has commercial development all around it. It was a small arms range. It is really a diversity of properties. Sometimes they are in housing developments and some where it is just a private property owner. All sorts of different stuff.

Question – As a result of the findings, is there any chance the Appalachian Trail could be moved?

Kim Harriz – No. I don't foresee that. We actually didn't find any munitions items anywhere near the Appalachian Trail. This is our furthest munitions item found to be northwest, so not really that close to the Appalachian Trail. About how close is that to the Appalachian Trail?

Marty Holmes – About $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile.

Jo Anderson – This is the last call on the ballots. Please put your vote in the basket if you haven't done so already. I also wanted to mention our past meeting minutes are on the DMVA website. If you missed meetings before, you can read up on what we've talked about before. At this point, I'd like to turn it over to Jim to talk about the history of Cold Spring.

The History of the Cold Spring Area – Jim Logan, Save Stony Valley Coalition, presented a summary of the history of the Cold Spring Area. He and his father, James M. Logan, authored *The Cold Spring Hotel Site: Uncovering its Layers of History*.

The area flourished from 1850 until 1900, when the hotel burned. The site is right down from Fort Indiantown Gap. In the 19th century, it was the site of a tavern house, a spring and bath house, two adjoining hotels and resort grounds, and the home base of Mulford Foster, a naturalist and botanist. In 1900, the hotel burned. Then the area was used for bottling water and as a summer YMCA camp. The site was used for military training in the 1940s and early 1950s to the end of the Korean War. It was then turned back to the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

Using historical and recent photographs, Mr. Logan presented a walking tour of the site as it looked previously and as you can see it today.

Brandy Watts – Presented *Hidden History: Stony Valley*. Once supporting 2,000 residents in the mid 19th century, Stony Creek Valley was a prosperous industrial region of coal mines, lumbering operations and a standard gauge railroad that ran from Rockville, Dauphin County, to Auburn, Schuylkill County, a total of 54 miles. Today the region's history along the 20-mile Stony Valley rail trail is hidden to most visitors. We will be taking a quick journey along the Stony Valley rail trail from the Ellendale station to the gold mine.

See the website www.StonyValley.com for more information on Stony Valley.

Jo Anderson – Eleven munitions items will be placed in the Fort Indiantown Gap Museum. The Lebanon County Historical Society Museum also took 12 items.

Overview of Feasibility Study phase – Kim Harriz, National Guard Bureau presented an overview of the steps of the Feasibility Study, which is the next phase of the project after the Remedial Investigation has been completed. The presentation is included in Appendix D.

The Feasibility Study is really one of the most important aspects of the Cleanup process. I don't want you to lose interest over the summer after the Remedial Investigation report is out. Where we really need your input is at the Feasibility Study stage and then as part of the Proposed Plan, because that is what is going to determine how we move forward to reducing the risk. We definitely have some risk based on the fact that we found UXO out there, we don't think we have found it all. Because we have done sampling on

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
June 2, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

only a percentage of the property. We will do an evaluation and tell you what we think the risk is. But we really need you to think about how you want to handle any remedial action that we do.

Announcements – Jo Anderson announced that Fort Indiantown Gap is giving guided tours of the Regal Fritillary butterfly habitat on July 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10 at 10:00 a.m. Consult the DMVA website [www.dmva.state.pa.us] for what to wear and where to be. If a group of people are interested in the tours, but can't make one of the dates, we honor special requests for tours. Additional ideas for future presentations were requested. Jo thanked the Jim Logan and Brandy Watts for their historical presentations. The next meeting will be scheduled during September or October.

Results of organizational vote – Jo Anderson – The results of the organizational vote were 26 votes for Community Interest Group, 1 vote for a Technical Review Committee, and 1 vote for a Restoration Advisory Board. That means we will be having another Community Interest Group meeting in September or October. Jo noted that the meetings have had a great turnout and thanked everybody for showing interest in coming.

Adjournment – Jo Anderson adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Agenda
- Appendix B Presentation – Comparison of Organizations (Community Interest Group, Technical Review Committee or Restoration Advisory Board)
- Appendix C Presentation – Field Work Update
- Appendix D Presentation – Feasibility Study