

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Community Interest Group Members and Project Staff Attendees:

Debra Deis	Martha Ruff	Jo Anderson, Pennsylvania Army National Guard
Terry Fetterhoff	Lou Samsel	Kim Harriz, National Guard Bureau
Larry Herr	Jay Saylor	Emily Schiffmacher, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers– Baltimore District
Randall Hurst	Dorman Shaver	John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Donald Kleinfelter	Paul Shoop	Deb Volkmer, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Mike McKinne	Ruth Smith	Demaree Hopkins, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Thomas McKinne	Joseph Smith, Jr.	
Joan Renninger	Gene Stilp	
Jim Rice	Thomas Ricker	
John Rossey		

Other Attendees:

Nancy Cladel, Manada Conservancy	Linda McKinne
Robert Doren, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club	Josh McKinney
Gerald Eversmeyer	Sharon Southall, Lebanon Valley Hiking Club
Sterling Hupp	Shirley Shoop
Ruth Krebs	David Spaulding
Joyce Kunkle, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club, Stony Valley	Sam Varnicle, Weston Solutions, Inc.
	Jeff Warren
	Harry Watts

Handouts from the meeting:

1. Final Agenda for the April 2010 Community Interest Group meeting
2. Standard Operating Procedures/Meeting Ground Rules
3. Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Item Recovered/Munitions Debris Items Recovered/Other Recovered Items
4. Comparison of Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)/ Summary of Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP)
5. Community Interest Group/Public Meeting Evaluation Form
6. Fact Sheet, Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site, February 2010

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

Organizational Operating Procedures – Deb Volkmer discussed the Standard Operating Procedures and Meeting Ground Rules. The Standard Operating Procedures and Meeting Ground Rules are provided in Appendix B. A production schedule has been established to prepare the minutes and solicit comments and revisions to the draft minutes. The minutes will not be mailed but posted on the project Website. Ground rules were presented to encourage public input and to focus discussion on the Ricochet Area project. The meeting was audio recorded for the purpose of preparing accurate minutes.

Field Work Update – John Gerhard presented an update of the field work to date. The handout, Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Item Recovered/Munitions Debris Items Recovered/Other Recovered Items, and field work update presentation are provided in Appendix C.

Question – Martha Ruff – How did you find the piece of ordnance that is on the Gap property?

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

John Gerhard – We found it as we were walking in with the professional surveyors to establish the survey control area.

Question – Tom McKinne – Why are you doing the soil samples?

John Gerhard – Soil sampling is a standard requirement on this type of project. The Department of Defense (DoD) and the state regulators want to understand if there are any munitions constituents (MC) in the soils.

Kim Harriz – As part of the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP), we evaluate MC because of the potential for explosive constituents to leach to soil. We have to make sure that the concentrations that leach are not high enough that they could impact human health and the environment.

Question – Tom McKinne – When you detonated the ordnance, did it explode itself?

John Gerhard – Yes. It was considered a high order explosion. There were no sandbags remaining from that shot.

Question – Randall Hurst – What is a geophysical survey?

John Gerhard – Geophysical surveys are conducted with a piece of equipment that will see and create a digital record of where we traversed and allows for additional processing and manipulation of the data using hidden signature items that would be consistent with munitions.

Question – Randall Hurst – Would the survey be over all areas or in particular areas?

John Gerhard – That will be in focused areas.

Question – Larry Herr – At the meeting we had at the Gap, I thought you said you were not going to remove the artifacts that you find?

John Gerhard – We will leave in place building artifacts, human artifacts, and cultural artifacts. As one of the conditions of our permit with the Pennsylvania Game Commission, we have to turn in all metallic items to them. If you have an interest in these items, I'm sure you can talk to the Game Commission.

Question – Audience member – Detonating that item made a pretty large hole. How do you prevent the soil from entering the creek?

John Gerhard – Typically the sandbags would mitigate a lot of that. If we are adjacent to a creek, we may have to take special procedures.

Question – Audience member – Are there any roads in there to remove the shrapnel?

John Gerhard – No, no roads.

Question – Audience member – It is all carried out by hand?

John Gerhard – Yes. Because of the topography and elevation of the site, it is quite an ordeal to bring in the sandbags.

Question – Debra Deis – Do the weapons appear to be quite old or more recent?

John Gerhard – The majority of what we have recovered to date are from the World War II (WWII) era. Some of the illumination canisters are from the 1960s or 1970s.

Question – Dave Spaulding – Are the 105-mm practice high explosive antitank projectiles WWII era or APT tank rounds? It is labeled as a practice round and the tank rounds that they used to fire were an all metal shell. Is that what you have recovered?

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

John Gerhard – That is very consistent with what we have recovered.

Question – Dave Spaulding – So that is fairly recent, from the 1970s.

John Gerhard – I would have to get back to you on the specific nomenclature of that item. We can do that if you would like.

Origin of Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site (MRS) – Kim Harriz presented an overview of the Army National Guard’s Military Munitions Response Program being conducted nation-wide.

Question – Audience member – Are there any uranium shells?

Kim Harriz – There is no knowledge that any of that was fired at Fort Indiantown Gap.

Question – Dave Spaulding – I’ve asked personnel at the Gap and the Game Commission about the agreement with the Pennsylvania Game Commission. I would like to see a copy of that waiver and I cannot find it.

Kim Harriz – I have it. This was a waiver that the U.S. Army Garrison had. A copy of the waiver should be in the Historical Records Report. Not sure if it is actually in the written portion of Report or just included on the CD. I’ll try to find out exactly what we have and make it available. *Note: copies of the two documents are in Appendix E, SG211 Artillery Permit, July 18, 1997 and Appendix F, Pages from C.3 Waiver Letter, December 1981 and have been posted on the community website.*

John Gerhard – The Historical Records Report is part of the Administrative Record we set up at the Annville Library.

Documentation of munitions previously found in Ricochet Area MRS – Jo Anderson presented the summary of munitions previously found at the site. The map of locations of munitions found is provided in Appendix G. The munitions on the map were identified from different sources: the DoD database, Fort Indiantown Gap incident reports, magnetometer-assisted visual surveys, and interviews.

Kim Harriz – During the open house, a number of people asked about evidence that there are munitions in the Ricochet Area. The finds that Jo went over are the basis for the recommendation of a remedial investigation of this particular area.

Question – Randall Hurst – Last year a website was available that talked about the military munitions program at Fort Indiantown Gap and included interviews given by Lt. Col. Cleaver. In several different places it states that every year the Gap would receive many reports from hunters of finding munitions. I made a Federal Information Act request, got the records, and confirmed that there were no such reports. What you just told us here possibly indicates that maybe two of the munitions items were actually found at Indiantown Gap. I would be curious as to the source of that information.

Kim Harriz – Lt. Col. Cleaver isn’t here. It sounds as if the statements may have been verbal reports and it could have meant inert rounds that they reported. I actually don’t know.

Question – Randall Hurst – But there were no records of that? You reviewed all the records.

Kim Harriz – The only records that we have are those records that we just told you about. I have no idea what may have been called in, what they went to look at, and what they found. I think he did mean verbal reports and perhaps he overstated in terms of the written records. I don’t know. Where the Guard is concerned, we only have records that were post 1997. We don’t have records that are pre-1997. One of the Secretaries of the Army assisted us in locating a remnant of the data from the 756th EOD unit. We have thousands of records from 1996 to 2000 only, perhaps because they may not have been recorded in a spreadsheet format until 1996.

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Randall Hurst – That is the same database that they turned over to me.

Kim Harriz – That’s all the information we have. There may have been verbal reports or records prior to that that Lt. Col. Cleaver may have knowledge of, because the National Guard was a tenant on the installation at the time. He may have known of incidents for which the records are no longer available.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – I served at Indiantown Gap, starting in 1996. One of my jobs for almost 2 years was range officer for Fort Indiantown Gap in the 756th EOD. At that time, our servicing EOD detachment was the 56th EOD. I believe a lot of the things I saw on Area D on your map would have been down range of old tank range 27. It used to be a stationary tank - moving tank range, maybe a little bit further to the west. It would be in the west end toward Manada Gap.

Range 27 was a stationary tank, one moving target about 1,300 meters from the firing line. Round 5 was high explosive anti tank training, a solid hunk of steel. A lot of ricochets passed over near the top of Second Mountain and within probably several hundred meters above and past the boundary. We got a lot of live reports from hikers and hunters of finding things. Some of those might have been ricochets, some of those might have been found elsewhere and hand carried and dropped there. Most of the rounds I spotted were as rounds being fired out and were within Blue Mountain and into the Gap itself. I had no incidents in the time I was there of any round hitting south of Blue Mountain.

Artillery and mortar often hit along McLean Road. A lot of the units I investigated were along the north edge of the impact area between the impact area and Second Mountain Road. Most of those cases were 155 rounds. Most of the 105 incidents we experienced were down along McLean Road. What I would suspect you would probably find most in the areas you did identify would be lateral grade 27 rounds, more along Second Mountain. You will find a lot of the live, frag, high explosive anti-tank training rounds, With inert. The possibility of artillery rounds does exist all along the northern edge of the impact area. As I said, most of the incidents I investigated were 155 rounds.

Kim Harriz – What unit were you with?

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – The 756th EOD headquartered in Fort Dix, New Jersey. Unfortunately, I don’t know what happened to my own personal records that I kept. I couldn’t find them.

Kim Harriz – It is interesting that the DoD records that we do have mention a Jim McDonald going out with the Game Commission and looking for rounds. There must have been a reason they were out there. I don’t know if they even recorded all the incidences. If the person didn’t actually mark it, there might not have been a DoD response. In the database, when they found all the armor piercing rounds, (as represented by the red triangles on the map), they were on a mission to look for rounds. It may be that people had been calling and saying that they saw something, but they could never find anything.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – When a fire occurred and burned off the ground cover, you’d see a lot of rounds quite visible on the ground. Now it is vegetated.

Kim Harriz – The former commander of the 756th works at the National Guard Bureau now. He put us in contact with an individual who was in the unit, but is now no longer in the Army. We heard from him but he did not want his name to be used. He said we would find over 400 rounds. As you can see, we have already found 26 along the transects, and the transects are 300 feet apart. There are not hundreds of UXO, but there may be hundreds of munitions debris items. Luckily, it looks like the majority of these are totally inert.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – The safety waivers required a distance of 3,563 feet for a 500 AR. If any round you fired exceeded the boundary, or if any of the fragment hazard from an exploding artillery round, which just barely went up to about 500 meters from the very limit, exceeded, there is another

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

buffer zone that will reach the 500-meter fragmentation hazard. Most of the shells that were explosive were fired east-west, more or less up or down in that corridor, as we call it, in the valley. Anything that was pointed towards Second Mountain was inert rounds. There was no high explosive ammunition.

Kim Harriz – What were the years were you in the service?

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – 1984 to 1996.

Jo Anderson – We did have an interview with Joel Kissinger from the 756th who also spoke of range 27.

National Guard Military Munitions Response Program: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Role as Technical Support – Emily Schiffmacher discussed the role of providing technical support by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Baltimore District. The presentation is provided in Appendix H. The Corps provides technical support services to the Guard to ensure the quality of the work the contractors are prescribed to do in the scope of work is done. Quality Assurance is provided by the Government. The Government has quality assurance specialists for geophysics, and ordnance/explosive (O/E) safety. These specialists provide quality assurance for all aspects of the project (including field work, document/data review) to ensure that the project complies with the contract requirements. Quality control is provided by the Contractor, who has Quality Control personnel for geophysics and O/E safety.

Question – Joan Renninger, Stony Valley Coalition – I asked at the other meeting, but I wanted to have the answer on the record, please. Have you ever closed any portion of any installation because of too much ordnance?

Emily Schiffmacher – Not that I'm aware of from my projects. I'd have to ask about that in my office. I'm not sure.

In the week following the meeting, Emily Schiffmacher inquired in her office: After speaking with our O/E Safety Team Leader, we have never closed an area based on too much ordnance. We always provide, at minimum, training in the 3 R's (Recognize, Retreat, and Report) so that we ensure all those who have access to the site are safe. Our goal is not to limit access to the site.

Question – Joan Renninger – I really want to know because I don't want someone to say there is so much here that we're not going to explode it; we're going to declare it off-limits.

Kim Harriz – I will go on the record and tell you that we will not be saying there is too much ordnance on this property. First of all, the National Guard does not even own the land. It would have to be the Pennsylvania Game Commission that would make that determination and the Guard would never make that sort of recommendation. Our purpose is to investigate to see how much ordnance there is and then clean it up to the extent that the property can be used as it is intended. There is no intention of closing this property and the Guard couldn't request that.

As stakeholders, you also have input into what the cleanup is going to be. If we determine that there is UXO to be addressed, we issue a proposed plan proposing what we will do to clean it up. The community can provide comment regarding their preference for a cleanup. The Pennsylvania Game Commission also must determine what their liability is and what they want to do. But it is not the DoD's intent to spend money to clean up properties that people don't want cleaned up. Your opinion will weigh heavily with PADEP on what they feel is necessary to clean it up. If we determine that there is a risk, there will be a feasibility study. As part of that feasibility study, a number of different alternatives will be identified that could be valid ways to reduce the risk to human health and the environment. One of these would be no further action. There would be no alternative proposed that would involve condemning the land. You, as the stakeholders, can tell PADEP, your preferred alternative. And that will weigh heavily in determining what actually is done out there.

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Emily Schiffmacher – We might not perform a removal action, but we could always provide a safety briefing or put out signs to tell people that something's wrong. Under the MMRP, if anything is found in the future, we can always come back and respond to it.

Kim Harriz – As Emily implied, a very common alternative in this sort of situation is to post the property, providing information to the public who use the property of the potential risk of UXO. We've already found some. That could be the only action that would need to be taken to reduce the risk to the public.

Question – Jim Rice – How long will the feasibility study take?

John Gerhard – We'll have a draft remedial investigation report to the Army for review in August. We'll respond to their comments and have a draft final out for regulatory and Pennsylvania Game Commission review. I don't know if we would make it available for public comment at that time, but the final RI would be due in May of next year.

Kim Harriz – The Feasibility Study typically would take about another year.

Question – Jim Rice – Public comments would be given at this time next year?

Kim Harriz – You are free at any point to give public comments to PADEP on any of these documents. The documents are all reviewable in the Administrative Record. The PADEP is really your advocate. After the feasibility study is completed, a proposed plan will be submitted. It will describe the Guard's proposal for a cleanup or which alternative we think is best protective of human health and the environment. A formal public comment period would follow where the community has the opportunity to express its preference. Someone will collect the comments and submit them to PADEP. That will help determine what actually happens.

Question – Bob Doren – You are taking action on the explosive items that you find as part of the remedial investigation, are you also removing all the items that you find?

Kim Harriz – Yes. Every single item that we find is removed. All the scrap metal is removed.

Question – Bob Doren – If you are removing and acting on everything that you found, what is the difference between this phase and the feasibility study?

Kim Harriz – We are only looking at items every 300 feet. We are getting an estimate of where munitions items may be. We are not removing everything that is out there. We are only removing items that we find along the 300-foot transects.

Question – Joyce Kunkle, Save Stony Valley Coalition – Most of the findings were in June and November of 1997. It is now 2010. Why the delay if they were concerned about it?

Kim Harriz – I think when there were specific reports, the Guard responded or the EOD unit that was based at the U.S. Army Garrison responded. The MMRP did not come into effect until 2002, when Congress first mandated that we had to inventory the sites. It has been a continual process since 2002 at Fort Indiantown Gap. If there had been enough ordnance here, we would have performed a time critical removal action (TCRA). There are not enough ordnance items to necessitate a TCRA here. There are sites with 100s of UXO and other ordnance items. WESTON worked on one such site at the Tobyhanna Artillery Range in the Pocono Mountains.

John Gerhard – There is a former range at Tobyhanna Army Depot, which is part of a Formerly Used Defense Site. I think we started work there in 2003. We have performed numerous TCRAs there for Baltimore Corps and PADEP. I would say over 500 UXO items were removed from impact areas. The property is still State Park and State Game Lands.

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Emily Schiffmacher – The Corps was training people in the 3 Rs (recognize, retreat, report) and giving UXO debriefings.

John Gerhard, Jo Anderson, and Emily Schiffmacher discussed the record of decision for Tobyhanna and Fort Indiantown Gap.

John Gerhard – As far as verification for Tobyhanna, PADEP has paid for numerous TCRA's. A final decision document has not yet been written for the ultimate remedial action of the site.

Jo Anderson – The state has agreed to education and signs in that area?

John Gerhard – I think it's a combination of that and a removal.

Question – Jeff Warren – How are the grids selected for the geophysical surveys and grids for complete coverage over an area? Are they selected based on the findings? Are they based on historical areas of occurrence? Are they a combination? And also I presume your transects are just proposed lines across the site and that you are trying to stay on line as best as possible. If you find something, do you search around that particular find before you go on?

John Gerhard – The geophysical follow-up work will be based on the entire historical evidence and the evidence that we find on the individual survey. We will place grids to prove the absence and the presence of items. For the visual survey, we are sticking to the proposed line through the area. Of course, if our personnel visually see something on-site, they are going to deal with it then.

Question – Ed Rossi – One thing you have to consider is nobody has ever been hurt back there. So I figure that has to be considered in the final decision.

Kim Harriz – Yes. The public safety risk isn't really from people stepping on something on the ground in the Pennsylvania Game Lands. People typically get hurt when they find an item, take it home, and drill a hole in it or hammer it, or take a pick axe to it to see if there is high explosive in the round. That's how people are injured from UXO.

Question – Ed Rossi – Is Kathleen McGinty on the board of Weston Solutions formerly of PADEP?

John Gerhard – Yes, she is.

Question – Ed Rossi – Why did she leave PADEP?

John Gerhard – I'm not sure why she left.

Question – Ed Rossi – That's what we want to know. Did you know there's Marcellus shale in Stony Valley?

John Gerhard – I did not know that.

Comparison of Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) – Deb Volkmer reviewed the handout entitled Comparison of Technical Review Committee and the Restoration Advisory Board. The Community Interest Group was developed to determine the level of interest in the community. The Comparison of Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) is provided in Appendix I.

The DoD started their community input groups with the TRC then they developed a more formal group with the RAB. TRCs are less formal than RABs, but the TRC can then be more formal than the Community Interest Group. DoD has established guidelines for the RAB. A RAB rules handbook is available on the project website (<http://www.dmva.state.pa.us> Click on "Featured Topics," then click on "Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site") and at the information repository at the Annville School

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Library. At the next meeting, there will be further discussion and a vote to extend this group into a TRC or a RAB or remain a Community Interest Group.

A few exceptions on the handout were noted: the handout states TRC meetings need not be open to public; however, if the group chooses to become a TRC, the meetings will be open to the public. The handout also states minutes are not required, but minutes will be prepared for TRC meetings.

If the choice is made to become a TRC or RAB, there are requirements to advertise the formation of the TRC/RAB and provide a membership application process. Beyond that is a process to select members. It's not an automatic membership as there is with the Community Interest Group. Of course, the third option is to retain the Community Interest Group as it is.

The handout for the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) is provided in Appendix J. DoD has made funding available to community members of TRCs and RABs. They can apply for funding to hire their own contractor to review technical equipment or technical reports and processes. It is not automatic. There is an application process and the application would be reviewed. It is open for bid so that qualified people can apply for this task.

Question – Audience member – Do you have to have a TRC or a RAB in order to access that funding stream?

Deb Volkmer – Yes. Only a TRC or a RAB can access the TAPP monies. A Community Interest Group cannot access TAPP money. You can find the complete document that explains the TAPP program on the website (<http://aec.army.mil/usaec/cleanup/rab-tapp.pdf>) provided on the handout and the project website provide the document. The TAPP process is government red tape. There are a lot of checks and balances. There is reporting, auditing, and review processes. So it is time consuming. We will go through the process with you and assist you in any way we can.

Question – Audience member – What did you say about grant money?

Deb Volkmer – Grant money is in the TAPP program to hire another contractor to review WESTON's reports and processes and report back to you what they think.

Kim Harriz – It would be your own individual contractor.

John Gerhard – This would be a representative that would help this group evaluate what the government and Weston Solutions are doing for the project. They can provide additional input and answer questions that you have on how we are doing things or why we are doing things. That person could answer those questions for you if you choose that option.

Question – Audience member – Looks like you guys are doing a good job.

Kim Harriz – Thank you.

John Gerhard – It is a technical field. The DoD has taken this approach to make sure that the public's best interests are represented, so they truly can understand what's going on regarding the project.

Kim Harriz – It is a very good program if there is a contentious relationship with the community. If the community is suspicious of the government's contractor and feels they are not telling them the truth, they can hire their own person who will verify whether what the contractor is saying is true or not. If they don't trust the government's contractor, they can hire their own.

Deb Volkmer – Note that that assistance provider has to be qualified.

Kim Harriz – It is very common for people to get individuals from a state university.

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Lou Samsel – It seems to me that it's one or the other.

Deb Volkmer – You can stay with the Community Interest Group, you can go with a TRC or a RAB.

John Gerhard – You have a fourth option if everyone came back and said they didn't want any group.

Question – Lou Samsel – Under TRC on the handout, it says it's required by SARA section 211.

Deb Volkmer – What's required is that we present you the option.

John Gerhard – Just as the group can choose to decline.

Question – Lou Samsel – So we can choose either a TRC or a RAB, but not both.

Deb Volkmer – Correct. There's only one group per installation.

John Gerhard – We can continue with the current group the way we have it, the Community Interest Group; we could have the TRC, which is a more slightly formal group; or we can form a RAB, which is a much more formal process.

Question – Lou Samsel – That's what I thought. Thank you.

Kim Harriz – The point is, as DoD, we have to solicit and do what you want to do. We have to present you with the various options and you choose. We will do what you want to do, whichever of those options you prefer.

Question – Joyce Kunkle, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club – How many of the various sites that you mentioned across the country decided to take advantage of TAPP?

Deb Volkmer – I don't have that information regarding how many RABs have requested TAPP funds.

Emily Schiffmacher – We have multiple groups in the Corps who have used TAPP.

In the week following the meeting, Kim Harriz researched the number of TAPPs: The Active Army has 218 installations involved in an environmental restoration program, of these 79 installations have RABs and 10 of these (or 13%) have TAPPs. These tend to be the VERY large installations with lots of sites. These numbers do not include environmental restoration activities at Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).

Announcements – Jo Anderson coordinated with the attendees the date of the next Community Interest Group meeting: May 5, 2010, at the same location and time. The project team will consider topics suggested from the public for presentations at future meetings. Progress reports and field reports will be presented at future meetings.

Fort Indiantown Gap has planned an Earth Day celebration on April 17, 2010. It is open to teenagers 14 to 17 years old. Lots of activities have been planned.

Weekly updates will be posted on the project website of the field work that's taking place. Please visit the site every week to see what kind of progress being made and items found.

John Gerhard – Different features of work are presented along with our progress on that work on a weekly basis. The website includes photographs of the items found and the operations.

Question – Audience member – How many deer/bear/snakes have you seen?

John Gerhard – I have not been out in the field. I'm the guy that stays in the office, unfortunately. They have seen deer, but not bear or snakes, that I'm aware.

**Final Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
April 8, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Audience member – Can we go watch your teams?

John Gerhard – I would prefer that you stay at a distance for safety reasons. It is good that you are very interested in what we are doing, but please keep your distance unless the personnel are out of the area and not working, we'd appreciate that very much.

Question – Audience member – I was walking through the area where you are working and noticed an abundance of pink ribbons tied on trees. Are you going to remove them when you are finished?

John Gerhard – I understand your request. The Pennsylvania DCNR asked us to flag the holly trees. I think we could modify our approach and get Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates. We will do our best to police the area.

Question – Audience member – You did a great job. We need someone from the Game Commission and Lt. Col. Cleaver to attend the meetings.

Question – Audience member – Could a PADEP (Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection) or DCNR (Department of Conservation and Natural Resources) representative come to the meetings?

Jo Anderson – We invited PADEP, but they are not paid for after-hours events. If you have any other questions, feel free to email Deb (deborah.volkmer@westonsolutions.com) and we'll address them.

Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Agenda

Appendix B – Standard Operating Procedures and Meeting Ground Rules

Appendix C – Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Item Recovered/Munitions Debris Items Recovered/Other Recovered Items and Presentation: Field Work Update

Appendix D – Presentation: Origin of Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site

Appendix E – SG 211 Artillery Permit, July 18, 1997

Appendix F – Pages from C.3 Waiver Letter, December 1981

Appendix G – Presentation: Munitions Previously Found in Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site

Appendix H – Presentation: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' role as Technical Support

Appendix I – Comparison of Technical Review Committee (TRC) and Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

Appendix J – Summary of Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP)