

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 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	Lt. Col. Chris Cleaver, Pennsylvania Army National Guard
Donald Kleinfelter	Dorman Shaver	John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Joan Renninger	Paul Shoop	Marty Holmes, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Jim Rice	Ruth Smith	Deb Volkmer, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Josh McKinney	Joseph Smith, Jr.	Demaree Hopkins, Weston Solutions, Inc.

Other Attendees:

Robert Doren, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club	Shirley Shoop
Gerald Eversmeyer	Edward Smith
Warren Harris	Pauline Smith
Joyce Kunkle, Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club, Stony Valley	Gary Smith
Charles LaBarre	Sam Varnicle, Weston Solutions, Inc.

Handouts from the meeting:

1. Final Agenda for the April 2010 Community Interest Group meeting
2. Draft Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group, Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA, April 8, 2010
3. Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211 – Overview of Munitions Recovered Through 30 April 2010
4. Technical Review Committee (TRC)/Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)/ Summary of Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) voting ballot
5. Community Interest Group/Public Meeting Evaluation Form

Welcome – Jo Anderson 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 April 8, 2010 meeting minutes.

Field Work Update – John Gerhard presented an update of the field work to date. The handout, Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211 – Overview of Munitions Recovered Through 30 April 2010, and field work update presentation are provided in Appendix B.

Question – Joan Renninger – Was [the American holly] found near Yellow Springs?

John Gerhard – Yes. The data will later be given to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR). They believe that the American holly is at its northern extent in this valley. They also believe it is some of the original non-imported holly trees.

Question – Joan Renninger – Where exactly is [the Cold Springs Firing Point]?

John Gerhard – It is near the stream, the big open field, and the parking lot.

Kim Harriz – Could you explain the difference between the one-step geophysical process and the two-step analog instrument surveys?

John Gerhard – When we collect data with the analog instruments, the technicians swing the instruments back and forth along the transects. When they find something, they excavate down to that item, and determine what it is. With the geophysical methods, the technicians will have the magnetometer on their

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

shoulder, which has sensors and a controller that logs the data as they traverse over the area where they are collecting the data. The data are recorded into a data logger and are downloaded. A geophysicist processes that data with software that maps the locations of any anomalies present. Then, based on that, we pick some of the items to dig. The data are thoroughly reviewed by WESTON, the National Guard Bureau, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps provides the Quality Assurance: reviews data and assists the National Guard Bureau and the PA Guard in the review and evaluation of WESTON's recommendation of anomalies to excavate. Then we excavate the agreed upon anomalies from the project team to determine what we have in those grids.

Question – Joan Renninger – Are you finding anything that you did not expect in the soil?

John Gerhard – We do not have the analytical results back yet. It takes about 30 days to receive results from the laboratory. I don't think visually we have been seeing anything that is of concern. But until we have the results, we can't make a final assessment.

Kim Harriz – The soil samples are only being analyzed for explosives and metals. So if there are any other compounds that are not associated with munitions, they would not be detected. Based on our prior sampling results, we don't really anticipate that we are going to find appreciable concentrations of either explosive compounds or metals.

Question – Randy Hurst – [During the geophysical surveys within the grids] as you go along and you detect anomalies, or pieces of frag, you don't immediately pick it up, you just report the information, you just analyze it? And then decide whether or not to blow it up?

John Gerhard – From the time we collect the geophysical data until we dig it is probably a week before that data can be processed and compared to the known values to determine what sort of munitions are present. We actually dig items that are below what we think are munitions just to confirm that we are not missing anything.

Marty Holmes – The field teams work together. We also don't know the results until after we dig on the object.

Question – Randy Hurst – So the operator doesn't know?

John Gerhard – No. We are putting corners into our grid corners and we are also putting a 2 by 8-inch pipe nipple that is buried by the Corps as a validation of our instrument detection as a Quality Control check to see if we have found those items.

Question – Joan Renninger – How many have you detonated?

John Gerhard – We have six UXO items so far and all six have been detonated.

Question – Joan Renninger – Is the Game Commission relatively happy with what you are doing in SGL?

Jo Anderson – They seem satisfied with what is going on out there.

Kim Harriz – What was the disposition of the primers? Were they disposed of as well?

John Gerhard – No, they are in our possession. We will be disposing of them before the end of the project, preferably in one shot with other times we may find.

Marty Holmes – They are small primers, about the size of a 22 shell.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – I have one here—a souvenir from my first 155 round. They were fired a long time ago. It contains about enough powder, like a 30-caliber carbine round, less than a 30/30 rifle, though. They are generally harmless unless you beat on the primer.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Robert Doren – Given that you are following a particular grid, was there any special effort made to check the common foot paths, the bike trail, or any of those areas where people commonly go? Or are you just crossing your own grid?

John Gerhard – We cleared the rail trail and we investigated the Stony Creek early on in the field work. We mapped the Appalachian Trail with the geophysical equipment. The data have not been processed or compared to the grid data yet, but my understanding is that the number of anomalies was relatively low. If the project team chooses to dig anomalies or items of interest there, we would include the Appalachian Trail.

Kim Harriz – Right now we are doing an investigation of where the munitions are. We are actually not clearing anything. None of the work that we are doing constitutes clearance. Once the investigation is finished, and we define where we think the munitions are, then we'll make the determination of whether further removal activities may need to be conducted and where those removal activities can be focused. An analysis of what we are going to do will be part of a feasibility study. Input into that process from the community is welcomed. Your ideas regarding what you think we ought to be doing will definitely be captured in future meetings.

I just want to emphasize that our effort as part of the remedial investigation phase is not to clear or make anything safe. Nothing is safe out there. Every single area still has the potential of having unexploded ordnance. We are just trying to find the areas most likely to contain ordnance.

Question – Robert Doren – I understand that part. I was just asking about specifically investigating along the Appalachian Trail.

John Gerhard – To answer your question, we may have crossed other trails with those transects, but we did not specifically follow along the trails.

Marty Holmes – We did follow the river (Stony Creek).

Question – Did field workers find any of the plants that they were looking for?

John Gerhard – They found the holly. To my knowledge, they have not found any of the netted chain fern or the minniebush. We have a biologist who will be on-site 2 days this week checking the grids to make sure we have not missed any.

Question – Are you actually giving the Game Commission the non-ammunition metal items you are removing?

John Gerhard – The National Guard Bureau has a special land use permit to access the State Game Lands 211. As part of that permit, all non-munitions related items are turned over to the Game Commission. They have indicated that they don't really have an interest in the items. We have to do further coordination there, but I believe that they will allow another institution to take over them.

Question – Where are the items now?

John Gerhard – They are under WESTON's control. Nothing has been done with them yet.

Question – Is Scott Bills the contact for anyone interested in the potential of those items being of historic value?

Jo Anderson – Scott Bills at the Game Commission is the person that I am talking to about it. He has indicated that he would like to see any railroad items donated to a local museum. We will meet to discuss other items so that Scott can see everything that was collected.

Question – I understand you cleared out six UXOs? Because this lady over here was saying that this is only the identification phase. Why did you take six of them out?

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

John Gerhard – The six UXO items were discovered when we traversed the 300-foot spaced transects with the instrumentation. We have to follow certain procedures when we come across an unexploded ordnance. Once personnel have made a determination that that an item is a UXO, we have to take care of that item that day or stand watch on the item itself. If it's disposable, we turn it over to the appropriate authorities. On this project, we are handling both the detonation and disposal of those items.

Question – During the actual clearing phase, is there the possibility of other UXO yet to be found?

John Gerhard – Of all the work that we have done out there, those are the only UXO we have come across. It doesn't mean that there aren't any more. These are 300-foot spaced transects. We're trying to get a better idea in some higher density areas and we'll be doing additional analog transects to try to define the areas where we think there are more items. There may or may not be more items.

Kim Harriz – Yes. They are just looking at a statistical sample of the area to determine what the density of items is. And taking care of items is part of that investigation. They're removing them. Those items are cleared, but the area associated with them is not considered by the Department of Defense (DOD) as cleared. This is just an investigation. They take the items they find as they go, but again, they are only looking at 10-foot swaths at 300-foot spacing, so there's another 290 feet on either side that they haven't investigated.

Question – Joan Renninger – Once you finish this process, how long before they have enough data so they can say there are some more items and we should go back and look again? A year?

John Gerhard – No. We're envisioning the field work for the investigation running through May 21st. Then we will write a remedial investigation report that will explain where we have higher density, where we don't think we have problems, and where we may have problems. There will be another report that will assess the risk to human health and the environment from an explosive safety standpoint and also from the analytical data from some of the sampling we conducted.

Question – Joan Renninger – Does this take long to do?

John Gerhard – I believe the remedial investigation report will be finished by March 2011. I think, Joan, you are asking how long until we know an ultimate endpoint?

Question – Joan Renninger – Yes.

Kim Harriz – There won't be any other field work as part of the investigation after they leave at the end of May. In the Report John said is due in March, WESTON will give us an assessment of where they think the munitions are and the potential density of other unexploded ordnance. We found six unexploded ordnance items and we found four little primers in a hole. I don't know what percentage of the area we've actually investigated. A 10-foot swath out of 300 feet is about 3 percent.

John Gerhard – I think with the geophysics methods included, we're at about 5 to 6 percent.

Kim Harriz – We've only investigated a small percentage of the site and we've found six unexploded ordnance items. If you extrapolate that, that indicates there are more unexploded ordnance items out there to be found. That would be a focus of the feasibility study to determine what additional steps need to be done to mitigate what might be an explosive hazard that could affect human health. We'll have an area where we think there is a potential for unexploded ordnance, and WESTON will propose different alternatives and evaluate those alternatives to clean it up. That's one of the decisions to be made. We'll choose one of those alternatives, we'll propose that to the community, and then the community will weigh in on what alternative they would like to see done. Because we've found unexploded ordnance items and we've only surveyed a percentage of the area, we can't say that there aren't any other unexploded ordnance items out there. We are reasonably certain that there are. Now, if we've only found six, I'm not saying there are hundreds and hundreds of them, but that is something that WESTON will be making

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

some sort of an assessment of in the Remedial Investigation Report. We may start the feasibility study sooner than we may have anticipated because we won't wait for the remedial investigation to be finished before we start the feasibility study. I could see the end of the feasibility study being at the end of 2011. Then within a year, we'll probably choose an alternative and work with the group on making a final decision on what that alternative would be. That's the end of 2012. That would make it 2013 and 2014, when whatever measure we decided to do would be implemented. Because of community involvement and the regulatory review that is required, and because all this has to be documented, and, obviously, even we have internal review drafts that have to be incorporated as part of the process, it takes a while.

Question – They will never say in a million years that it's all cleared.

Kim Harriz – He makes a good point. We will not ever be able to say it because we are not going to investigate 100% of the area. So we will never make a statement that there are no unexploded ordnance out there – ever. We will only be able to say that we addressed the human health risk to a standard that should be acceptable to the community. That's why we need you to weigh in on whatever alternative is chosen. There is a possibility that we could post the entire area through the rest of the use time. In addition to the removal action that you might want us to do or whatever measures would be taken, even then we may want to post the area to indicate to people that there is a potential for unexploded ordnance being discovered and that they should follow the 3Rs – recognize, retreat, and report. Even if we do a removal action, and say, as far as we know, we got everything, we'll never be able to say 100 percent of the unexploded ordnance was removed

Question – Joan Renninger – And this will follow, in other words, the pattern of other installations that you've done? You just get to a point where you think you've got as much as you can and then you will post signs, but you never declare it, really complete, because nobody does.

Kim Harriz – Yes. I don't know of any site we've condemned. Dudded impact areas often have restricted uses, but those are areas that are under installation control. In other words, if this area were like the Fort Indiantown Gap impact area or a dudded impact area, the Department of Defense would never allow that area outside their control to be used for residential housing. That's just not a land use that would be permitted, since the Department of Defense owns that land. We don't own the Pennsylvania State Game Lands 211. It's not a dudded impact area. I don't know under any circumstances where it has been declared before that a public property would have a restricted use or it couldn't be used by the public.

John Gerhard – There's been projects where the Department of Defense has sifted soil to large depths to clear munitions. Those projects are very expensive. They have a very high price tag associated with that type of work. It is generally associated in an area where there is a community or the future land use would be for housing and high traffic volume.

Question – There's layers of impacts from and they are layered over areas like that in some places.

Kim Harriz – Yes, but even then that would be under certain rules, because in area where UXO is known or suspected to remain, there would likely be restrictions on intrusive activities. For instance Camp Edwards, Massachusetts is a dudded impact area that has thousands of unexploded ordnance. It is land rented from the State of Massachusetts by the federal government. The lease ends in 2050. When the lease was instituted in the early 1900s, it was incorporated into the lease that the government was to remove all the scrap metal as a condition for turning over the land. Based on the current technology, the Department of Defense would comply with that lease if, in fact, the State of Massachusetts requested us to. But that would require us bulldozing the entire 2,200 acre Impact Area and physically removing the unexploded ordnance down to 4 feet. Then it would be cleared. That probably would cost millions of dollars and wouldn't be what the State of Massachusetts would want. But even that property, that is not under the

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

National Guard's control, is not property that we are going to declare as condemned. We are doing a cleanup that is related to a water quality issue, and not really to the munitions themselves. So one of the alternatives they talked about for use of that land, which has a high density of unexploded ordnance, is actually using it as a wildlife refuge and putting up raised boardwalks so people can appreciate it as a wildlife refuge but not encounter unexploded ordnance. Even if you have a lot of unexploded ordnance, it doesn't mean that the land is condemned for only military use. If the land is owned by the federal government and is a duded impact area that would cost millions and millions of dollars to clean up, it is unlikely that the government is going to release that land for unrestricted land use.

Question – You keep speaking of alternatives. At the very first meeting, I was under the impression they were going to clear this area, period. They were going to check all 8,000 acres, not 10 feet for every 300 feet and then skip 290 feet. Are you saying that it is not going to be that way?

Kim Harriz – Not as part of the investigation. That could be an alternative that is considered as part of the feasibility study and it certainly could be an alternative that is proposed. I think, based on our remedial investigation, if we did something like that, we wouldn't really consider the area to the northwest, since we haven't really discovered anything out there. And so the likelihood that they would discover something, based on our statistical sampling, shows the odds are pretty low. That is certainly a scenario where they could do the analog surveys or geophysical areas throughout the entire acreage that is identified as relatively high density munitions areas. That is certainly an alternative that will be evaluated. That will also be very expensive.

Question – So one of the alternatives could be that we feel this still isn't safe for recreation use? That could be an alternative?

Kim Harriz – It certainly will be an alternative that's evaluated—100 percent removal.

John Gerhard – I think we would evaluate that alternative. I'm not saying that it is not safe to use that area recreationally, it just means there's a risk in which the government, including the state regulators, may not be comfortable.

Kim Harriz – You are safely using, hopefully, the land right now. The only thing is, you are not supposed to touch **unexploded** ordnance and the risk is primarily from picking it up. We don't have an estimate of what the density of the unexploded ordnance may be yet, because we haven't finished our study, but a reasonable alternative is simply posting the land and letting people know there is a risk out there and they need to be aware and not pick up munitions items. That is a very reasonable and not uncommon mitigation method that is used.

Question – I think that is probably the biggest concern of everybody here. We wouldn't be here if it weren't. We don't want that as an alternative. Not to be able to use that the way we are now. But I noticed just in the last month that the Gap has posted signs that they never had up before and has impact areas right against the State Game Lands. New signs that they just recently put up. And they are going out right across the top of the mountain.

Question – Jim Rice – Lt. Col. Cleaver, I have one quick question. According to your EIS, in 2002, you said 29 out of 32 ranges needed waivers. You did not have an adequate fan. Every year you review it and you renew your waivers. How many ranges to date out there are waived?

Lt. Col. Cleaver – I'd have to check it. I don't think that there's any now. Once we took over, we reoriented the ranges or we closed them. I don't think that they are. We'll check and I'll get you the answer.

Later in the meeting, Lt. Col. Cleaver verified that all legacy ranges operate on waivers: there are 22.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – What about the Multi-Purpose Training Range (MPTR)?

Lt. Col. Cleaver – There is no waiver since the MPTR was only a proposed project that is not moving forward.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – Have you ever walked around Gettysburg, Antietam? Any Civil War battlefield? Or any battlefield for that matter, [if so], you have walked on unexploded ordnance.

Kim Harriz – The only reason they are not sites that we are investigating is that battlefields are specifically excluded under the regulation which says that we have to investigate areas like the Pennsylvania State Game Lands 211. I want to go back to the feasibility discussion. I don't want us to jump forward too much and say what alternatives we will propose or what is going to be decided. That is something that is going to be further down the road. We have to first finish the investigation. There will be a number of different alternatives that are looked at. The posting is just one of them. Like I said, we will look at nearly 100 percent removal, as well, as an alternative. There is going to be an alternative, as required under the CERCLA process, that there is no action. There are a series of alternatives that will be addressed. You'll have the opportunity to review the report that discusses all the alternatives. There will be a proposed plan where the National Guard chooses the alternative that they think is the best, based on listening to you in these kinds of meetings and listening to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. That proposed plan will have a 30-day comment period where the community can send in comments that the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection will review. That is when you can say here's what we think needs to be done. Those comments absolutely will be factored into what the final solution will be.

Question – That's why I said last time, nobody has ever gotten blown up back there. So that's on our side. We only want to see Stony Valley saved and nobody's ever gotten hurt.

Discussion of Community Interest Group or Technical Advisory Committee or Restoration

Advisory Board – Deb Volkmer reviewed the options of Community Interest Group, Technical Advisory Committee or Restoration Advisory Board and explained the voting procedure.

Short break for meeting attendees to informally discuss organizational possibilities and vote.

Those present voted to table the vote on organizational possibilities until the June meeting. The organizational presentation will be posted on the website. The Restoration Advisory Board Rulebook is already on the website.

Overview of Munitions Recovered – John Gerhard and Marty Holmes, WESTON Project Manager and Senior UXO Supervisor (SUXOS)/Site Manager, presented an overview of the munitions found on-site. A handout listing the items found was provided and posted on the website. The following items were displayed and discussed.

- 37-mm M55A1 practice projectile
- 37-mm M80 armor piercing projectile
- 57-mm M70 armor piercing projectile
- 60-mm Mortar M721 illumination
- 81-mm Mortar M879 practice mortar
- 81-mm Mortar M301A2 illumination
- 75-mm M339 armor piercing projectile
- 105-mm M467 practice high explosive tracer (training projectile)
- 105-mm M392 armor piercing discarding sabot
- 105-mm M490 and M490A1 practice anti-tank projectiles
- 105-mm M314 illumination projectiles and canisters
- 4.2-inch M335 illumination projectile
- 155-mm M118 illumination projectiles
- 155-mm and 105-mm illumination canisters
- 155-mm M107 projectile (empty)
- 165-mm M623 practice high explosive plastic (training projectile)
- Fragmentation from a high explosive munitions

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Were most of the UXOs 75-mm HE?

John Gerhard – Yes. All of the ones we have disposed of in place have been 75-mm high explosive rounds.

Question – Do you have dummy ones that you could bring next time?

John Gerhard – We do not.

Marty Holmes – We have 75-mm shrapnel rounds.

Kim Harriz – We could find other types.

Question – Just so we could recognize them.

Kim Harriz – You need to recognize them all. Just because those are the only ones we've found to date doesn't mean that we couldn't find some other items that might be energetic. They found 155-mm high explosive round, too, in State Game Lands 211.

Marty Holmes – That is correct. It was actually found on Second Mountain Trail.

Question – Does the illumination round fall with a parachute?

Marty Holmes – Yes, with a parachute. This is actually the candle itself. It will actually come out of here. This cable at one time had a parachute attached to it. So when the projectile and the fuze functions, it actually lights candle and pushes it out the back end.

Question – Does it contain phosphorus?

Marty Holmes – It's not phosphorus.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – I believe it is magnesium.

Marty Holmes – Yes, I believe it is magnesium. Phosphorus does not burn very bright.

John Gerhard – Once again, follow the 3 R's - recognize, retreat, and report.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – It is a problem at larger installations. People actually do go out and risk their lives collecting stuff.

Marty Holmes – It is important that he mentioned risking their life. They are munitions. And you go up there with a, nowadays, it would be a cordless drill with a cutting bit on it. And you have created everything that's needed to cause an explosion – heat, shock, and friction.

Question – Sam Varnicle, WESTON – If they come across something out there, you said they should report it. Who should they report it to?

Marty Holmes – Call 911. Mark the location as well as you can. Recognize it, retreat, and then report it to 911. 911 will contact the nearest EOD unit and EOD will come and take care of it. Even if UXO is found on the Gap, they call EOD. The EOD unit is out of Aberdeen Proving Ground. They have already responded one time while we were here for the 155 round that was found on Second Mountain Trail. We actually met up with EOD and escorted them down into the area.

Question – Have you seen any snakes?

Marty Holmes – We've seen rattlesnakes. I don't know whether we've seen any black snakes. I believe we've come across 12 rattlesnakes.

Question – You don't kill them?

Marty Holmes – No.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Kim Harriz – I see the background [of the 165-mm HEP round] is painted blue, but it is kind of mangled. Is it an HE round or is it a practice round?

Marty Holmes – It was a practice round. Again, blue does mean practice or training rounds, but blue does not mean it is safe. A lot of people get that confused. Most of the rounds that had the spotting charges are usually something that needs to be seen from a distance. Planes that dropped the Mark 4, the 2,000 lb pound that the Air Force drops.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – The Mark 82 is a 500-pounder. The ones that dropped out there are called BDU 33s. They have an edge about like this. They have a frangible tail fin on them and it has some type of white phosphorus charge in it.

Marty Holmes – It is actually a good sized charge. We've had guys who do what I do get hurt with those simply because of carelessness. They take those rounds for granted. It is an easy check. There is a little hole in the side. They don't do it. They pick them up, go to throw them into the bin where they are collecting them all, and they function. It is a big spotting charge. You can tell when they fall over backwards. They are pretty dangerous. The Mark 84 is a 2,000-pound bomb. The spot charge on that is 5 pounds of explosives.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – The BDU 33 and charge, if not blocked by trees, can easily be seen over a kilometer away.

John Gerhard – Just for reference, do you know how many pounds of explosive there are in the 155?

Marty Holmes – I want to say the 155 has 30 lbs of explosive.

Question – Jerry Eversmeyer – It's 30 pounds.

Kim Harriz – How many pounds are in the 75s we found?

Marty Holmes – There are 1.47 lbs of TNT inside a 75. It's a cast explosive. Back in the '40s and '50s, they used to steam out explosives in some facilities. If you steam it, it liquefies and comes out, then once it comes out, it goes back to a cast form.

Question – When you find one that you blow in place, what kind of sandbags do you use? Some kind of fine gravel?

Marty Holmes – We are using limestone sand.

Question – The bags are sometimes nylon mesh. Is that biodegradable?

Marty Holmes – It is not. We clean up our shots. We did do one shot where some of the bags got hung up in the trees. We are just waiting for Mother Nature to blow them down. We'll go back out to those locations again and make sure everything is cleaned up.

Question – Mr. Larry Herr asked me if I would give you these photographs where you have not cleaned up.

Marty Holmes – This is one of the locations where these bags were actually in the trees at that time. They are down now.

Question – I'm just letting you know.

John Gerhard – I was able to participate in one of the detonations and it is amazing. They put somewhere in the order of 50 to 60 sandbags on these items and when you come back, you have sandbags 30 feet up in the air and maybe 40 or 50 feet and further away, and they are completely demolished. There are phenomenal explosive pressure waves and force when you detonate them.

**Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA
May 5, 2010 • East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA**

Question – Joan Renninger – What do you put on top?

Marty Holmes – We use a safe shot, similar to what they use in the high explosive rounds. They are no bigger than a shot glass. And it pushes a hole right through the metal and puts the main charge in the back.

Question – Joan Renninger – Did they have active explosives in them?

Marty Holmes – Yes. When 155s are being blown up, we use a lot more sandbags.

Question – You said the illumination round had a parachute. What were the parachutes made of? Do you ever find any of them?

Marty Holmes – The parachutes are made of nylon. We actually had one illumination round that was dangling in the trees. We were unable to get it down.

Question – Joan Renninger – Did you find anything explosive?

Marty Holmes – The primers were the only explosive items (referencing Cold Springs Area).

Question – Joan Renninger – Why didn't you blow them up?

Marty Holmes – We will blow them up when we dispose of any other rounds we find. The charge in them is so small that we are able to store them instead of disposing of them immediately.

Announcements – Jo Anderson – I don't have any announcements except that we will vote next month on June 2. If there are presentations that any of you might be interested in, please let us know.

Kim Harriz – We are running out of ideas for presentations. If you think of any presentations other than the field update that you might like to talk about, either let us know now or email Deb Volkmer and we will see what we can do.

Question – Can you possibly demonstrate a live detonation?

John Gerhard – I can show a video of a demolition of a Tobyhanna detonation.

Jo Anderson – It is not a SGL 211 video, but it is a detonation.

John Gerhard provided a video demonstration of an in-place detonation performed at Tobyhanna Formerly Used Defense Site.

Jo Anderson – At the last meeting, somebody had asked to see copies of the field artillery permit and waiver letters from years ago for SGL 211. We have copies here.

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

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Agenda
- Appendix B Field Work Update
- Appendix C Comparison of Organizations (Community Interest Group, Technical Review Committee, Restoration Advisory Board)
- Appendix D Overview of Munitions Recovered
- Appendix E Photographs of Munitions Displayed at the May 5, 2010 Meeting