



Technical Project Planning Meeting #3 – January 20, 2017
Remedial Investigation, Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, Texas

A stakeholder Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting for the Remedial Investigation (RI) at the Closed Castner Firing Range (Castner Range) was held on January 20, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Radisson Hotel - El Paso Airport, El Paso, Texas.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review and confirm TPP Meeting #2 conclusions;
- Present summary of field work performed to date and preliminary results
 - Munitions and Explosives of Concern Mmunition and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Investigation
 - Mmunition Constituents (MC) Investigation
- Discuss remaining field work
- Discuss RI Report
- Review remaining schedule

The meeting attendees included the following:

Name	Organization
Mike Bowlby	United States Army Environmental Command (AEC)
Eric Kirwan	United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Rick Smith	USACE
Frank Roepke	USACE
Mike Slavens	USACE
Victor Garcia	Fort Bliss DPW-E
Ron Baca	Fort Bliss PB & A
Robert Gilliam	TCEQ Region 6
Allan Posnick	TCEQ – Austin
Ruth Winsor	TCEQ – Austin
Sarah Alder-Schaller	PIKA-ARCADIS JV
Garett Ferguson	PIKA-ARCADIS JV
Mike Madl	PIKA-ARCADIS JV
Steve Stacy	PIKA-ARCADIS JV
Marilyn Guida	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Judy Ackerman	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Thomas Robinson	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Pat White	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Janae Reneaud Field	Frontera Land Alliance
Jamie Ackerman	TPMN
Dr. Cesar Mendez	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
Stephanie Acosta	Office of Congressman O'Rourke
Laurence Gibson	Sierra Club
David Evans	Citizen
Matt Leveque	UXO Pro
Guy Volb	Fort Bliss PAO
Richard Teschner	Castner Range Conservation Committee
Richard Langford	Fort Bliss (not legible)



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
 UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
 UNITED STATES ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND
 FORT BLISS



Name	Organization
Scott Cutler	Frontera Land Alliance
Mike Blondell	Fort Bliss Garrison Safety
Cathy Conti	NA
Joe Conti	North Hill Neighborhood Association
Vicki Hamilton	NA
Christi DeBates	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Joe Molinar	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
William Kilmer	Mahorsky Group
Aliris Lopez	Legislative Intern
David Pentland	USAG Safety
Lois Balin	TPWD
Charles Turner	Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition
Richard Solis	NA
Jose Barriga	Citizen

Mr. Ron Baca, Fort Bliss Directorate of Public Works – Environmental Division (DPW-E) began the meeting by welcoming everyone to the technical project planning meeting. He introduced Mr. Mike Madl, the project manager for the PIKA-ARCADIS Joint Venture (JV), the contractor conducting the RI. Mr. Madl briefly discussed the meeting agenda and overall meeting goals. He noted the purpose of this third TPP meeting was to provide an interim update on the progress of the work, focusing on the results of the MEC and Phase 1 MC investigations completed to date.

Mr. Madl then continued the meeting by leading an introduction of Army project team members, regulatory stakeholders, the JV team, and local stakeholders. Local stakeholders were asked to introduce themselves and their organization. Mr. Madl noted key definitions and acronyms were provided as a handout that would be used throughout the presentation.

Mr. Madl summarized topics covered in TPP Meeting #2 and presented the project activities completed since that meeting. Mr. Madl went on to describe RI project objectives and the JV’s general approach.

Mr. Madl then turned the presentation over to Mr. Stacy to discuss the specifics of the MEC field investigation that was completed from February to July 2016. Mr. Stacy provided a review of the RI technical approach (e.g., focusing the current field work on the non-concentrated munitions use areas (NCMUAs), data gaps from previous investigations, and the boundaries of the CMUAs defined to date. He then reviewed the MEC investigation phases which included:

- Phase 1 (slopes >30%) – Investigation of 70 acres via instrument-assisted visual surveys (IAVS).
- Phase 2a (slopes <30%) – Investigation of 1750 100-foot Wide Area Assessment (WAA) transects to reacquire anomalies and investigate using hand tools.
- Phase 2b (slopes <30%) – Digital Geophysical Mapping Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) Grid investigation designed by Unexploded Ordinance (UXO)



- Estimator program. Twenty-two grids investigated and all anomalies investigated using hand tools.
- Phase 2c (slopes <30%) – Investigation of 1,002 analog mag and dig 100-foot transects using EMI sensors and investigated using hand tools.
 - Phase 3 (slopes >30%) – Analog mag and dig investigation in IAVS areas where anomaly densities were found to be greater than 300 anomalies/acre. Transects were used to determine the nature and extent of MEC within potential CMUAs.

As discussed in TPP Meeting #2, the investigation area planned totaled 29.8 acres, using these investigation approaches. The actual field investigation covered 33.6 acres, resulting in additional data to be used in the evaluation.

Mr. Stacy then presented the results of all phases of the RI investigation using a series of figures that depicted the MEC and other munitions debris found during the RI field work, and then the total amount of material found when factoring in past investigations and removal actions. He noted that six additional MEC items were found in the NCMUA areas investigated during the RI field effort.

As a result of the MEC found and density of other munitions debris, the boundaries of several existing CMUAs are recommended for expansion; three new CMUAs are recommended to be added within the Munitions Response Site. No additional investigation is required, as the MEC density is expected to exceed the original assumptions, and sufficient data is available to calculate new MEC densities for the NCMUAs.

Mr. Allan Posnick, TCEQ, asked about the total number of DGM grids that were investigated. Mr. Stacy clarified that 30 total DGM grid investigations were performed. Mr. Posnick then noted that two of the six MEC items were located in DGM grids, and asked whether the MEC density is better correlated to DGM grid investigations rather than DGM transect investigations. Mr. Stacy noted that even with these finds, there is still a higher MEC density from investigations using the WAA DGM transects than compared to the DGM grid investigations, but that both were useful tools in determining MEC density. Mr. Stacy also noted that these six MEC items were found in NCMUAs, and that a much greater number of MEC have been located within CMUAs.

A TPP stakeholder asked whether the property where the Border Patrol and archaeological museums are located had been cleared of MEC. Mr. Mike Bowlby, USAEC, noted that the Army had transferred the land to the City of El Paso, which included a recommendation of restricting its land use. Later, Mr. Richard Teschner asked whether there was any past data on MEC finds near the Border Patrol Museum. While the JV did not have any information related to this, Allan Posnick noted he had been involved with a USACE Albuquerque District project here; his recollection was that no MEC was found, but that small arms in the hundreds of pounds may have been removed.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
UNITED STATES ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND
FORT BLISS



Mr. Richard Teschner asked whether munition items were migrating down from the mountains to the flatter terrain areas on Castner Range. Mr. Bowlby confirmed that this migration pathway did appear to be occurring.

Another TPP member asked about the understanding of the past training activities that might have occurred within Fusselman Canyon. Mr. Stacy stated that most of the range fans were located on the east end of Castner Range, and that some may have pointed toward the canyon, but that a specific range had not been established inside the canyon. This will be further evaluated in the RI report.

A TPP member asked whether the hand grenades located within new CMUA 23 were practice or high explosive. Mr. Mike Slavens, USACE Ordnance and Explosives Safety Specialist (OESS), stated that no grenades were found that would be considered MEC, but that fragmentation from high explosive grenades has been found there, so there is confirmation on their use in this location.

Mr. Posnick asked: how big do metallic fragments need to be in order to determine whether they are associated with munitions? Mr. Slavens stated that it depends on the munition item. For example, a MK2 grenade is designed to break into fragments about a square inch in size, but a larger item with a thick body would break into much larger pieces. In many cases the metal is small enough that a UXO technician cannot be sure.

With regard to the conclusion that no additional investigation is warranted since the NCMUAs appear to have more than 0.1 MEC/acre; Mr. Posnick asked whether the few MEC finds we made during the RI field work were enough to make a deviation from the 0.1 MEC/acre metric? Mr. Stacy stated yes; even finding one MEC item in an NCMUA area would change this MEC density value. Mr. Eric Kirwan, USACE geophysicist, asked if the JV had rerun the MEC density calculation assuming that four of the six MEC were now located in expanded CMUA boundaries, leaving two MEC in the NCMUAs. Mr. Stacy indicated the calculation had been run, and estimated it at 0.3 MEC/acre. He also noted that when we move to reporting the results in the RI Report, this revised MEC density would be finalized using UXO Estimator at a 95 percent confidence level and would be described in the RI Report.

A TPP member asked that after the MEC density analysis is complete, would the value apply across the entire extent of Castner Range? He pointed out that no MEC and little munitions debris had been found in the southwest corner of Castner Range and wondered whether the MEC density would still apply at this portion of the site. Mr. Stacy confirmed that it would, but that the RI report would pull in qualitative data to provide further input on future remedial objectives for areas such as this.

Several TPP members asked whether munitions were found in other arroyos that might be leading eastward to the property boundary. The JV confirmed some items had been found in the locations where investigations had occurred.



Following a short break, the MC RI field investigation findings were presented by Ms. Sarah Alder-Schaller, the JV Regulatory Specialist. She reviewed the RI program elements, including the Incremental Sampling Methodology (ISM) for surface soil sampling, discrete soil sampling of berms, and sediment and surface water samples from the arroyos and seeps located on Castner Range.

Phase I included the area wide horizontal delineation with collection of 149 ISM surface soil sample locations in one-acre decision units. The samples were sent to an analytical laboratory and analyzed for explosives and metals; some additional samples included perchlorate analysis (at locations where rockets had been used). The analytical results from the samples were compared with human health (direct contact) and ecological screening levels to determine potential exposure exceedances of the protective concentration levels (PCLs). Ms. Alder-Schaller noted that only six of the 149 sampling locations had analytical results exceeding a PCL for a metallic constituent of concern (COC). Very few detections of explosive COCs were encountered, and none exceeded the PCLs.

Phase II will include ISM sampling at the new CMUAs and around the six exceedances identified, based on the Phase I data. All samples collected around the new CMUAs will be analyzed for metals, and 10 percent of the samples will be analyzed for explosives. Samples collected in “step out” locations around the six exceedances from Phase 1 will be analyzed only for the COC that exceeded the screening level PCLs.

Phase II sample collection will include sampling for sediment and berm locations based on Phase I exceedances. Sediment “step-outs” will be located upstream and downstream of exceedances and will be analyzed for only the COCs that exceeded in Phase I. Phase II sampling related to berm locations will be conducted at the four berm locations showing exceedances in Phase I to delineate the surface soils and will only be analyzed for lead. No surface water will be collected during the upcoming Phase II event as both a Phase I and II surface water samples were collected in 2016.

The following questions were asked during discussion of the MC RI program elements:

- Why did the JV collect surface water samples more than 48-hours after a rain event? Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that it is in a surface water guidance document as any water flows within 48-hours of a rain event is considered storm water and would not represent actual exposure conditions to people, plants and animals during this period.
- Are ecological screening levels lower than human health screening levels? Ms. Alder-Schaller stated yes, ecological screening levels are less than human health screening levels.
- Several sediment sampling locations appear to be on ridges and not within arroyos. Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that the aerial imagery can be deceiving but all sediment samples were located within arroyo drainages.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
UNITED STATES ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND
FORT BLISS



- Ms. Ruth Winsor asked if JV will consider fixed lab data to confirm X-Ray Fluorescence's (XRF) sampling during the soil boring selection process. Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that the JV is not relying on XRF data but could possibly take a split sample and send to a fixed lab for analysis.
- Mr. Teschner asked how much clearance of vegetation is needed to make roads to drill wells and how much damage to vegetation will occur at Castner? Mr. Garrett Ferguson stated that a track-mounted rig will be utilized to drill wells in off-road locations. The JV will use existing trails and roads as much as possible to limit vegetation damage while mobilizing to drilling locations.
- Are there any shallow wells near Castner? Mr. Ferguson stated that there are wells to 400+ feet deep around Castner Range but no shallow wells are known to be installed in or around Castner Range.
- How are ecological screening levels (benchmarks) defined? Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that they are developed for both flora and fauna; the most conservative levels are used for comparisons.

Following the completion of the MC investigation elements, Mr. Madl presented information on the development of the RI Report, updating the Conceptual Site Model, reporting on the nature and extent of MEC and MC, preparation of the Human Health Risk Assessment and Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment, preparation of the MEC Hazard Assessment, and updating the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol. Mr. Madl presented the upcoming schedule for Castner Range noting that a Restoration Advisory Board meeting is likely in April 2017 with the TPP #4 in May 2017. The draft RI report is expected in May 2017 with a public meeting in July or August 2017.

- Ms. Judy Ackerman asked if the slides and meeting minutes will be provided to the stakeholders. Mr. Mike Bowlby stated that they will be provided and are available through the Fort Bliss PAO. Mr. Ron Baca stated that the slides used will have all names removed and then will be published. Contact for receiving these files is Ms. Sylvia Waggoner.
- Would the JV be able to provide larger graphics and topographical maps? These would be more beneficial to the meeting attendees. Mr. Madl stated that for TPP#4 the JV would move to a LIDAR background similar to the CMUA 23 slide. The Army will be providing the slides after the meeting where the items would be more readily visible than the handouts. He also encouraged the TPP members to review the posters of the MEC and MC investigation results, which were posted outside the meeting room.
- Ms. Ackerman asked if money had been "POM'd" (Department of Defense term for funding plans) for the clearance of Castner Range? Mr. Mike Bowlby stated that the final land use still needs to be determined by stakeholders and HQ Army to assist in the development of the Feasibility Study and possible Remedial Action alternatives. Based on the collaborative efforts, leading up to and in conjunction



with the Feasibility Study, appropriate levels of Remedial Action will be determined and subsequently budgeted for in the out years. Mr. Allan Posnick stated that the TCEQ will work with the Army as they do not want to stall the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) process.

- Based on Figure 51 (sediment sampling locations), water is flowing off Castner Range under Highway 54 into residential neighborhoods. Will this require cleanup since Castner Range is polluting the water? Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that the screening levels are for delineation of contamination and not actual cleanup levels.
- A stakeholder requested samples at the edge of the Castner Range boundary to confirm no MC are leaving the installation. Ms. Alder-Schaller stated that surface water was not observed and storm water flows are outside the JV's scope of work. Mr. Madl stated that two samples were collected within CMUAs (areas with the highest potential to have MC contamination) with results less than the screening levels, indicating offsite migration was not likely in the other arroyos.
- A stakeholder asked if contamination has been found within a storm water ponding area southeast of the Castner Range. Mr. Mike Bowlby stated that he believes previous contractors investigated this pond location. Mr. Eric Kirwan stated that soil sampling was conducted east of Highway 54 and all results were below the screening levels. He was unsure if sampling took place in ponds but noted that samples were collected from arroyos and other locations downstream that were most likely to contain contamination from the ponds themselves, if any existed.
- A stakeholder asked what the storm water impacts to El Paso is for the flows leaving Castner Range. Mr. Madl stated that this is unknown to the JV. Mr. Ron Baca stated that the El Paso Water Public Service Board has information regarding storm water flows. The stakeholder stated none of the agencies can do anything due to the MEC on Castner Range. Mr. Mike Bowlby stated that the current contract (Castner Range RI) does not cover that type of analysis. A separate study and contract would need to be awarded for that type of effort if it was determined that there was an environmental concern or impact.

With no further questions, Mr. Madl thanked the stakeholders for attending and adjourned the meeting at 12:30 pm.

The following stakeholders were invited to this meeting but did not attend:

Name	Organization
Judge Veronica Escobar	El Paso County Judge
Senator Jose Rodriguez	Texas State Senate, District 29
Representative Mary Gonzalez	Texas House of Representatives, District 75
Representative Marisa Marques	Texas House of Representatives, District 77
Representative Joe Moody	Texas House of Representatives, District 78



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
UNITED STATES ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL COMMAND
FORT BLISS



Name	Organization
Representative Joe Pickett	Texas House of Representatives, District 79
Mayor Oscar Leeser	Mayor, City of El Paso
Dr. Carlos Rincon	U.S. EPA Region 6 Border Office Director
Annette Gutierrez	Rio Grande Council of Governments
Representative Emma Acosta	El Paso District 3
Representative Carl Robinson	El Paso District 4
Representative Michiel Noe	El Paso District 5
Representative Claudia Ordaz	El Paso District 6
Representative Lily Limon	El Paso District 7
Representative Cortney Niland	El Paso District 8
Commissioner Carlos Leon	El Paso County Commissioner, Precinct 1
President Frederick Chino, Sr.	Mescalero Apache Tribe
Chairman Jeff Houser	Fort Sill Apache
Chairman Ron Twohatchet	Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma
Javier Loera	Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo