### Closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation

Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting #3 19 January 2017 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM





# Meeting Agenda

- Meeting Goals
- Remedial Investigation (RI) Project Objectives
- Review of Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting #2
- RI Status
  - Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Investigation
    - Work Completed
    - Results
  - Munitions Constituents (MC) Investigation
    - Work Performed to Date
    - Results
    - Phase 2 Activities
- RI Report
- Schedule
- Questions and Follow-Up Items



# Safety Moment







# **Meeting Goals**

- Review TPP Meeting #2 conclusions
- Present summary of field work performed to date and preliminary results:
  - MEC Investigation
  - MC Investigation
- Discuss remaining field work
- Discuss RI Report
- Review remaining schedule







# **RI Project Objectives**



- Overall Goal:
  - Gather sufficient information to determine the nature and extent of MEC / MC and assess potential risks / hazards at the Closed Castner Firing Range MRS
- RI Objectives:
  - Conduct RI field investigation to characterize the Closed Castner Firing Range
    - Determine the type (nature), density and distribution (extent) of MEC
    - Determine the concentrations and extent of MC
  - Assess potential risks/hazards to human health, safety and the environment
  - Ensure sufficient data collected to develop remedial alternatives for Feasibility Study phase



# Review of TPP Meeting #2

Meeting held 11 February 2015



### Actions Completed Since TPP 2

- Finalized QAPP
- Conducted Public Meeting
- Finalized Explosives Site Plan
- Completed MEC Investigation
- Completed Phase I of the MC Investigation







# Castner Range RI Tasks

Implement TPP Process	
TPP Meeting #1 & 2	Complete
TPP Meeting #3	Today
TPP Meeting #4	~ April 2017
Develop Planning Documents	Complete
QAPP	March 2015
ESP	March 2016
<b>Community Relations Support</b>	
Public Meeting 1	May 2015
Public Meeting 2	~ July 2017
RAB Meetings	~ April 2017
RI Report	Currently Working







## General RI Approach / Data Gaps

- Includes MEC and MC investigation
- Evaluate and utilize previous work, especially:
  - 2012 WAA Field Demonstration Report
  - 2013 ISM Field Demonstration Report
- Collect additional MEC and MC data to fill data gaps:
  - Vertical and horizontal extent of MEC and MC
  - MEC density outside identified CMUA
  - Identify additional CMUAs in high slopes, if present
  - Transportation potential of MEC and MC from high to low elevations



- Sufficient existing data to:
  - Define boundary CMUAs (*i.e.*, potential target areas) in eastern side of MRS
  - Show that CMUAs were delineated to an accuracy of +/- 250 ft
  - Characterize nature and extent of MEC within CMUAs
- Phased field investigation will close remaining data gaps:
  - Define boundary of CMUAs, if any, in steep areas within western side of MRS
  - Verify that MEC density throughout MRS outside of CMUAs is < 0.1 MEC/acre to a 95% confidence level</li>
  - Migration potential of MEC (and MC) from higher to lower elevation areas



## **Delineated CMUAs**





- MEC approach uses UXO Estimator to determine statistically valid approaches
- In areas with slopes < 30%:</li>
  - Investigate approximately 25 acres, using three methods:
    - Reacquisition and intrusive investigation of WAA anomalies (~16 acres)
    - Collection of new DGM data, processing, and intrusive investigation (~5 acres)
    - Analog ("mag and dig") transect surveys (~ 4 acres)
- In areas with slopes > 30%:
  - 70 acres via Instrument-assisted visual survey
  - Analog (i.e., "mag and dig") investigation if potential CMUA identified



- MEC Phase 1: Instrument Assisted Visual Surveys (areas with slopes > 30%)
  - Meandering path surveys
  - Handheld GPS and EMI sensor
  - No intrusive investigation
- MEC Phase 2 (areas with slopes < 30%):
  - Phase 2a: Investigation of WAA anomalies
    - 1750 100-ft transect segments selected
    - Reacquire anomalies with GPS and hand-held EMI sensor (*e.g.*, White's all metals detector)
    - Intrusively investigate with hand tools
    - Record results in tablet PC



Handheld EMI Sensor

- **MEC Phase 2 (areas with slopes < 30%):** 
  - Phase 2b: DGM Grids
    - 22 100' x 100' grids (areas with <18% slope)</li>
    - Designed in UXO Estimator
    - EM61-MK2 surveys with RTK DGPS positioning
    - Investigate all anomalies meeting selection criteria with hand tools
    - Record results in tablet PC
  - Phase 2c: Analog ("mag and dig") transects
    - 1,002 randomly placed100-ft transect segments (18% < slopes < 30%)
    - Use hand-held EMI sensor to identify anomalies
    - Intrusively investigate with hand tools
    - Record results in tablet and GPS anomalies



EM61-MK2







- MEC Phase 3 (areas with slopes > 30%)
  - Analog ("mag and dig" transects) in IAVS areas with anomaly density greater than 300 anomalies/acre
  - Analog transects to determine the nature and extent of MEC within potential CMUA



Analog "mag and dig"



Handheld EMI Sensor



# MEC Sampling Design

Decision Unit	Area (acres) <sup>1</sup>	Sampling Design		Required Investigation (acres)		Actual Investigation	
		MEC/ Acre	Conf. Level	MEC Range	Investigation Type	Area (acres)	(acres)
Areas outside NCMUA	5977	< 0.1	95%	0-600	Total Required	29.8	29.8
					Conducted in WAA	4.6	4.6
					Analog Transects	4.3	6.3
					RI WAA DGM Transect Investigation	16.1	16.1
					RI DGM Grid	4.9	6.7
					RI Total Investigation:	29.8	33.6

Note:

1 – Acreage represents 6,803 acres of Castner Range (from GIS files) minus the known concentrated munitions use areas.

2 - Requires that no UXO are found to confirm hypothesis

# RI Approach - MEC



MRS Boundary



Intermittent Stream



High Anomaly Density - CMUA; No Investigation Performed

High Anomaly Density - NCMUA; No Investigation Performed

High Anomaly Density - Investigation Confirmed a NCMUA

- IAVS Transect
  - WAA DGM Transect
- WAA DGM Lot converted to new DGM grid
  - Analog Mag-and-Dig Transect
- DGM Grid



# IAVS Results



- + Fuzes
- Grenade



## Analog Transect Results





# New DGM Grids



MRS Boundary



High Anomaly Density - CMUA; No Investigation Performed

High Anomaly Density - NCMUA; No Investigation Performed

High Anomaly Density - Investigation Confirmed a NCMUA

WAA DGM Lot converted to new DGM grid

New DGM Grid



## **RI MEC Finds**



Target ID	Location	MEC Found	МЕС Туре
NA - Surface	Grid 20	37mm High Explosive (HE) Projectile	Projectile
WAA-1441	Lot 8	M19A1 Rifle Grenade, White Phosphorus (WP)	Grenades
WAA-1735	Lot 9	40mm M81 Projectile still in cartridge	Projectile
WAA-0284	Lot 2	37mm HE Projectile	Projectile
WAA-0391	Lot 2	MK27 Point Detonating (PD) fuze	Fuze
G24-0003	Grid 24	60mm Mortar fuzed	Mortar

# **MEC Finds**















# RI Dig Results



·---- Intermittent Stream



High Anomaly Density - CMUA; No Investigation Required High Anomaly Density - NCMUA; No Investigation Required

High Anomaly Density - Additional Investigation Required to Determine if CMUA



- 40mm Projectile
- 75mm Projectile
- Projectile frag



- Mortar
- Illumination
- Practice Mines (Land)
- \* Rockets







# **RI Dig Results - North**



- A Fragment
- 🕂 Fuzes
- Grenade
- Mortar
- A Illumination
- Practice Mines (Land)
- Rockets





# **RI Dig Results - Central**

360000

MRS Boundary - Intermittent Stream High Anomaly Density - CMUA; No Investigation Performed High Anomaly Density - NCMUA; No Investigation Performed High Anomaly Density - Investigation Confirmed a NCMUA Analog Transect **IAVS** Transect WAA DGM Transect DGM Grid MEC Find Ŵ **MD** - Projectiles 20mm Projectile 37mm Projectile  $\Diamond$ 40mm Projectile 75mm Projectile 0 Projectile frag **Other Munitions Debris** 

Flares

Fragment

- 🕂 Fuzes
- Grenade
- Mortar
- Illumination
- Practice Mines (Land)
- Rockets





# **RI Dig Results - South**



# RI and Historical MEC Finds





360000



### **RI and Historical MEC Finds - North**





### **RI and Historical MEC Finds - Central**





### **RI and Historical MEC Finds - South**



### Munitions Density Estimate

DGM Grid MEC Find (RI)







### **Munitions Density Estimate - North**







### **Munitions Density Estimate - Central**





### **Munitions Density Estimate - South**

361,000

361,500

362,000

362,500

363,000

363,500

360,500

358,000

358,500

359,000

359,500

360,000









# **CMUA 23**



# Revised CMUAs





# **Revised CMUAs**



CMUA Location	Original Size (acres)	CMUA Expansion Size (acres)	Revised Size (acres)	Comments
1	632.4	288.41	920.81	Four expansion areas and merged with CMUA12
4	119.6	81.07	200.67	Two expansion areas
6	24.5	26.0	50.5	One expansion area
8	8.8	73.7	82.5	One expansion area
10	17.5	97.5	115	Was not considered a CMUA in the QAPP based solely on WAA dig results.
12	23.2	-23.2	0.0	Now included in CMUA 1
22	0.0	28.37	28.37	New CMUA identified during RI
23	0.0	29.48	29.48	New CMUA identified during RI
Sub-total:	826	601.33	1427.33	
NCMUA	5977.3	-601.33	5375.97	
Total:	6803.3	0	6803.3	

# **MEC Recommendations**



- CMUAs
  - Incorporate area of CMUA expansion boundaries
- NCMUA
  - Re-calculate the MEC density
  - Additional investigation not recommended; original hypotheses likely impossible to prove given large number of MEC found.
  - Recommend also including historical data to qualitatively determine residual MEC hazard.
- Revise CSM

## **Break**





# MC RI Program Elements

- Elements include:
  - Incremental Sampling Methodology (ISM)
  - Discrete sampling (soil, surface water, sediment)
  - Sampling associated with MEC
- Phased approach to meet TCEQ delineation requirements
- Based on ISM Demonstration Report
  - Lead, copper, zinc primary MC
  - Ecological receptors will likely drive assessment level



#### 41 19 January 2017

## MC

- Explosives (USEPA Method 8330B)
  - Materials inside munitions
  - 16 separate constituents including TNT, RDX
- Metals (USEPA Method 6010B)
  - Small arms ammunition, munition casings
  - antimony, arsenic, beryllium, copper, lead, nickel, zinc
- Perchlorate (USEPA Method 6850)
  - Propellant used in rockets



Example of MC deposition



## **ISM Delineation – Phase I**



- 149 Area-Wide Sample Locations
  - Within CMUAs identified prior to RI MEC data collection
  - 1-acre decision units
  - Separate mobilization to resample DU locations with laboratory QC issues for explosives
- Laboratory Analysis
  - Explosives, metals all samples
  - Perchlorate only samples collected near former rocket ranges



## Phase 1 ISM Locations







## **ISM Results & Affected Property**

- Plotted results of 2011/2012 Study and 2016 RI
  - Screened against:
    - Ecological benchmarks
    - Human Health Tier 1 PCLs (<sup>Tot</sup>Soil<sub>comb</sub>)
    - Assumes <sup>GW</sup>Soil pathway will be closed during Phase II
- Estimated Affected Property Areas
  - Results >Residential Assessment Level
    - Driven by ecological benchmarks
    - Some human health exceedances (TotSoil<sub>comb</sub>)



## **ISM Results - Metals**



# Phase II ISM Locations



- Identified Phase II Step Out Locations
  - Within newly identified CMUAs
  - To complete delineation of Affected Property Areas
- Phase II Locations Limited by:
  - Steep terrain in some areas
  - Range boundary to the north (separate RI planned)
  - Range boundary to the east (Highway 54 boundary)



## **Phase II ISM Locations**



## Backstop Berms- Phase I



- 10 Berms Identified using LIDAR Data
- Discrete Soil Sampling
  - 2 samples per berm, three depth intervals (0-1', 1-2', 2-3')
  - 4 samples at base of berm
  - Laboratory analysis for metals



### Phase I Berm Results & Phase II Locations



- Four berms had sample results above assessment level
- Lead was the only metal exceeding
- One lead result (Berm 1) exceeded human health <sup>Tot</sup>Soil<sub>comb</sub> PCL
- Phase II sampling will be performed to:
  - Delineate lead
  - Have a sufficient number of results to perform statistical comparisons to the PCL



### **Berm Results and Phase II Locations**



## Arroyo Sampling - Phase I



- Arroyo Soil Delineation
  - Provides information on MC transport from steep areas
  - 52 discrete sediment sample locations in depositional areas
    - Samples collected from 0-6" in depth
    - If located in CMUA, samples collected at 0-6" and 12-18"
    - Analyzed for metals
- Surface Water Samples
  - Two events: dry weather and wet weather performed in Phase I
  - Seep sampling
    - 18 locations targeted; 4 locations contained water
    - Samples analyzed for metals
  - Arroyo surface water samples 6 locations targeted
    - Dry event and 48 hours after rain event: No water present in arroyos

### Planned Surface Water and Sediment Sampling Locations







## Surface Water Sampling Types





### Arroyo Sampling Location (dry)

Seep Sampling Location

## **Phase I Sediment Results**



- Arsenic, Nickel, and Zinc exceeded Ecological Screening Levels ("benchmarks")
- Arsenic exceeded human health <sup>Tot</sup>Soil<sub>comb</sub> at two locations
- Results for the two locations at the downgradient Range boundaries were less than screening levels
- Phase II sampling will be performed for Zinc and Arsenic



### Surface Water Results



- No water was present in the arroyos during the dry sampling event or 48 hours after the rain event
- Of the potential seep locations, four contained sufficient water for sampling
- Metals results compared to Freshwater <sup>SW</sup>RBELs
- Only one sample had a result above the screening level
  - Dissolved copper exceeded Freshwater Chronic Aquatic Life <sup>SW</sup>RBEL
  - Water was only present at this location during the wet event; so acute criteria apply. The single exceedance will be handled in the risk assessment.

### Phase I Seep Results





### Soil to Groundwater Pathway - Phase II



- Vertical delineation
  - Discrete borings in 3 DUs with highest lead concentration
    - BF052 (lead 1,520 mg/kg)
    - CN073 (lead 1,320 mg/kg)
    - DG070 (lead 5,030 mg/kg)
  - 3 Borings per DU to depth of 20 feet
    - Locations determined based on field screening for lead with XRF
    - 3 depth intervals sampled (0-0.5 inches bgs, interval with the highest XRF results, and the bottom of the boring)
    - If XRF result from bottom of boring exceed background, boring will be advanced an additional 10 feet



# **Phase II Boring Locations**



### Soil to Groundwater Pathway - Phase II



- GWSoil PCL Determination
  - Collect samples for remaining Tier 2 parameters during Phase II
    - pH collected during Phase I
    - SPLP analyses performed on Phase I samples
- Groundwater Assessment
  - Groundwater Assessment performed only if necessary based on vertical delineation results
  - Groundwater Assessment, if necessary, performed in Phase III
  - If refusal encountered in Phase II borings, <sup>GW</sup>Soil Pathway will be considered incomplete

# **RI Report**



- Document and evaluate data (both MEC and MC findings)
- Update CSM
- Report on nature and extent of MEC and MC
- Prepare HHRA and SLERA
- Prepare MEC Hazard Assessment
- Update MRSPP

Conclusions of the RI Report provide the foundation to develop remedial alternatives during a future Feasibility Study

# **Upcoming Project Schedule**



- Phase 2 MC Field Work
- RAB Meeting:
- TPP Meeting #4:
- Draft RI Report:
- Draft Final RI Report:
- Public Meeting:

January / February 2017

- ~ April 2017
- ~ April 2017
- ~ May 2017
- ~ August 2017
- ~ July / August 2017

# **TPP Comments**



Sylvia A. Waggoner Chief, Compliance Branch Directorate of Public Works Fort Bliss, TX 79916 915-568-7031



### Questions?

