

***Final Minutes
Restoration Advisory Board
Former Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range
November 16, 2005***

The November 16, 2005 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was held at the Aurora Public Library at 14949 E. Alameda Dr., Aurora, CO. The meeting started at 6:20 p.m.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Ms. Bonnie Rader, Community Co-chair for the RAB, opened the meeting at 6:20 p.m. Ms. Rader asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.

Attendance

The following RAB members were present:

- Bonnie Rader, Community Co-Chair
- Jerry Hodgson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District (USACE), Co-chair
- Jeff Swanson, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE)
- Joe Freund, Citizen
- Bob Hastings, Citizen
- Melissa Feeder, State Land Board
- Julio Iturerrria, Arapahoe County
- Carol MacLennan, Tri-County Health Department (TCHD)
- Don Roche, City of Aurora
- Mark Harding, Rangeview Metropolitan District

Other attendees:

- Richard Rader, Citizen
- Keith Wegner, Correlation Corp.
- Morey Engle, Shaw Environmental, Inc.
- John Mullen, Shaw Environmental, Inc.
- Teri Farrell, Shaw Environmental, Inc.
- Chris Sundeen, Shaw Environmental, Inc.
- Rick St. Amand, Shaw Environmental, Inc.
- Catherine Rafferty, Elbert County
- Tracie White, Sky Research, Inc.
- Laura Bishard, CDPHE
- Tim Blume, Army Environmental Center
- Randy Hawbaker, Cherry Creek School District
- Greg Travis, Zurich NA
- Jerryn Jacobs, Oakwood Homes
- Gennie Hawbaker, Citizen
- Sharon Moore, Air Education Training Command (AETC)

GENERAL RAB ITEMS

Ms. Bonnie Rader, Community Co-chair, asked if the board had an opportunity to review the minutes from the May 18, 2005 RAB and September 21, 2005 RAB meetings prior to the meeting. The minutes for both meetings were approved without comment.

Mr. Jerry Hodgson, USACE, stated that in lieu of discussing the individual project briefings, they would be posted on the Former Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range (FLBGR) website for review to ensure that there would be plenty of time for RAB project prioritization discussion and voting.

CHEMICAL VIAL FOUND IN THE JEEP/DEMOLITION RANGE

Before the project prioritization process commenced, Mr. Hodgson stated that on Monday, September 26, 2005 a cracked vial with a small amount of liquid was discovered at the Jeep/Demolition Range. The liquid in the vial tested positive for chemical agent. The item was immediately neutralized and munitions response activities at the Jeep/Demolition Range have been temporarily suspended. Mr. Hodgson also stated that at this time, there is no need to proceed into chemical response operations at the Jeep/Demolition Range. However, it is uncertain when conventional munitions response operations will begin again in this area, but recommendations for further actions are currently under evaluation.

Mr. Jeff Swanson, CDPHE, mentioned that the evaluation for further actions will need to incorporate input from the City of Aurora regarding the application of risk management procedures to find and address glass vials that are currently not detectable and ensure that this work can be performed safely.

Ms. Rader asked what kind of vial was found. Mr. Rick St. Amand, Shaw Environmental, Inc. replied that it was a cracked "sniffer" vial that was originally used for training purposes. Mr. St. Amand stated that this type of vial historically contained only a dilute mustard agent.

Mr. Hodgson was asked what his best guess is on the time frame for resuming work in the Jeep/Demolition Range. He replied that it may take a few more weeks to determine an appropriate plan forward. He also stated that a risk analysis will have to be performed prior to deciding the plan forward. If there is a need to transition to chemical clearance operations, munitions response teams may not return to this site for another year.

Mr. Hawbaker, Cherry Creek School District (CCSD), stated that any new planned high school and middle school construction for the area is planned for several years in the future. Mr. Hodgson stated that he would speak with the CCSD prior to making any final decisions regarding the Jeep/Demolition Range.

FORMER LOWRY TRAINING ANNEX FIELD WORK UPDATE

The project status briefing for the Former Lowry Training Annex is posted on the www.flbgr.org project website.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (TAPP) UPDATE (presentation posted on the web)

Mr. Keith Wegner, Correlation Corp., reported on his recent activities associated with the FLBGR project. Mr. Wegner stated that he has continued to review documents for the Bombing Target 5 activities being performed by CH2MHill. He also stated that he has prepared for and will be facilitating the project prioritization discussion and subsequent voting to occur at this meeting.

FORMER LOWRY BOMBING AND GUNNERY RANGE (FLBGR) FIELD WORK UPDATE

The FLBGR project status briefing is posted on the www.flbgr.org project website.

PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Mr. Keith Wegner, Correlation Corp., gave a brief overview of the project prioritization process and how the RAB voting would take place.

Current Prioritization

Currently, the highest ranked weighting criteria is current/future land use which has made the Jeep/Demolition Range the number one project priority, with Bombing Target 1 being the lowest priority. When prioritization was last revisited, the RAB voted and ranked the nine weighting factors. Mr. Wegner then scored those factors based on the current and available information for each category as they related to each Area of Concern (AOC). Mr. Wegner stated that he will ensure that he has all the most up-to-date information regarding each AOC (i.e., what has been

found to-date, closest development, planned projects, etc.) when performing the current AOC scoring for prioritization. AOC scoring has been and will be done as follows:

- A score of 100 for factors needing a high weighting
- A score of 75 for factors needing a moderate weighting
- A score of 50 for factors needing an average weighting
- A score of 25 for factors needing a low weighting

Scoring is then summed up to determine a numerical ranking for each AOC. Mr. Wegner suggested using the same method for scoring the votes from this RAB meeting unless the RAB members would like a different approach. The RAB agreed to use the same methodology.

Mr. Wegner then showed a board with the categories alphabetized (not showing any weighting bias) for the RAB to discuss and vote on. He pointed out that Bombing Target 5 (BT5) is detailed in blue to make it stand out from the other AOCs. This is because BT5 falls under a separate fixed-price remediation with insurance (FPRI) funding vehicle and schedule with respect to munitions response activities. Mr. Wegner asked the RAB if they still wanted to include BT5 in their voting since it falls under a different contract.

Bombing Target 5

A discussion ensued in which Mr. Wegner stated that in the event that the FPRI vehicle is insufficient to clear all of BT5 (i.e., there were more items to clear or clearance activities were more complicated than originally thought), the remainder of the AOC would still have to be cleared with regular FLBGR funding. Ms. Carol Maclennan, TCHD, suggested that BT5 remain in the voting process in the event that the target falls back under regular FLBGR funding. In this case, the prioritization for this target will have already been addressed. Mr. Bob Hastings, Citizen, agreed to leave BT5 in the voting process and pointed out that it is simple to remove it later, if necessary. Ms. Rader also agreed to leave BT5 in the voting process.

Mr. Mark Harding, Rangeview Metropolitan District, asked what the duration of the BT5 contract is. Mr. Hodgson answered that the contract runs through February 2006 and that BT5 was chosen for the FPRI vehicle as it was initially thought to be the most appropriate test case based on the estimated cost and duration assumed to clear the area. Mr. Hodgson then mentioned that it was also chosen because it fit well into the current prioritization schedule.

Ms. Melissa Feeder, State Land Board, mentioned she did not agree about keeping BT5 in the voting process since it is an entirely different project under its own funding and with its own time schedule. She pointed out that any prioritization from the RAB would not affect the clearing of this AOC, as it already has its own schedule set in place. Mr. Harding agreed with Ms. Feeder since BT5 has its own economic solution. He then asked if munitions response activities would change if BT5 suddenly became the top priority. Mr. Jeff Swanson, CDPHE, mentioned that if BT5 is left in the scoring, it will not change USACE's munitions response activities, but if the site is not completely cleared within the FPRI funding allotment, then BT5 is already scored and can be taken into consideration.

Mr. Wegner then clarified that the BT5 project is managed by the Corps of Engineers, Huntsville District, not the Omaha District as are the remainder of the FLBGR AOCs. He also mentioned that there will be some reshuffling of priorities based on the current status of hazards and other factors (development and land use, etc.). The decision was made to include BT5 in the scoring process.

Other Prioritization Discussion

Ms. Maclennan requested RAB members to consider all current weighting criteria and decide if there are any necessary additions or omissions. Mr. Wegner then did a synopsis of each of the nine current weighting criteria, in alphabetical order:

1. Access: Factors to consider for access are whether or not there is physical access to an AOC, are there roads or obstacles to an AOC, and whether or not difficulties may be present in accessing an AOC.
2. Cost: The percent complete of some AOCs have changed since prioritization was last revisited, along with associated changes to the Cost to Complete (CTC). This criterion will change some of the scoring based on the current CTC information.

3. Economic Impact: Mr. Wegner used Bombing Target 4 as an example, whereby munitions response activities would affect wheat growing operations depending on what time of year clearance activities are performed. Another factor in the Economic Impact category is considering whether or not clearance activities are to take place on public or private land.
4. Environmental Impact: One factor to consider is preservation of prairie habitat. For example, there are currently new terms regarding the definition of the antelope habitat in and around the Air-to-Ground Gunnery Range which did not exist the last time prioritization was revisited.
5. Infrastructure: Utilities in and/or near any AOC.
6. Land use: This category was originally two categories (Current and Future) and has since been combined into one category. The last time project prioritization was revisited, this was the heaviest weighting criteria.
7. Legal restrictions: Any impediment to performing munitions response activities.
8. Overall Hazard: Proximity to schools/population, number of people impacted/exposed to an object detonating or a chemical release.
9. Type of Hazard: This category primarily deals with the concentration of unexploded ordnance (UXO) at an AOC, difficulty of clearing, and the current defined boundaries of the AOCs.

After discussing these nine categories, Mr. Wegner asked the RAB if there were any additions or omissions they would like addressed. He also stated that the Type of Hazard category may change the weighting in certain AOCs due to the discovery of some recent items such as a 500 lb General Purpose Bomb in the Rocket Range. This could, for example, change the raw scoring for the Rocket Range site from a 25 to a 75.

Mr. Don Roch, City of Aurora, stated he felt all nine categories are relevant and nothing should be omitted. Mr. Julio Iturria, Arapahoe County, mentioned that when considering the combined land use category (current and future), it is necessary to be cognizant of the escalation of development around the site. He also mentioned that historical/archaeological information needed to be considered in the scoring. Mr. Wegner added this as a third bullet under the Environmental Impact category.

Mr. Mark Harding asked whether or not infrastructure should be combined with Land Use. Mr. Iturria suggested they remain separate. Mr. Wegner then clarified that infrastructure is defined by the following questions:

- What infrastructure is needed to support munitions response activities?
- Is it necessary to build a new road, or improve an existing road?
- Will munitions response activities affect an existing private road?
- It was pointed out that currently, infrastructure does not refer to pipes, tanks, utilities or reservoirs.

At the urging of Mr. Mark Harding, the RAB decided that the Infrastructure definition should be revised to include any component of water storage and delivery, such as pipes, tanks, utilities or reservoirs.

Mr. Iturria also pointed out that the development community is moving forward with construction of several housing developments despite munitions response activities occurring on the FLBGR. He also mentioned the construction has already started and is on-going for the future Arapahoe County fairgrounds.

It was ultimately decided that each RAB member would get 18 chips (2 chips to vote with per category) and voting would take place informally, i.e., there would be no record of who voted for which category and by how much. Voting began at 7:45 p.m. When everyone distributed their votes, Mr. Wegner tallied up the results and then divided the number of votes per category by the total number of votes available to determine the criteria weighting. A draft report with the results of the criteria voting and his subsequent scoring will be distributed after the holidays.

Adjournment

Arrangements were made for the next meeting to be held on January 18, 2006 at the Aurora Public Library; 14949 E. Alameda Dr., Aurora, Colorado.

The meeting notification for the next RAB meeting will be sent on or around January 9, 2006.