

**Restoration Advisory Board
Former Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range (FLBGR)
20 July 2011
FINAL MEETING MINUTES**

The 20 July 2011 meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was held at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Site Compound, 25950 East Quincy Avenue, Aurora, CO 80016. The scheduled start time was 6:00 p.m.

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Jerry Hodgson, USACE, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:05 p.m. Mr. Hodgson then asked all attendees to introduce themselves.

ATTENDANCE

The following RAB members were present:

- Joe Freund, Citizen
- Mark Harding, Rangeview Metro District
- Bob Hastings, Citizen
- Jerry Hodgson, USACE, Co-Chair
- Julio Iturreria, Arapahoe County
- Carol MacLennan, Tri-County Department of Health (TCHD)
- Melissa Palmer, Department of the Navy (U.S. Navy)
- Don Roche, City of Aurora
- Jeff Swanson, Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE)
- Melissa Yoder, State Land Board (SLB)

Other attendees:

- Jimmy Andrianakos, DTH
- John Andrianakos, DTH
- Caleb J. Connor, Bennett Fire Department
- Morey Engle, Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw)
- Ryan Field, USACE
- Steven Gehring, Shaw
- Randy Hawbaker, Cherry Creek School District
- Beth Loehrke, Shaw
- Jed Lowrey, Tetra Tech
- John Mullen, M2R Solutions
- Ernest Ouellette, American Automation Building Solutions, Inc.
- David Rathke, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Rick St. Amand, Shaw
- Lisa Stahl, Shaw
- John Steinbergs, Sky Research, Inc.
- Chris Sundeen, Shaw
- Elaine Tate, Shaw
- Ken Vogler, CDPHE
- Mark Wichman, USACE
- Marvin Williams, American Automation Building Solutions, Inc.
- Adam Wilms, Tetra Tech

GENERAL RAB ITEMS

Mr. Hodgson asked if the Board had an opportunity to review the minutes from the 20 April 2011 RAB meeting. As there were no comments, the minutes from the April 2011 RAB meeting were approved.

NAVY/Denver Research Institute (DRI)

Navy Update (presentation posted on the project website: www.flbgr.org)

Ms. Melissa Palmer (U.S. Navy) announced that field operations at the Navy/DRI Site are essentially complete. Anomaly removal was completed in early May and the site has been partially demobilized. In addition, site restoration has been completed. The only material remaining on-site are containers of material documented as safe (MDAS) and depleted uranium (DU)/radium contaminated soils, which are awaiting transportation off-site for disposal. The After Action Report is currently in progress. Upon final characterization and disposal of impacted soils, the remaining site compound will be demobilized.

The intrusive investigation identified 33,715 targets of interest. “Mag-and-dig” teams cleared approximately 10 acres in the northern and central Denver Test Area (DTA) and along roadways. There were approximately 78,000 square feet of target areas, mostly located in the DTA. During the course of the removal action, 724 munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) items were recovered, of which 717 were identified as discarded military munitions (DMM) and 7 as unexploded ordnance (UXO). A total of 136,502 pounds of metallic items were recovered, as well as 81,000 MDAS items. The Radiological Survey identified 25 radiological contaminated items including 4 DU rounds. The only remaining work to be performed at the Navy/DRI Site are sampling and off-site disposal of the containerized contaminated soil, and shipping of the MDAS items to a scrap metal recycler. Mr. Hodgson asked Ms. Palmer to clarify what types of DMM were found. Mr. Adam Wilms (TetraTech) responded that most of the DMM consisted of Cartridge Activated Devices, 20 millimeter (mm) projectiles, and 3-pound practice bombs.

FORMER LOWRY TRAINING ANNEX (FLTA)

Air Force Update

Mr. Hodgson reported that because all munitions response activities are essentially complete at FLTA and that it is in the final reporting stage, there was no need for an update on the FLTA. The final report is currently in Regulatory review.

FORMER LOWRY BOMBING AND GUNNERY RANGE (FLBGR)

Project Status and Field Work Update (presentation posted on the project website: www.flbgr.org)

Mr. Hodgson presented a briefing on the current project status of FLBGR activities, which included a summary of activities completed to date, ongoing activities, and planned future efforts. To date, the project has had 4,193 days without lost time due to injury.

The FLBGR currently encompasses 12 known munitions response sites (MRSs) and 3 Areas of Interest (AOIs) within approximately 59,000 acres (~100 square miles). To date, 4,372 acres have been cleared, 24,439 live items have been disposed, over 1,448,454 inert items have been recovered, over 653,744 pounds (~327 tons) of munitions scrap have been recovered, and over 286 tons of munitions scrap has been sent off-site for disposal. To illustrate the amount of scrap removed from the site, Mr. Hodgson pointed out that at one time there had been 17 roll-offs filled with scrap on-site but now there was only two. Currently, there are six munitions response teams in the field at FLBGR within four of the MRSs: two munitions response teams are working within Bombing Target 2 (BT2); one geophysical team is working within Bombing Target 3 (BT3); two munitions response teams are working within Bombing Target 4 (BT4); and one munitions response team is working within the Rocket Range.

Five-Year Review Status

Mr. Hodgson presented the current status of the on-going Five-Year Review process. Mr. Hodgson reminded the RAB that the purpose of the Five-Year Review process is to assess all 15 MRSs and AOIs at the FLBGR to determine if the current work efforts continue to minimize explosive safety risk; are protective of human health, safety, and the environment; and are consistent with project objectives (i.e., is the project continuing to accomplish its objectives).

Current activities in the Five-Year Review process include ongoing Stakeholder/Community interviews, which are being conducted by Ms. Lisa Stahl (Shaw), and the preparation of the Five-Year Review Report. The 30-day, public review period is scheduled to commence in October 2011 with the next scheduled RAB meeting (19 October 2011) doubling as the public meeting for the draft final report. Mr. Hodgson foresees finalizing the report by the end of 2011.

USACE Contract Transition Plan

Mr. Hodgson announced that the two current contractors, Shaw and Sky Research, who have both been at the site since 1999, have expiring contracts. Shaw's contract, awarded through the Total Environmental Restoration Contract (TERC) program, expired approximately five years ago; however, Mr. Hodgson had been able to extend the contract through Task Order modifications. Sky Research had been operating under a Single Award Task Order Contract. In both cases, there is no capacity for extending the current contracts any further. As a result, in the near future the project will need to transition to new contracts, and possibly new contractors. Mr. Hodgson clarified that neither contractor would be leaving immediately, and that they will be on-site through the end of the year and perhaps into 2012.

Mr. Hodgson's plan moving forward is that by the end of the current contracts, a majority of the existing MRSs will be substantially complete and that the three incomplete MRSs – the Air-to-Ground Gunnery Range (AGGR), the 20mm Range Fan, and the Jeep/Demo Range (JDR) – will become separate projects, with the JDR likely being separated into two individual projects: the Center Berm Area and the remainder of the site periphery. The JDR may be broken in two because of the different technologies needed to address their specific needs. Future work at AGGR will be based on yearly funding and how much of the MRS can be cleaned using the yearly allotments. The plan for the remainder of this fiscal year (FY11) is to award a new contract to focus on the Center Berm Area at the JDR. Then, for FY12, Mr. Hodgson will confer with Mr. Jeff Swanson (CDPHE) to decide what to move on to next, though it will likely be some aspect of AGGR.

Mr. Julio Iturreria (Arapahoe County) asked if the contract transition would change the project timeline. Mr. Hodgson indicated that while there would be logistical issues with transitioning from one contractor to another, the timeline should not be significantly affected. He added that, as these will be competitive bids, the current contractors will have a chance of being awarded the new work.

Mr. Randy Hawbaker (Cherry Creek School District) asked if the project had an estimate on how long the interior of JDR will take. Mr. Hodgson responded that a requirement of each bidder's proposal will be a schedule for completing the work, and, as such, the new contractor would be held to that schedule. Regarding contract costs, Mr. Joe Freund (Citizen) asked if the work would be awarded as a "flat rate," to which Mr. Hodgson responded that it would be a "fixed price" contract.

Field Work Update

Mr. Hodgson altered his usual presentation format by not going through each individual MRS status summary during the briefing but used a matrix showing the status of each AOI. He encouraged everyone to look at the individual MRS status slides for themselves, which had been provided as a handout at the

meeting or which could be found at the end of the FLBGR briefing posted to the project website (www.flbgr.com). In closing, Mr. Hodgson reminded RAB attendees that the next RAB meeting, as well as the public meeting for the Five-Year Review, would be held on 19 October 2011.

GENERAL DISCUSSIONS AND ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Iturreria made the observation that, on a county level, there has been increased interest in gas and oil exploration in the region, and asked if the USACE was involved with this or if they had any concerns. Mr. Hodgson acknowledged that he had been forwarded several items published in local Denver and Aurora newspapers that dealt with interest/concerns in performing so-called “fracking” procedures for extracting oil and gas at the FLBGR. Mr. Hodgson then directed the discussion to Ms. Melissa Yoder (State Land Board), who provided a brief overview of current general discussions between her office and various county commissioners and local jurisdictions in attempting to produce policies and protocols overseeing fracking procedures on the SLB property. However, because there have been only preliminary discussions and ideas are just being formed and are evolving, she thought that the SLB might have more definitive ideas in place by the next RAB meeting. Mr. Iturreria noted that the situation was similar on a county level. Mr. Hodgson added that he thought that this would be a very appropriate topic at the next RAB meeting.

With regards to FLBGR, Mr. Hodgson stated that if a firm wants to do any seismic exploration at the site, the USACE (i.e., Mr. Ryan Field) should first be informed what they are doing and where they propose to do it. Depending on where they propose to explore for oil or gas, the project may need to send someone to check out the area prior to any intrusive activities. If they are interested in a portion of an area of concern (AOC), an Ordnance and Explosives (OE) escort will be provided to make sure everything is safe from a munitions and explosive safety standpoint. Mr. Hodgson pointed out that the main focus is safety; any activities going on at the site need to be done safely. He added that because they did not want to drain project resources, the USACE would prefer that any such work happen outside of an AOC.

According to Mr. Ryan Field (USACE), seismic crews have already worked portions of the FLBGR site. He had accompanied a seismic crew working at Bombing Target 3 (BT3), not because of concerns over seismic vibrations, but rather because they were going to be digging within the MRS. Prior to working at BT3, the seismic crew contacted the site, and the site in turn contacted Ms. Yoder. Project personnel expressed any potential concerns they had and what precautions the seismic team needed to take. No issues whatsoever arose during the testing. Mr. Morey Engle (Shaw) added that the seismic crew subcontracted their own UXO technicians; no UXO technicians from the FLBGR project site were used. Mr. Swanson (CDPHE) pointed out that providing their own UXO technicians was part of the cost of exploring gas and oil in the area.

Having attended a demonstration of how this seismic technology worked using a vibration truck, Mr. Mark Harding (Rangeview Metro District) suggested that it might be helpful to do a similar demonstration for the RAB. Mr. Hodgson thought that the field personnel would also be quite interested in seeing such a demonstration. Mr. Harding agreed to set up such a demonstration for a future RAB meeting. Mr. Hodgson stated that, because it is the members’ RAB, he would facilitate any topic they were interested in.

As there were no further questions or discussions, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.