

**Senior Management Board  
Bourne Best Western  
September 24, 2008  
6:30 – 8:40 p.m.  
Meeting Minutes**

<b>Members:</b>	<b>Organization:</b>	<b>Telephone:</b>	<b>E-mail:</b>
George “Chuckie” Green	Town of Mashpee	508-539-1400	<a href="mailto:ggreen@ci.mashpee.ma.us">ggreen@ci.mashpee.ma.us</a>
Linell Grundman (sitting in for Dana Barrett)	Town of Sandwich	508-888-2601	<a href="mailto:grundmans@comcast.net">grundmans@comcast.net</a>
Mark Harding	Mashpee Wampanoag	508-477-1600	<a href="mailto:mark@wampworx.com">mark@wampworx.com</a>
Alan Cowles	E&RC	508-968-5147	<a href="mailto:alan.cowles@us.army.mil">alan.cowles@us.army.mil</a>
CDR Steve Torpey (sitting in for Dan Abel)	USCG	508-968-6300	
Martha Steele	MDPH	617-624-5757	<a href="mailto:Martha.steele@state.ma.us">Martha.steele@state.ma.us</a>
Mary Sanderson	US EPA	617-918-1381	<a href="mailto:sanderson.mary@epa.gov">sanderson.mary@epa.gov</a>
Millie Garcia-Serrano	MassDEP	508-946-2727	<a href="mailto:millie.garcia-serrano@state.ma.us">millie.garcia-serrano@state.ma.us</a>
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Organization:</b>	<b>Telephone:</b>	<b>E-mail:</b>
Mike Minor	AFCEE/MMR	508-968-4670	<a href="mailto:mike.minior@brooks.af.mil">mike.minior@brooks.af.mil</a>
Jon Davis	AFCEE/MMR	508-958-4670	<a href="mailto:jon.davis@brooks.af.mil">jon.davis@brooks.af.mil</a>
Tom Sims	AFCEE	404-562-4200	<a href="mailto:Thomas.sims@us.af.mil">Thomas.sims@us.af.mil</a>
Bill FitzPatrick	E&RC	508-968-5154	<a href="mailto:bill.f.fitzpatrick@us.army.mil">bill.f.fitzpatrick@us.army.mil</a>
Bill Sullivan	E&RC	508-968-5147	<a href="mailto:William.g.sullivan@us.army.mil">William.g.sullivan@us.army.mil</a>
Lynda Wadsworth	E&RC	508-968-5152	<a href="mailto:Lynda.e.wadsworth@us.army.mil">Lynda.e.wadsworth@us.army.mil</a>
Emily Derbyshire	E&RC	508-968-5146	<a href="mailto:Emily.derbyshire@us.army.mil">Emily.derbyshire@us.army.mil</a>
Sally Hartmann	E&RC	508-968-5145	<a href="mailto:sally.a.hartmann@us.army.mil">sally.a.hartmann@us.army.mil</a>
Hap Gonser	IAGWSP	508-968-5107	<a href="mailto:kent.gonser@us.army.mil">kent.gonser@us.army.mil</a>
Ben Gregson	IAGWSP	508-968-5821	<a href="mailto:ben.gregson@us.army.mil">ben.gregson@us.army.mil</a>
Chris Faux	102 <sup>nd</sup> IW	508-968-4247	
Shawn Cody	MAARNG	508-223-6520	<a href="mailto:shawn.cody@us.army.mil">shawn.cody@us.army.mil</a>
Mike Ciaranca	MAARNG	508-968-5121	<a href="mailto:Michael.ciaranca@us.army.mil">Michael.ciaranca@us.army.mil</a>
Andrew Philbrook	MAARNG	508-737-0039	
Ellen Iorio	USACE	978-318-8433	
T. J. Granito	USCG	202-475-5682	<a href="mailto:Thomas.j.granito@uscg.mil">Thomas.j.granito@uscg.mil</a>
CDR Paul Rendon	USCG	508-968-6480	
Bob Cannon	USCG	508-968-6487	<a href="mailto:rfcannon@d1uscg.mil">rfcannon@d1uscg.mil</a>
Denis LeBlanc	USGS	508-490-5030	
Randy Cordeiro	HQCE	508-968-6487	<a href="mailto:randall.j.cordeiro@us.army.mil">randall.j.cordeiro@us.army.mil</a>
Carter Hunt	MassDevelopment	617-519-9857	<a href="mailto:chunt@massdevelopment.com">chunt@massdevelopment.com</a>
John Kennan	Sandwich Selectman	508-833-1857	<a href="mailto:jgkesquire@comcast.net">jgkesquire@comcast.net</a>
Brian Price	Noblis	303-751-9555	<a href="mailto:bprice@noblis.org">bprice@noblis.org</a>
Jim Quin	Ellis Environmental	720-937-9123	<a href="mailto:james.quin@ellisenv.com">james.quin@ellisenv.com</a>
Jane Gasper	Innovar	508-759-9114	<a href="mailto:jgasper@innovar-env.com">jgasper@innovar-env.com</a>

**Handouts Distributed at Meeting:**

1. Presentation handout: Osborne Pond Update
2. USACE fact sheet: Osborne Pond at Massachusetts Military Reservation
3. Environmental Assessment (EA) Timeline: EA for the Proposed Construction Projects at the 102<sup>nd</sup> Intelligence Wing, Massachusetts Air National Guard
4. Presentation handout: Ashumet Valley and Chemical Spill 10 (CS-10) Update
5. Presentation handout: CS-18 and CS-19 Source Area Update

- 
6. Presentation handout: Remediation & Investigation Update
  7. Presentation handout: Camp Edwards Small Arms Range Update: Small Arms Progress and Next Steps
- 

### **Agenda Item #1. Introductions, Approval of May 28, 2008 SMB Minutes, and Agenda Review**

Mr. Green convened the meeting at 6:40 p.m. and the Senior Management Board (SMB) members introduced themselves. Mr. Green asked if there were any additions or corrections to the May 28, 2008 SMB meeting minutes. No changes were offered and the minutes were approved as written.

### **Agenda Item #2. Late-Breaking News**

Mr. Cowles announced that this is COL (Retired) Bill FitzPatrick's last week working for the Massachusetts National Guard, with Monday being his first day with the U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC). He thanked COL FitzPatrick for his good work and wished him the best.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano read a news release from the Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs (EEA) announcing a meeting on Wednesday, October 15, 2008, at 6:30 p.m., at the Sandwich public library, Room 2, to present an overview of the planning process to restore natural resources affected by releases from the Textron Systems Corporation (Textron) and describe opportunities for the public to contribute restoration project proposals. The release also noted that following the public meeting, the EEA will be soliciting proposals for projects worth a total of approximately one million dollars.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano also reported that Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) Commissioner Laurie Burt announced two staffing changes today: Gary Moran will become the Deputy Commissioner for Operations and Programs, and Ed Kunce, who will serve in a new senior management position as the Director of Environmental Response and Technical Support, will be tasked with the coordination and management of environmental response, emergency preparedness, and homeland security activities.

### **Agenda Item #3. SMB/Community News**

#### ***Osborne Pond Update***

Ms. Iorio of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) reminded the group that Osborne Pond, located near the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) part of the base, is a former bivouac area. She also noted that during the Archive Search Report, an Air Force reserve trainee who was at the base from 1963 to 1973 indicated that a munitions disposal site may have been located at the pond, having recalled seeing a 1968/1969 photograph that showed exposed mortars, grenades, and artillery shells in low water. The investigations of Osborne Pond were undertaken in response to this information.

Ms. Iorio stated that the geophysical mapping of the 14 acres of the pond's uplands, which was conducted in August 2005, identified 807 anomalies. The anomalies were investigated and only one discarded military munition (DMM) was found (an unfuzed 2.36-inch rocket), while all of the other anomalies turned out to be cultural debris unrelated to military activities, such as rebar, cans, and wire. Soil samples taken in the area of the much deteriorated rocket showed that a variety of explosives (but below reportable concentrations) were emanating from the item, which was brought to the contained detonation chamber (CDC) to be destroyed.

Ms. Iorio then reported that the 2008 investigation that followed the geophysical mapping of the pond itself looked at 17 anomalies and the outfalls and revealed no DMM, only cultural debris such as pipes and cans. She also noted that chemical analysis of the surface water didn't identify any munitions or

---

explosives of concern (MEC), and that the sediment was not tested because no MEC items were found on it.

Ms. Iorio stated that the Osborne Pond investigation has been completed. The next steps are: submit the Remedial Investigation (RI) report to the regulators and stakeholders, after which comments will be resolved; perform a Feasibility Study (FS) that evaluates any alternatives being considered for the site; submit the FS report to the regulators and stakeholders; and jointly come to a decision on any further actions to be taken, to be documented in a Decision Document.

### ***Base Planning Update***

Mr. Cowles announced that VHB of Watertown, Massachusetts is the contractor selected for the MassDevelopment preliminary land survey activity. He explained that the activity involves creating an illustrated plan that shows locations of Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR) easements, restrictions, and boundaries of record from the documents provided or on file with the USACE and other parties.

Ms. Garcia-Serrano inquired about the completion date of the project. Mr. Hunt of MassDevelopment said that the contractor has estimated that it will take 12 weeks to complete the task; however, the contract has not yet been finalized. Ms. Grundman asked if there's an expectation on the part of the state, in terms of a timeframe. Mr. Cowles clarified that MassDevelopment is working for the Massachusetts National Guard. Ms. Grundman asked if it's correct then that the project is not time sensitive, and Mr. Cowles confirmed that it is not.

LTC Chris Faux of the 102<sup>nd</sup> Intelligence Wing (IW) reminded the group that the 102<sup>nd</sup> is in the process of transforming from a Fighter Wing to an Intelligence Wing. He also noted that handouts entitled "Environmental Assessment [EA] Timeline – EA for the Proposed Construction Projects at the 102<sup>nd</sup> Intelligence Wing Massachusetts Air National Guard" are available at the meeting, and that currently the 102<sup>nd</sup> IW is working on the Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives (DOPAA), the public portion of which is expected to be released in January 2009.

### **Agenda Item #4. Installation Restoration Program Updates**

#### ***Ashumet Valley and Chemical Spill 10: IROD-to-ROD/Construction***

Mr. Davis noted that he would be discussing the last four Air Force Center for Engineering & the Environment (AFCEE) Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites at MMR to reach remedy-in-place, which AFCEE wants to achieve by September 30, 2009.

Mr. Davis showed a map of the Ashumet Valley plume, which he noted is located in Falmouth, and reminded the group that AFCEE's plan is to add an extraction well in the southern part of the plume in an area of higher contaminant concentrations. He showed a figure depicting the layout of the southern treatment system and pointed out the extraction well location, the pipeline, the mobile treatment unit (MTU) to be located on private property, and the discharge bubbler in the Backus River. He also noted that AFCEE is in the process of working out property access for the MTU.

Mr. Davis also pointed out on a map the Chemical Spill 10 (CS-10) plume, the base boundary, and Ashumet Pond. He then reminded the group that AFCEE had agreed to install an additional extraction well to address an uncaptured portion of the plume, and noted that a pipeline will run along town roads and join up with the existing pipeline on Sandwich Road.

Mr. Davis reported that the Ashumet Valley construction contract (\$930K) was awarded on September 3, 2008, the extraction well is currently being installed, and the remainder of the schedule depends on

---

property access for the MTU. He also noted that the CS-10 construction contract (\$1.4M) was also awarded on September 3, 2008, the extraction well is currently being installed, and the anticipated completion date for the project is spring 2009.

Mr. Davis then spoke about the paperwork required to move the Ashumet Valley and CS-10 plumes through the Interim Record of Decision (IROD)-to-Record of Decision (ROD) process. He noted that it was determined that a new Ashumet Valley Proposed Plan was not needed, as the selected remedy is a variation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) and MassDEP's preferred remedy. Also, the public has been informed about the remedy through the Plume Cleanup Team (PCT), the SMB, a public meeting with Ashumet Valley residents, the Falmouth selectmen, and through the media outlets. A draft Ashumet Valley ROD is due to be submitted to the agencies in mid November, with ROD signature to occur in May 2009. For CS-10, AFCEE is awaiting final concurrence from MassDEP, which is expected soon, two months after which a Proposed Plan will be issued. The CS-10 ROD is expected to be signed by no later than September 30, 2009.

#### ***Questions and Comments from SMB and Public***

Ms. Garcia-Serrano said that she recently reviewed the CS-10 piece, transmitted it over to the Commissioner's office, and anticipates that AFCEE will be receiving an answer very soon. She added that it "looks very good."

#### ***Chemical Spill 18 and Chemical Spill 19: Removal Action/Next Steps***

Mr. Davis reported that a site investigation (SI) and supplemental site investigation (SSI) have been conducted at CS-18, a gun position site. He noted that over the fall/winter AFCEE plans to excavate some DNT-contaminated soil that exceeds the MassDEP standard of 700 parts per billion (ppb), conduct confirmation sampling as well as site-wide sampling using newer methods developed since the time of the SSI, and write a Removal Action Report. Mr. Davis explained that a ROD would not be required since an RI was not conducted at the site. He also noted that it's possible that an additional groundwater sampling event will be conducted before a Decision Document is finalized, although no groundwater detections of any concern have been seen thus far.

Mr. Davis then discussed CS-19, a munitions disposal area site, which was originally understood to be approximately one acre in size, but through investigation was found to be somewhat bigger. He showed slides that noted that AFCEE has: excavated, transported, and disposed of 980 tons of RDX- and DNT-contaminated soil from the site; has transported and disposed of 1,070 tons of stockpile soil generated while removing unexploded ordnance (UXO) and munitions debris; will excavate, transport, and dispose of approximately 724 tons of TNT- and nitroglycerin-contaminated soil during winter 2008; will conduct confirmation sampling, including semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs) during winter 2008; and produce a closure report in spring 2009 for this part of the site, known as the "original CS-19 source area."

Mr. Davis also spoke about the bunker area, known as the "expanded" CS-19 study area, which is north of the original site and includes a concrete bunker (used to support munitions testing in the 1950s and 1960s) and the nearby area. He then reviewed a next steps slide for the expanded CS-19 study area, which noted that AFCEE will: excavate and remove a burn pit, which has exceedances of metals and dioxins; conduct an EM-61 survey over all grids in the area; investigate the anomalies, looking for non-training activities such as munitions testing, burial, and burning; conduct surface and subsurface soil sampling at each grid and analyze for explosives, perchlorate, SVOCs, and metals; and conduct additional removal based on the results of the investigation. Mr. Davis also mentioned that so far groundwater sampling doesn't indicate any significant sources in the bunker area.

---

Mr. Davis continued his presentation by showing a map of the CS-19 groundwater plume, noting that it is intermingled with the Central Impact Area plume, which is being addressed by the Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP). He noted that the CS-19 plume is very thin, but can be directly tied to the original CS-19 source area. He also reported that the plume is stable, does not appear to be migrating, has a maximum RDX concentration of 15 ppb, and has an historical maximum RDX concentration of 21 ppb. Mr. Davis further noted that the plume becomes very dilute as it moves away from the source area, with some concentrations around 1 ppb.

Mr. Davis also said that next steps are to complete removal at the original CS-19 site and complete further investigations at the expanded (bunker) study area and be prepared for additional removal, if warranted. He further noted that the groundwater remedy will have to be addressed for a ROD, and the initial concept is a “monitoring-only” remedy, as it doesn’t appear that the plume will impact future water supplies in that area. He noted that AFCEE will be meeting with MassDEP and EPA next week to work out the details of the CS-19 Proposed Plan and ROD process, which will be shared with the SMB in the future.

### ***Questions and Comments from SMB and Public***

Ms. Garcia-Serrano asked if AFCEE and the IAGWSP are coordinating their efforts with respect to CS-19 and the Central Impact Area plumes. Mr. Davis replied that the Central Impact Area FS is not yet done; however, AFCEE retained a contractor for the FS who is familiar with the modeling work being done on the Central Impact Area to ensure that coordination continues. Ms. Garcia-Serrano asked if AFCEE foresees any potential for a long-term monitoring remedy to change as a result of the coordination efforts. Mr. Davis said that EPA had mentioned the idea of noting in the ROD that a Central Impact Area active remedy might capture all or a portion of the CS-19 plume, for which the remedy is long-term monitoring. He said that he can’t believe that the ROD would be signed without some mention of how the CS-19 and Central Impact Area plumes interact. Ms. Sanderson added that if things do change in the future, there are vehicles such as an Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) to deal with those changes.

## **Agenda Item #5. IAGWSP Remediation & Investigation Updates**

### ***J-2 East Treatment System Startup***

Mr. Gregson reported that the J-2 East treatment system, which began operating about two weeks ago to treat that RDX and perchlorate plume, is located on the eastern base boundary. The plume’s source is believed to be disposal activities that occurred at the J-2 Range, which had been used by defense contractors for munitions testing. The system, which consists of three extraction wells (one near the source, one in the middle, and one near the toe) and four MTUs, will pump about 600,000 gallons of water per day (gpd) – coupled with the J-2 North system, which is pumping about 500,000 gpd, the two systems will be pumping about 1.1 million gpd. Mr. Gregson also noted that the total pumping rate for the IAGWSP, which now has five treatment systems in place, is about 2.8 million gpd. He further noted that the J-2 Range treatment systems are predicted to achieve cleanup in about 14 to 16 years. He also showed several photographs of the J-2 East system construction and noted that a single MTU handles between 100 to 120 gallons per minute (gpm).

### ***J-1 South Update***

Mr. Gregson reminded the group that shortly after the J-1 South plume was discovered, the IAGWSP undertook a Rapid Response Action (RRA) to install a treatment system, consisting of an extraction well and an MTU at the base boundary, which has been operating for about one year and seems to be performing well. He then noted that the source of the J-1 South plume is located on the J-1 Range,

---

another contractor-operated range where testing and disposal activities took place. He also reported that the plume, which is RDX-only, flows from the northwest to the southeast, and that the base boundary system was a first step toward addressing the plume, preventing additional contamination from migrating off base.

Mr. Gregson stated that as a next step the IAGWSP has been looking at concentrations off base and conducting additional sampling. He pointed out an area where some drive-points were recently installed, and also pointed out a monitoring well where RDX was detected at about 1 ppb over the last couple of sampling rounds – noting that the plume appears to have “extended down in this direction.” He reported that preliminary drive-point results showed a detection of 1.7 ppb at location A, a detection of 5 ppb at location B, and nondetect at location C. He added that another drive-point will be installed southwest of location B to determine the width of the plume there, and perhaps one or two drive-points will be installed in the vicinity of Grand Oak Road to see if the plume has extended to that area. Once those data have been obtained, the groundwater flow model and transport model will be updated to predict how the plume will behave and the IAGWSP will look into whether there are appropriate treatment alternatives that could be considered to clean up the off-base portion of the plume. Mr. Gregson also mentioned that a mailing to the neighborhood’s residents about the possibility of locating an extraction well on their property didn’t result in any positive responses thus far; however, there are town roads in the area where a well might be installed. He then clarified that the first thing to do is “look at our current understanding of the plume and to try and understand what remedies might be appropriate.” He also showed a photograph of the drive-point rig, noting that it is on loan from AFCEE.

### ***Robotics Technology Demonstration***

Mr. Gregson spoke about the Air Force Research Laboratories (AFRL) robotics technology demonstration at the base, noting that a more detailed presentation would be provided at the combined SMB/MMR Cleanup Team (MMRCT) meeting in November. He noted that activities at L Range include the use of the following remotely-operated equipment: brush-cutting equipment, geophysical survey equipment, a power rake and rototiller, and a beach cleaner. He also reported that L Range was historically used as a 40mm grenade launching range, and the robotics technology has been quite successful, having recovered about 40 to 50 high explosive rounds from the range. Mr. Gregson then noted that robotics work at the Central Impact Area has included brush-clearing with the “Brontosaurus” attachment, which basically “chews down the trees,” and the use of an electromagnet to pull UXO from the ground surface.

Mr. Gregson reviewed the values of the technology observed during the demonstration thus far: reduced worker exposure and increased safety; reduced time, manpower, and cost; increased quality, particularly with respect to the geophysical survey equipment; the ability to work in a variety of weather conditions, including snow; and flexibility, in that the equipment can use commercially available attachments. He also reviewed some of the challenges that have been observed: line-of-sight limitations; some terrain limitations; difficulty with sifting apparatus working in wet soil conditions; the need to manage material streams; and limited equipment availability, in that the AFRL will be at MMR for only a certain amount of time.

### ***Former B and Former D Ranges***

Mr. Gregson reported that the IAGWSP has been conducting investigations at two former Small Arms Ranges (SARs), Former B Range and Former D Range, which are located near the base boundary with the town of Bourne. Lead ammunition was fired at these ranges, which were used from the late 1930s/early 1940s until the early 1980s, and the IAGWSP wanted to do some field screening to determine the amount of lead there that could potentially be recovered and recycled. Mr. Gregson

---

showed some 1950s-era aerial photographs of the ranges and pointed out the various features. He also noted that today the ranges are grown in with vegetation.

Mr. Gregson then explained that the IAGWSP's contractor used an x-ray fluorescence (XRF) device to detect the lead and develop maps showing areas with lead concentrations above 300 parts per million (ppm), the state's cleanup standard for lead in soil. He showed the maps depicting these areas and reported that there are about 700 cubic yards of soil with lead concentrations exceeding 300 ppm at Former B Range and about 3,000 cubic yards at Former D Range, and the IAGWSP believes it can remove about 7,000 pounds of lead from the ranges. Mr. Gregson said that next steps are to compile the results of the investigation report, write a workplan, excavate the soil, recover the metal for recycling, and perhaps reuse the sifted soil to build berms at another SAR for future firing.

### ***Alternative Energy***

Mr. Gregson reported that like AFCEE, the IAGWSP is pursuing the use of wind energy to help power its treatment plants. Because of the nature of the infrastructure of the IAGWSP's treatment systems, a number of smaller wind turbines were initially being considered (100-kilowatt turbines), as opposed to the single 1.4-megawatt turbine that AFCEE is constructing. However, since passage of the recent "Green Communities Act" legislation, which allows for virtual net-metering, the IAGWSP can now consider larger turbines to meet its needs – perhaps two 600-kilowatt turbines. Mr. Gregson stated that the IAGWSP is still working through funding issues associated with its wind turbine project and hopes to be able to proceed with the project over the next year.

### ***Questions and Comments from SMB and Public***

Mr. Harding inquired about the amount of land that would have to be cleared in order to conduct the excavation work at the Former B and D Ranges. Mr. Gregson replied that the total amount of land to be cleared is between one-half to one acre.

### **Agenda Item #5. Camp Edwards Small Arms Ranges Update**

Mr. Cody, the director of environmental affairs for the Massachusetts National Guard, showed a map and pointed out Tango Range, the SAR where the first STAPP bullet catcher system on the base was installed about two years ago. He reminded the group that in August 2007 the Guard received approval to fire lead ammunition at Tango Range for a 17-month trial period, and to date, nearly 80,000 rounds have been fired into the STAPP system, including 5.56mm rounds, 7.62mm rounds, and 9mm/.40 cal rounds.

Mr. Cody reported that the next steps at Tango Range are: to continue "positive management" of the range, in accordance with the Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan (OMMP) that was developed with the SAR Working Group, which includes EPA, MassDEP, and the Environmental Management Commission (EMC); to continue soil, soil-pore water, and groundwater sampling at the range; to, within the next month or so, conduct a mass balance, which is a measure of the weighted metal captured by the STAPP system; and, at the end of the 17-month trial period, which concludes on December 31, 2008, to develop a final report to be submitted to the regulators.

Mr. Cody then discussed Juliet & Kilo Ranges, two other ranges where STAPP bullet catcher systems are being installed. He noted that elevated levels of tungsten and nitroglycerin found in Juliet Range soil were excavated before beginning construction of the STAPP system there, while nitroglycerin-contaminated soil at Kilo Range was excavated prior to installing that STAPP system, which has since been completed. Mr. Cody showed several photographs of a STAPP system being constructed and

---

spoke about the rubber granules, the liner, and the rubber cover that self-seals after bullets pass it through it.

Mr. Cody reported that the next steps at Juliet & Kilo Ranges are to: complete the installation of STAPP systems and finish writing the OMMPs, incorporating the lessons learned at Tango Range; finalize the investigations, working with the IAGWSP; at the end of this week, submit to EPA a formal letter petitioning the agency to change the Administrative Order #2 (AO#2) Scope of Work (SOW) such that the Guard will be allowed to fire lead ammunition on the ranges; include in that letter a request to be allowed to continue firing at Tango Range while awaiting review of the final report and the agencies' final decision regarding firing of lead at that range; and have a public meeting sometime in late October/early November to answer any questions the public might have.

Mr. Cody continued by speaking about the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), a requirement of the November 2006 Notice of Project Change (NPC) that was filed to request approval to move forward with Tango & Echo Ranges. Although the Tango Range effort worked out well, Echo Range proved more challenging because its targets are arranged at different intervals and therefore a more innovative system than STAPP is needed. Mr. Cody reported that a second NPC was filed with the state to explain the difficulties associated with Echo Range and to request permission to move forward with Juliet & Kilo Ranges since a proven technology would be used there. Permission was granted, but the Guard still has to file the SEIR, which will include Sierra Range, a qualification range that is "what every soldier needs to qualify on before they go to combat." He said that the plan is to file the SEIR on November 18, 2008, to be followed by a public comment period that runs through December.

Mr. Cody also mentioned that different approaches are being tried at Sierra Range, including installing a landscaping type of fiber material containing a honeycomb structure on a small berm behind each target. He said that the Guard continues to work with the SAR Working Group to come up with solutions for Sierra and Echo Ranges, two important training venues (small arms and rifles). He also noted that other future training venues include "live" fire convoys, simulated munitions (simunitions), and additional Small Arms Ranges.

#### ***Questions and Comments from SMB and Public***

Mr. Harding asked if the honeycomb material that Mr. Cody mentioned is self-sealing like the rubber cover on the STAPP systems. Mr. Cody replied that the material, which is really just a landscaping fiber, is not as good as the STAPP system material, and may very well not end up being the answer for Sierra Range.

#### **Agenda Item #6. SMB Meeting Schedule and Adjourn**

Mr. Green stated that the next SMB agenda planning meeting will occur on November 5, 2008 to prepare for the combined SMB/MMRCT meeting on November 19, 2008. Mr. Cowles said that everyone's cooperation in scheduling that meeting to avoid the Thanksgiving holiday is very much appreciated.

Ms. Sanderson said that she thinks the transition to combine the PCT and Impact Area Review Team (IART) into the MMRCT has been successful. She also noted that she attended a recent MMRCT meeting and found it similar to an SMB meeting in terms of substance and level of detail. She further noted that she appreciates that everyone is willing to try a combined SMB/MMRCT meeting and see whether that might be the right next step in terms of being more efficient for the IRP and IAGWSP offices. Mr. Green then adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.