

**WAIKANE TRAINING AREA  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2013  
WAIAHOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAFETERIA  
48-215 WAIAHOLE VALLEY ROAD  
WAIAHOLE, ISLAND OF OAHU, HAWAII**

1. David Henkin called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone.
2. Those in attendance included Government Co-Chair Kevin Pien of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); RAB members Community Co-Chair David Henkin, John Adolpho, Bryon Ho, Kyle Kajihiro, Steven Mow, Roger Morey, Laurie Noda, Eunice Lehua Pate, Paul Zweng, and Aaron Walker substituted for William Keoni Fox.

Others in attendance included Don Cooke, S. Joe Estores, Robert H-H Harter from DEM, City & County of Honolulu, Kaipō Faris from Makawai Stream Restoration Alliance, and Paul Chong from the State of Hawaii-Department of Health, Jackie Conant from USACE - Honolulu District, and Debra Edwards from US Army Engineering Support Center, Huntsville.

Contractors present included David Wolf of Zapata Incorporated (ZAPATA), and Clayton Sugimoto of WCP Inc. (WCP).

RAB members absent were Heidimarie Chung, Walea Constantinau, Todd Cullison, Robert Fernandez, Chris Lopes, Karen Maeda, Bernie Panoncial, and Poola Villarimo.

The agenda of the meeting was:

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Review/Approval of April 2012 Meeting Minutes
- III. Update on Feasibility Study, David Wolf of Zapata, Inc.
- IV. Next Meeting
- V. RAB and Community Member Open Discussion

<b>Name</b>	<b>Action Items from 27 February 2013</b>	<b>Suspense Date</b>	<b>Completed</b>
David Wolf & Kevin Pien	Find the map with transects/grids regarding the Western/Mountainous Region to give to Paul Zweng	March 31, 2013	<b>March 22, 2013</b>
Kevin Pien	Follow-up with Sonja of Environet about the anomalies	March 31, 2013	<b>March 21, 2013</b>
Kevin Pien	Obtain a map showing cultural resources	March 31, 2013	<b>March 21, 2013</b>
David Wolf	What is the acreage covered in the Southeastern Region?	March 31, 2013	<b>March 25, 2013</b>

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Review/Approval of April Meeting Minutes
  - o April Meeting Minutes approved as corrected unanimously by RAB members
- III. Update on Feasibility Study, David Wolf of ZAPATA.
  - A. Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Program
    - a. Congress established the FUDS Program in 1986. US Army Corps of Engineers manages the FUDS Program for Department of Defense (DoD)
    - b. Formerly Used Defense Sites
      - i. FUDS are properties that were formerly owned, leased, possessed by, or otherwise under the operational control of the DoD or military prior to October 1986
    - c. FUDS program follows the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process
  - B. CERCLA Process
    - a. Current phase- Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS)
    - b. Public involvement throughout
  - C. Goals of CERCLA
    - a. Protect Human Health and Welfare
    - b. Protect and Preserve the Environment
    - c. Manage Risk
  - D. Waikane Training Area
    - a. 3 Munitions Response Sites (MRS)
      - i. Western Mountainous Region MRS
      - ii. Southern Impact Region MRS
      - iii. Southeastern Region MRS
  - E. Remedial Investigation (RI) Objective
    - a. Define the NATURE and EXTENT of Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) and Munitions Constituents (MC) Contamination
  - F. Remedial Investigation Report
    - a. Report Structure
    - b. Risk Assessment
      - i. MEC Hazard Assessment (MEC HA)
        1. Qualitative measure of an explosive hazard to human receptors
      - ii. Human Health Risk

1. Evaluates potential risk to human health presented by munitions constituents

iii. Ecological Risk

1. Evaluates potential risk to the environment presented by munitions constituents

G. MEC HA

- a. Assesses acute MEC explosive hazards
- b. MEC HA has three components of potential hazards
  - i. Severity
  - ii. Accessibility
  - iii. Sensitivity
- c. Hazard Levels range from “1” to “4”
  - i. 1-Highest potential explosive hazard conditions
  - ii. 2-High potential explosive hazard conditions
  - iii. 3-Moderate potential explosive hazard conditions
  - iv. 4-Low potential explosive hazard conditions

H. MEC HA Results

- a. MEC HA not conducted in Western/Mountainous Region MRS
  - a. No MEC found during previous investigations
  - b. Limited site accessibility and proposed future land use activities
  - c. A complete MEC exposure pathway (i.e., MEC source, receptor, and receptor acting upon MEC item) is unlikely
- b. Baseline condition is “post removal action” in the Southern Impact Region and Southeastern Region MRSs
- c. MEC HA hazard level “4” identifies low potential explosive hazard conditions in Southern Impact Region MRS and Southeastern Region MRS
- d. MEC may still pose a hazard

I. Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Results

- a. Elevated MC concentrations in soils were limited to the Southeastern Region MRS in a localized area within removal area AOC #2
- b. Confirmation subsurface soil samples were collected at location of highest lead concentration within AOC #2 (Southeastern Region MRS)
- c. Confirmation samples were below State of Hawaii, Department of Health (HDOH) Environmental Action Level (EAL) for lead
- d. Relatively low magnitude of exceedances

- e. Negligible risk potential to human health or ecological receptors from MC exposure in soil

J. Summary of Results-MC

- a. Some sample results exceeded screening levels in soil
- b. Risk assessment indicated negligible risk to human health and ecological receptors
- c. No further action required to address MC

K. Summary of Results-MEC Western/Mountainous Region MRS

- a. No MEC found during previous investigations
- b. There is no evidence of concentrated munitions use within the MRS
- c. A complete MEC exposure pathway (i.e., MEC source, receptor, and receptor acting upon MEC item) is unlikely
- d. Proceed to FS phase for MEC

L. Summary of Results-MEC Southern Impact Region and Southeastern Region MRS

- a. No MEC found during RI
- b. No additional impact areas were identified in the MRSs
- c. Areas characterized with relatively high munition debris (MD) density may contain MEC
- d. Proceed to FS phase for MEC

M. Remedial Action Objectives

- a. Manage MEC and MC exposure risk through a combination of removal/remediation, administrative controls, and/or public education; thereby rendering the site as safe as reasonably possible to humans and the environment and conducive to the anticipated future land use

N. Feasibility Study Purpose

- a. Develop and evaluate appropriate remedial alternatives
- b. Evaluate remedial alternatives against National Contingency Plan (NCP) nine criteria:
  - a. Threshold Criteria**
    - i. Overall protection of human health and the environment
    - ii. Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)
  - b. Balancing Criteria**
    - i. Long-term effectiveness
    - ii. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume
    - iii. Short-term effectiveness

iv. Implementability

v. Cost

**c. Modifying Criteria**

i. State acceptance (pending FS review/comments)

ii. Community acceptance (pending FS review/comments)

c. A specific remedy is not selected during the FS process

**O. Feasibility Study Response Alternative Screening Process**

a. Initial screening process involves evaluating alternatives with respect to the following criteria (Initial Screening):

a. Effectiveness (long-term and short-term)

b. Implementability (technical and administrative)

c. Cost (investment and benefit)

b. Remaining alternatives are evaluated against the nine NCP criteria (Individual Analysis of Remedial Action Alternatives)

c. Alternatives then compared against each other for each MRS (Comparative Analysis)

**P. Feasibility Study Response Alternatives**

a. Alternative 1-No Action

b. Alternative 2-Land Use Controls (LUCs)

c. Alternative 3-Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs

d. Alternative 4-Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs

e. Alternative 5-Subsurface Removal to Support Unlimited Use

**Q. Alternative 1-No Action**

a. Baseline for comparison of other risk-reduction alternatives

b. No action would be taken to address MEC potentially present at the MRSs

c. No alternative is appropriate for sites where

a. No MEC has been found, or

b. Where there is no documented evidence of military munitions usage.

**R. Alternative 2-LUCs**

a. LUCs are physical, legal and administrative controls

b. Warn people of the potential MEC dangers (signs and MEC awareness program)

c. Impose a use restriction (land use and permitting)

d. Requires landowner and agency participation

- e. Can be a component of other remedial actions
- f. Appropriate if MD/Potential MEC present

S. Alternative 3-Surface MEC Removal w/LUCs

- a. Involves removal and disposal of MEC/MD located on the ground surface or partially buried
- b. Requires teams of unexploded ordnance (UXO)-qualified personnel to use visual identification, aided by hand-held instruments, to search for MEC
- c. Vegetation removal would be required
- d. Appropriate if documented MEC and MD are present on ground surface
- e. Current/Future land use includes surface activities only (i.e., hiking and hunting). No intrusive activities
- f. Combined with LUCs

T. Alternative 4-Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal w/LUCs

- a. Involves a combination of surface and subsurface MEC/MD removal and disposal
  - a. Requires teams of UXO-qualified personnel aided by hand-held instruments to search for MEC
  - b. Extensive vegetation removal would be required
- b. The effectiveness of subsurface removal is limited by the technology available at the time of removal
- c. Appropriate if documented MEC and MD are present on surface and in areas with high MEC subsurface density
- d. Current/Future land use includes intrusive activities (i.e., residential, construction, agriculture)
- e. Combined with LUCs

U. Alternative 5-Subsurface MEC Removal to Support Unlimited Use

- a. This alternative involves a combination of surface and subsurface MEC removal to a depth which allows for unlimited use and no LUCs
  - a. Requires teams of UXO-qualified personnel to search for MEC
  - b. Extensive site-wide vegetation removal and excavation with heavy machinery would be required to remove all metallic items
- b. The effectiveness of subsurface removal is limited by the technology available at the time of removal
- c. Appropriate if documented MEC and MD present on surface and in areas with high MEC subsurface density
- d. No LUCs

V. Initial Screening of Remedial Action Alternatives (Step 1 of 3)

- a. Effectiveness
- b. Implementability
- c. Cost

W. Initial Screening Results Alternative 5-Unlimited Use

- a. Eliminated from detailed evaluation for each MRS
- b. Not technically feasible
- c. Not compatible with the current and proposed future land use
- d. Will not comply with ARARs
- e. Cost prohibitive

X. Initial Screening Results Western/Mountainous Region MRS

- a. Alternatives 3 and 4 (removal alternatives) were eliminated from detailed evaluation for this MRS
- b. There is no documented evidence of MEC or concentrated munitions use within the MRS
- c. Limited site accessibility and proposed future land use activities
- d. A complete MEC exposure pathway (i.e., MEC source, receptor, and receptor acting upon MEC item) is unlikely
- e. Alternatives 3 and 4 are not technically feasible due physical constraints of the site

Y. Individual Analysis of Remedial Action Alternatives (Step 2 of 3)

Z. Alternative 1-No Action

- a. Threshold Criteria
  - i. Does not implement a response or remedy
  - ii. Not constrained by ARARs
- b. Balancing Criteria
  - i. No long-term management measures
  - ii. No reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume of MEC
  - iii. No short-term management measures
  - iv. No implementability concerns posed by this remedy, since no action would be taken
  - v. Cost \$0

AA. Alternative 2-LUCs

- a. Threshold Criteria
  - i. Risk is managed through measures implemented to modify receptor behavior

- ii. Complies with ARARs
  - b. Balancing Criteria
    - i. Long-term management measures such as 5-year reviews
    - ii. No reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume of MEC
    - iii. No short-term management measures
    - iv. Implementation of LUCs require landowner and agency participation
    - v. Cost \$
- BB. Alternative 3-Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs
  - a. Threshold Criteria
    - i. Protective of human health and the environment for non-intrusive activities (hiking and hunting)
    - ii. Can be implemented to comply with ARARs
  - b. Balancing Criteria
    - i. Long-term effectiveness is moderate if MEC is present
    - ii. Reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume of MEC at the surface
    - iii. Effective in the short-term if MEC is present on surface
    - iv. Implementation requires UXO-qualified personnel
    - v. Implementation of LUCs require landowner and agency participation
    - vi. Cost \$\$
- CC. Alternative 4-Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs
  - a. Threshold Criteria
    - i. Most protective of human health and the environment for surface and intrusive activities
    - ii. Can be implemented to comply with ARARs
  - b. Balancing Criteria
    - i. Very effective as a long-term remedy if MEC is present
    - ii. Most reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume of MEC
    - iii. Very effective in the short-term if MEC is present
    - iv. Implementation requires UXO-qualified personnel
    - v. Implementation of LUCs require landowner and agency participation
    - vi. Cost \$\$\$
- DD. Comparative Analysis of Remedial Action Alternatives (Step 3 of 3)



EE. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Western/Mountainous Region MRS

a. FS Alternatives Summary Western/Mountainous Region MRS

Alternative	Cost (30-year Present Worth)	Rationale
1-No Action	\$0	No risk reduction
2 - LUCs	\$1,156,170	Reduce potential risk by providing signage and community MEC educational awareness program with safety training.
3 - Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	--	Not considered based on lack of MEC found on the surface during the EE/CA and RI.
4 - Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	--	Not considered based on lack of MEC found on the subsurface during the EE/CA and RI. Limited intrusive activity anticipated for future land use.
5 – Subsurface Removal to Support Unlimited Use	--	Not considered because it is not technically feasible, does not comply with ARARs and is cost prohibitive compared to the other alternatives.

b. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Western/Mountainous Region MRS

Remedial Alternative			
	EPA's Nine CERCLA Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 1 No Action Baseline (Condition)	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls (LUCs)
Threshold Criteria	Overall Protectiveness of Human Health and the Environment	○	●
	Compliance with ARARs	N/A	●
Balancing Criteria	Short-Term Effectiveness	○	●
	Long-Term Effectiveness	○	●
	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume Through Treatment	○	○
	Implementability	○	●
	Cost	N/A	\$
Modifying Criteria	State Acceptance	TBD	TBD
	Community Acceptance	TBD	TBD

Notes:

N/A Not Applicable.

● Alternative has high ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

● Alternative has moderate ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

○ Alternative does not impact baseline condition.

\$ Low or minimal costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$ Moderate costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$\$ High costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

TBD To be determined based on public and regulatory review of FS.

FF. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Southern Impact Region MRS

a. FS Alternatives Summary Southern Impact Region MRS

Alternative	Cost (30-year Present Worth)	Rationale
1-No Action	\$0	No risk reduction
2 - LUCs	\$1,156,170	Reduce potential risk by providing signage and community MEC educational awareness program with safety training.
3 - Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	\$3,648,890	Reduce risk for potential receptors which activities involve surface use. Receptors may still encounter subsurface MEC.
4 - Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	\$5,327,930	High level of protectiveness for proposed future activities.
5 – Subsurface Removal to Support Unlimited Use	--	Not considered because it is not technically feasible, does not comply with ARARs and is cost prohibitive compared to the other alternatives.

Notes:

- Cost reflects removal actions over accessible area (+/- 44 acres) of the 90 acre-MRS.

b. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Southern Impact Region MRS

Remedial Alternative					
	EPA's Nine CERCLA Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 1 No Action (Baseline Condition)	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls (LUCs)	Alternative 3 Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	Alternative 4 MEC Surface and Subsurface Removal and Implementation of LUCs
Threshold Criteria	Overall Protectiveness of Human Health and Environment	○	●	●	●
	Compliance with ARARs	N/A	●	●	●
Balancing Criteria	Short-Term Effectiveness	○	●	●	●
	Long-Term Effectiveness	○	●	●	●
	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume Through Treatment	○	○	●	●
	Implementability	○	●	●	●
	Cost	N/A	\$	\$\$	\$\$\$
Modifying Criteria	State Acceptance	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	Community Acceptance	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Notes:

N/A Not Applicable.

● Alternative has high ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

● Alternative has moderate ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

○ Alternative does not impact baseline condition.

\$ Low or minimal costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$ Moderate costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$\$ High costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

TBD To be determined based on public and regulatory review of FS.

GG. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Southeastern Region MRS

a. FS Alternatives Summary Southeastern Impact Region MRS

Alternative	Cost (30-year Present Worth)	Rationale
1-No Action	\$0	No risk reduction
2 - LUCs	\$1,156,170	Reduce potential risk by providing signage and community MEC educational awareness program with safety training.
3 - Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	\$2,437,030	Reduce risk for potential receptors which activities involve surface use. Receptors may still encounter subsurface MEC.
4 - Surface and Subsurface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	\$3,255,940	High level of protectiveness for proposed future activities.
5 – Subsurface Removal to Support Unlimited Use	--	Not considered because it is not technically feasible, does not comply with ARARs and is cost prohibitive compared to the other alternatives.

Notes:

- Cost reflects removal action over +/- 21 acres

b. Comparative Analysis of Alternatives Southeastern Impact Region MRS

Remedial Alternative					
	EPA's Nine CERCLA Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 1 No Action (Baseline Condition)	Alternative 2 Land Use Controls (LUCs)	Alternative 3 Surface MEC Removal and Implementation of LUCs	Alternative 4 MEC Surface and Subsurface Removal and Implementation of LUCs
Threshold Criteria	Overall Protectiveness of Human Health and Environment	○	●	●	●
	Compliance with ARARs	N/A	●	●	●
Balancing Criteria	Short-Term Effectiveness	○	●	●	●
	Long-Term Effectiveness	○	●	●	●
	Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume Through Treatment	○	○	●	●
	Implementability	○	●	●	●
	Cost	N/A	\$	\$\$	\$\$\$
Modifying Criteria	State Acceptance	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	Community Acceptance	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Notes:

N/A Not Applicable.

● Alternative has high ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

● Alternative has moderate ability to meet the specified comparative analysis criteria relative to baseline condition.

○ Alternative does not impact baseline condition.

\$ Low or minimal costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$ Moderate costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

\$\$\$ High costs to implement relative to other alternatives evaluated.

TBD To be determined based on public and regulatory review of FS.

HH. Assessment of Alternatives Southeastern Region MRS

- Non Time Critical Removal Action conducted in AOC #2
- MEC items found close to the removal action boundaries
- A buffer was applied around the MEC items and it is included in the proposed removal action area
- Based on 21 acres

II. What Happens Next?

- a. FS Report
  - i. Present Alternatives for decision makers
  - ii. Comment Period: 31 March 2013
  - iii. Final: April 2013
- b. Proposed Plan
  - i. Present recommended alternatives
  - ii. Public Meeting
  - iii. 30 day Public Review
  - iv. Final: July 2013
- c. Decision Document
  - i. Final: August 2013

JJ. Safety

- a. RECOGNIZE-Military Items can be DANGEROUS
- b. RETREAT-DO NOT TOUCH IT! Move away from the area
- c. REPORT-CALL 911

Eunice Lehua Pate: Clarification on Alternative 2 LUCs. It states the cost is roughly around \$1.2M for each of the three regions. Does the \$1.2M cover all three regions?

David Wolf response: Cost that is shown on the slides is the estimated cost of one MRS alone. If all three MRS occurred at one time the cost would also total approximately \$1.2M.

Kevin Pien response: Alternative 2 LUCs is primarily an administrative alternative. It includes signage, education programs, five year review which is included in the \$1.2 M cost.

David Henkin: Describe the difference between Alternative 4 and Alternate 5. Is Alternative 5 stripping the property down, removing all soil and vegetation?

David Wolf response: Correct. Alternative 5 is an involved operation. It is not implementable or technically feasible, for various reasons, and would not comply with ARARs.

David Henkin: Unclear where the 21 acres were analyzed in the Southeastern Region. Why has only 21 acres been looked at?

Minutes for Waikane Training Area Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

February 27, 2013

Page 16

David Wolf response: The 21 acres are the grey hatched areas. A buffer was applied to the MEC items which were found in close proximity to the removal action area, AOC #2. The buffer area that fell outside the previous removal action boundary is the 21-acre proposed removal action area. No MEC items were found outside of the removal action area.

Paul Zweng: If MEC items weren't found why do you propose Alternatives 3 & 4?

David Wolf response: MEC items have been found and removed in AOC #2. To be complete, Alternatives 3 and 4 were considered since MEC and MD have been recovered in the Southern Impact Region and Southeastern Region MRSs and they passed the initial screening process. Alternatives 3 & 4 were removed in Western/Mountainous Region. It is part of the evaluation process.

Paul Zweng: Describe the nature of work done in the Western/Mountainous Region.

David Wolf response: During the EE/CA phase transects and grids were placed. Intrusive investigations were done along portions and across ridgelines.

Community Member: There must be remote sensing technologies that can detect munitions in these areas.

Paul Zweng: According to my experience, the current remote sensing platforms either do not have the capability of detecting items the size of the munitions found here. They are typically used to locate very large mineral deposits.

Aaron Walker: Do you have old training records for the Army and Navy?

Kevin Pien response: No. There is not much documentation from that period.

Kyle Kajihiro: If you chose one alternative, what would the proposal be according to the physical areas?

David Wolf response: The proposed removal action was within the entire area.

Kevin Pien response: Entire area was covered only in the Southern Impact Area.

Kyle Kajihiro: Can the proposed removal area in the Southeastern Region be adjusted to the south to cover the high MD density area?

David Henkin: I also think clearance in this area would be appropriate.

David Wolf: To clarify, intrusive investigation grids were placed in areas with high MD density including the area to the southwest of AOC #2 during the RI.

David Henkin: Were the grids for MC?

David Wolf: No, they were for MEC

Kyle Kajihiro: How big were the grids?

David Wolf: The grids were 25 feet by 25 feet.

Kyle Kajihiro: Where are the cultural areas in the Southeastern Region?

Paul Zweng response: At the junction of the Waikane stream, there are Waikane taro plots; near the Waikakee stream there are series of loi. Other potential farm use is in a comprehensive management plan permits for which that have been submitted to DLNR. There are also forest restoration efforts with associated potential worker exposure in the Western/Mountainous Region.



David Hekin: Do you know what acreage is accessible in the Southeastern Region?

David Wolf response: Not off the top of my head. Will find out what the acreage is.

Kevin Pien response: Part of being accessible is due to what was covered by transects in the Southern Region MRS. There are gaps where they were not able to get to.

Steven Mow: How much non-munition debris is in other areas?

David Wolf response: There were non-munitions debris located throughout the other MRSs. I am not able to provide a ratio of munition to non-munitions debris. They did not remove large non-munitions debris in any of the MRSs.

Kevin Pien: According to the April 25, 2012 minutes, in the removal action, the ratio of non-munitions debris to munitions debris was approximately 10:1 (15,865 lbs non-MD to 1,638 lbs MD). I'm not sure what the "Anomalies Removed (pounds): 41,433" refers to, but I will find out from Environet.

Steven Mow: How hard was it to distinguish between munition to non-munitions debris?

David Wolf response: In some cases it is relatively easy. In other cases it could be a metal fragmentation where the UXO technician would have to determine what it was based on material thickness.

Steven Mow: What would be the plan if you did a surface/subsurface removal? Could the cost be affected if there is non-munition debris?

David Wolf response: The non-munition debris on the ground surface could interfere with geophysical instruments and mask subsurface anomalies. If non-munitions debris is on the surface it should be removed. The quantity of surface/subsurface non-munition debris required to be removed by the contractor may impact the cost.

Joe Estores: Goal: The Corps should clean-up the land to what it was before the military used it.

- The Feasibility Study (FS) comment period ends at the end of March.
- Comments for the FS can be given to Kevin Pien or David Henkin.

#### IV. Next Meeting

- Tentatively Scheduled for Wednesday June 5, 2013.

#### V. RAB and Community Member Open Discussion

- David Henkin adjourned the meeting at 09:00 p.m.