

MEETING MINUTES

8 July 2005

Project: Former Trabuco Bombing Range Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

Date: 27 June 2005, 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Location: City Hall, Rancho Santa Margarita, California

Purpose: Project Kick-Off/Technical Planning Process Meeting 1

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation	Contact Information
Larry Sievers	CESPL PM	213.452.3989 larry.a.sievers@usace.army.mil
B. J. Allen	CESPL	858.674.6766 billy.j.allen@usace.army.mil
Dan Ledford	Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc. (ITSI) PgM	925.946.3124 dledford@itsi.com
Joni Jorgensen-Risk	ITSI PM	925.260.5832 jrisk@itsi.com
Rogerio Leong	ITSI	925.946.3156 rleong@itsi.com
Bill Kelso	Parsons PM	303.764.1932 william.kelso@parsons.com
Michael Short	Parsons	678.969.2451 michael.short@parsons.com
Daniel Cordero	DTSC	714.484.5428 dcordero@dtsc.ca.gov
Randy Sterett	OCSD Bomb Squad	714.538.2694 RSterett@ocsd.org
Capt. Eric J. Lake	U.S. Army	619.553.8500 eric.lake@us.army.mil
Tom Wheeler	City of Rancho Santa Margarita	949.635.1800 ext. 507 twheeler@cityofrsm.org
Steve Mitchell	RSM/OC Sheriff	949.635.1817 smitchell@ocsd.org
Ron White	RSM/OC Sheriff	949.635.1819 rwhite@ocsd.org
Leslie Ray	County of Orange O'Neill Regional Park	949.923.2259 leslie.ray@rdmd.ocgov.com
Mark Carlson	County of Orange HBP/South District	714.973.6864 mark.carlson@rdmd.ocgov.com
Jim Lazzaro	Lt. OCSD	714.647.6024 j.lazzaro@ocsd.org
Steve Thornton	Representative Miller	714.257.1142 steven.thornton@mail.house.gov

Prepared by: Joni Jorgensen-Risk

Mr. Larry Sievers opened the meeting by thanking those in attendance for coming and introduced himself as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), LA District Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) Program Manager and Trabuco Bombing Range Project

Manager (PM). He requested that if any of the attendees had any questions regarding this project, or any other project in the L.A. District FUDS Program please contact him. It is his job to respond to any inquiries on the FUDS Program or the Trabuco Bombing Range. He provided his contact information and encouraged any and all inquiries. Mr. Sievers then reviewed the agenda and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves.

Mr. Sievers proceeded to his presentation beginning with an overview of the USACE and its various missions designed to serve the public through the regulatory programs, flood control and construction, the civil works program, as well as military construction for their federal government customers. He reviewed the project schedule so that calendars could be coordinated among the team. The next TPP meeting is scheduled for 18 August; the third TPP meeting is scheduled for 12 October. Mr. Sievers suggested that may need to be moved if it conflicts with the RSM council. A public meeting will also be held at that time that will include a posterboard session and provide the public with information they will need to participate in the remedial process. The final TPP meeting is scheduled for 15 December where comments will be reviewed and discussed on the Draft RI/FS Work Plan. Providing that funding is in place 60-days following the final submittal of the Work Plan, the project team expects to be in the field conducting the remedial investigation sometime around March or April 2006. He added that it is his job to provide the best value for the government by completing this project as fast and efficiently as possible and will need everyone's participation to maintain the schedule as close to projected as possible.

Mr. Sievers continued with a FUDS Program introduction. The USACE is the responsible agent, assigned by Congress, to address clean-up at all former military sites. These FUDS are addressed in-line with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process either under the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) or the hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste (HTRW) Program. He stated that the number of FUDS continue to grow as development presses into different areas or as research identifies new sites. The cost to complete the 9,700 FUDS in the program is estimated at \$18.1 Billion; there is only a fraction of that funding available. For that reason the USACE needs be particular about the sites that are investigated and the hazards those sites pose to the public.

The CERCLA flowchart was reviewed; steps completed thus far at the former bombing range included the Preliminary Assessment phase with the completion of the Archive Search Report, along with the Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) completed last year. The Site Investigation phase is considered a new phase in the MMRP, and for all intensive purposes, the Trabuco Bombing Range has moved beyond that into the RI/FS phase. Following the RI/FS phase is the Proposed Plan (PP) which describes to the public what remedial actions are proposed at the site in very simple, easy to understand terms. There will be a public review and comment period on the PP. Following that, the Record of Decision (ROD) will be developed that will describe in legal terms (written for a judge) the remedial action goals, the roadmap to achieve those goals and how we will measure our effectiveness in completing those goals. The design phase follows and that will put into play those activities proposed in the Feasibility Study. Next is the Remedial Action phase that could include installing fences, munitions removal, a Public Awareness Program, etc. Those Remedial Actions that are completed will be reviewed under long term monitoring (at a period of no more than 5 years) for their effectiveness in protecting human health and the environment.

Mr. Sievers stated that much of what would be reviewed that day was provided in more detail in the FUDS Program Policy (ER 200-3-1). He stated that the policy is fairly readable and if anyone was interested he would be happy to provide them with a copy.

Tom Wheeler, City of Rancho Santa Margarita (RSM), asked which of those actions included in the CERCLA flowchart were tasked and funded for the former Trabuco Bombing Range. Mr. Sievers stated that the USACE was funded for approximately two-thirds of the RI/FS, PP, and ROD actions referenced in the CERCLA flowchart. If the current funding remains, the USACE will finish funding the RI/FS process in whole, allowing for the completion of the project to remedy selection by next fiscal year.

Mr. Sievers continued with the program detail information; Trabuco is one of 357 MMRP sites. He reviewed the risk assessment code (RAC) scoring under FUDS; USACE is charged with handling RAC 1 (being the most hazardous for the likelihood of an encounter versus the severity of that encounter) and RAC 2 sites as quickly as possible (of which there are 51 in the LA District FUDS Program). He added that, generally when he shows that particular slide to a community, it is to explain why the USACE is not doing their respective project. RSM is fortunate that USACE is present and Mr. Sievers suggested that could be the result of effective actions by some of those in attendance.

Mr. Sievers provided a graphic display of what the USACE has determined to be the former footprint of the site. Historical records have not clearly defined the boundary and no parcel surveys were completed. For that reason, the boundary included in the graphic is what the USACE considers to be the best estimate of the lands included in the former bombing range. The current USACE efforts will likely focus on the remaining open space areas, though this is certainly open for discussion. The USACE is considering the removal of any developed areas from the project; they will not be looking for munitions in people's backyards.

Mr. Sievers provided a brief history of the former Trabuco Bombing Range beginning in 1944 with the acquisition of approximately 1,800 acres, the reduction in acreage to 502 in the 1950's, and the return to grazing and farming in 1956. The range was used for practice bombs and rockets, with practice bombs and rockets being the only items recovered in the past. A brief history was provided of the historical significance of the bombing range; important to the nation for the training of our military personnel.

Development in the area was initiated in the 1980's and the munitions clearance process was much different back then; there was no established process for remedial/removal action (certainly not like today's standards). In 1984 alone, 50,000 pounds of empty practice munitions were removed, of which 478 were suspected of containing spotting charges. Those clearing activities continued through 1988 until the Marines were unable to respond to all the munitions located at the site. The Santa Margarita Company then began to stockpile over 122,000 pounds of munitions at the site; this on top of the 50,000 pounds from 1984. Several tons of the stockpiled munitions were buried under 20-30 feet of soil at the 8th hole of the golf course.

Mr. Sievers presentation moved into FUDS history at the former bombing range beginning in 1990 with the completion of an Inventory Project Report (INPR) that assigned a RAC score of 2 and provided for funding at the site. Following that, in 1991, the USACE removed the 122,000 pounds of stockpiled munitions, and in 1993 the ASR was developed. In 1998, a Technical Assistance Group (TAG) completed a quality assurance evaluation of the work completed to date. Those data from the TAG and the

ASR were included in a supplemental INPR in 1999, and funding was programmed for Fiscal Year (FY) 04 due to heightened concerns of the public encountering munitions. In September 2003, Orange County personnel encountered potential munition items during construction activities for a bike trail. After the third munitions encounter, the county stopped work, and the USACE got involved. The USACE worked with county and city officials, and DTSC to organize the Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) to clear the remainder of the bike path of potential munitions so that the construction activities could resume. The TCRA covered a 2-acre linear path and located 12 inert items.

Mr. Sievers opened the floor for questions. Mr. Wheeler took the opportunity to introduce Steve Thornton from Congressman Miller's office. Mr. Thornton informed those in attendance that a new congressional caucus was formed the week prior to deal with unexploded ordnance, with Congressman Miller a founding co-chairman. Mike Carlson, County of Orange, asked if additional work is expected to take place in the O'Neill Park, or along the Arroyo Trabuco. Mr. Sievers replied that yes, work is expected to take place in much of the remaining open spaces and it is the intention of the USACE to secure Rights of Entry from the current property owners, which would include the County of Orange.

Mr. Sievers then introduced Joni Jorgensen-Risk from ITSI who would be presenting on the RI/FS process. Indicating to the TPP Information Package that all participants received, she stated that the package included copies of the INPR, ASR, TCRA, the Powerpoint presentations, some TPP worksheets, project schedule, project contact list, and a letter from Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to USACE dated 16 March 2004.

Ms. Jorgensen-Risk stated that the purpose of the RI/FS process is to adequately characterize the site for the purpose of developing and evaluating effective remedial alternatives. The RI phase is designed to provide the data necessary to assess the potential risks to human health, safety, and the environment. Data (historical and field investigation) collected during the RI will help support the FS phase, which is designed to ensure that appropriate remedial alternatives are developed and evaluated, and that an appropriate remedy is selected.

In concert with the RI/FS, the USACE is developing a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) to ensure that stakeholders are informed and that they are provided an opportunity to become involved in the remedial process. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk stated that there are several avenues that the USACE will be using to communicate with the public including conducting personal interviews, an on-line survey that members of the community are invited to log onto (<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=65113020E69047>), attend public meetings held by the USACE, and also to review upcoming documents and provide their feedback.

She concluded her presentation saying that the integrated parts of the RI/FS pave the way to the remedy selection, the ROD, remedial design, and remedial action. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk opened the floor to questions and comments. Mr. Wheeler asked when the PIP would be coming out and Ms. Jorgensen-Risk responded that the PIP is scheduled for distribution in October/November. He then asked if that was the time that the interviews would be conducted to which she responded that the interview process would start the first week of July. B.J. Allen asked how the on-line survey information was to be distributed; would there be a public notice published to announce the survey. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk indicated that announcements will come through the survey

process, and the USACE might also provide an announcement in the local newspaper. Mr. Wheeler asked for details regarding the list of interviewees, to which she responded that the list had been developed and included local school's, city and county officials, and will continue to be developed throughout the interview process. Mr. Thornton suggested that Congressman Miller's office could post announcement information to their web site and include any information for public distribution in their weekly newsletter. Mr. Wheeler offered the City of RSM website for posting as well, and added that the city would like to be involved as much as they can with this process. He also offered some additional contact information and a possible link to the on-line survey.

Michael Short, Parsons, transitioned the presentation to the technical planning process (TPP) developed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and adopted by USACE in an effort to develop a consensus early on in the remedial process which allows for cost savings by engineering a functional and forward-moving process. The project goals and objectives will be defined collectively by the team as we move through the technical planning process. There are four phases that the team will be actively involved in. Mr. Short displayed some charts that depicted the ideal in the planning process; the team has the greatest ability to influence project costs when there is sufficient up front planning in developing the statement of purpose; defining the data requirements; and developing the conceptual design. With sufficient up front planning, the team will be able to provide for an effective and executable remediation process and eventual close-out of the project—which is the end goal of any remedial project.

The RI/FS will be investigating about 15-20 acres of the current 800-900 acres of open space at the former bombing range thus providing for a statistically sound 2% of the overall area. Many variables can affect the process in the interim by affecting the schedule and the budget. The goal is to limit interruptions as much as possible by working as a team and communicating project and team needs effectively. Mr. Short reviewed the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) included in the information package provided to all attendees, and asked that if anyone noted any errors in the CSM regarding current or future land use to please identify those errors. Mr. Wheeler asked that O'Neill Regional Park be added to the open space identification. A discussion took place regarding the properties of Orange County and the City of RSM. All property issues will be investigated further in the planning process.

Mr. Short reviewed the geophysical process and equipment use, and discussed the physical nature of the site, the regulatory framework, demographics and land use, and provided a summary of Phase I of the TPP process. Mr. Short then provided some examples of closeout statements and asked all attendees to write down a project closeout statement from their viewpoint/perspective. The statements will be collected from the team and synchronized into a single comprehensive statement that will be discussed at the next TPP meeting.

Mr. Short provided details on the second phase of the TPP process that will determine the data needs. Keeping in mind that the end goal is site closeout; the USACE wants to collect the data needed to properly evaluate the site without collecting too much data, and also avoid collecting data that will not support site characterization/evaluation. He referred to an example from earlier in the day, during the site visit, where the USACE biologist provided necessary data that will enable the project team to minimize any impact to the flora and fauna at the site. Through the data gathering process, data gaps will be identified and collectively the team will identify how best to fill those gaps be they site accessibility issues, zoning, or technical gaps.

Mr. Short explained the technical approaches to characterizing the site which included collecting geophysical data by a combination of methods including meandering path, transects, and grids. He explained that the easiest way to characterize the site is with the EM61 instrument and provided examples regarding data collection using each approach. Mr. Wheeler asked if the project team will consider current land use and accessibility when designing their approach. Mr. Short responded that they most certainly will include current land use and site accessibility in the equation when designing the data gathering approach. With that in mind, Mr. Short explained that the work plans that will be developed for the data collection process will be dynamic, living documents; allowing for modifications that might be needed due to changing conditions. This will allow for an expedited site characterization approach and minimize interruptions to the process flow.

Mr. Short moved to the next phase of the TPP process; developing data collection options, starting with the plan sampling/clearance and analysis approach. He stated that the USACE does have an approach that they are finalizing and will lay it out at the next TPP meeting. There will be review and discussion of the approach at that time. The team will also be filling out the data needs worksheets at the next meeting to make sure that we are moving forward as one cohesive unit.

Part of the Phase III process is the development of analysis strategies and he provided some graphical illustrations of geophysical mapping and analysis. Documentation of data collection options will include how many samples (the RI/FS will be proposing 15 to 20 acres), where the samples will be collected (the geophysical investigation will provide us with that information), and what navigation methods (use of GPS whenever possible).

Phase IV will finalize the data collection program where all TPP participants will agree with the design and development of the work plan and allow for project execution. This will include defining the data quality objectives as a team so that the team is clear on the approved approach. The data quality will need to be scientifically defensible and economically practical. He stated that field data will be gathered electronically on palm pilots. This is done in an effort to avoid transcription/quality errors. The data (field notes and photos) are downloaded each evening into a GIS system that allows for timely data review by the project team.

Mr. Short stated that he reserved the details of Phase III and Phase IV for follow-on TPP meetings and summarized the TPP process and identified the value of developing a consensus early on and maintaining lines of communication during the entire process. He opened the floor for any questions/comments. Mr. Thornton asked if there would be investigative work taking place in Mission Viejo. Mr. Sievers and Mr. Allen responded that they hope to secure access to some open areas in Mission Viejo on the other side of Arroyo Trabuco in order to collect some samples. Mr. Thornton asked if the City of Mission Viejo had been informed of the fact that the USACE will be proposing sampling within their city limits. Mr. Sievers responded that the city had been invited to the meetings, but were not present; however, the city would certainly be contacted. Mr. Short added that the goal is not to be disturbing members of the community in their homes, and for that reason, there will be some public information/awareness initiatives put into play for the community members; so that they may understand the process.

Mr. Sievers asked Daniel Cordero if the DTSC had any questions or concerns. Mr. Cordero indicated that he did not, he reviewed the project schedule and stated that there

is sufficient time built into the schedule for DTSC to meet their CEQA requirements and be able to get the job done (even in the event that USACE may need to blow-in-place [BIP]). Mr. Wheeler asked if they thought they would need to BIP, to which Mr. Allen responded that they did not think it would be necessary, but they need to prepare for all potential outcomes. He suggested that most of the munitions located could be secured to the end of the project.

Mr. Sievers added that the USACE archaeologist and biologist will be active in the project planning and reviewing process. He stated that USACE has an agreement in place with State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) and is very cognizant of protecting the resources at the site, and added that available information will be shared with the native tribes that might have an interest in the area. Mr. Wheeler asked when a base map will be developed for the area proposed for investigation and asked if that would be available for review. Mr. Sievers responded that would be available for public review in October and to the TPP members prior to that.

Mr. Sievers and Mr. Wheeler confirmed the date of the next meeting scheduled for 18 August, and the location will be the same. Mr. Wheeler suggested that the public meeting could be held in the community center located next door and he volunteered to assist in the set-up of that with the team following the TPP meeting. Mr. Sievers reminded all in attendance to contact him with any questions, comments, or concerns, and volunteered his services to meet with the smaller interested organizations within the community to provide briefings. He asked that if any parties knew of interested groups to please provide that contact information to him.

The meeting adjourned at 3:32 PM.

CLOSEOUT STATEMENTS (from those in attendance):

1. To evaluate and remove as much ordnance and explosives (OE)/ unexploded ordnance (UXO) from the site to make the area safe for humans and the environment.
2. Manage the munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) risk through removal, administrative control, and education so that the project and site can be safe.
3. Complete UXO removal in O'Neill Park to this point that construction projects (e.g. sewer installation at O'Neill Park) will not turn up UXO during excavation (maximum depth not determined at this time). Open space not under construction, removal of all UXO to depth of 4 feet.
4. To render the site as safe as possible for the highest conceivable human use.
5. To educate the public and safely clear the area for its intended use.
6. To make this area safe for humans and animals for future generations.
7. Clear the property of munitions and make it safe for the public.

ACTION ITEMS:

- There are no actions items.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

- The team proposed 18 August for the next TPP meeting.

HANDOUTS:

- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, TPP Information Package, June 27, 2005. The package included the following items:
 1. Technical Planning Process Kick-Off Meeting Agenda, 27 June 2005
 2. Trabuco Bombing Range Project Contact Information
 3. Meetings, Work Plans, Field Work, and Reports Project Schedule dated June 23, 2005
 4. Letter from the Department of Toxic Substances Control to Colonel Richard G. Thompson, dated March 16, 2004.
 5. Technical Project Planning worksheet package that includes Phase I MFR Worksheet, Conceptual Site Model, Project Objectives Worksheet, and Data Quality Objectives Worksheet.
 6. Former Trabuco Bombing Range, USACE, LA District, TPP Information Package, TPP Meeting 1 CD includes: INPR, ASR, and TCRA.
 7. Former Trabuco Bombing Range, DERP—FUDS No. J09CA0209, Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS), Technical Planning Process (TPP), June 27, 2005 Powerpoint Presentation
 8. Trabuco Bombing Range, Planning for Project Execution, June 27, 2005, Powerpoint Presentation.