

MEETING MINUTES

29 August 2005

Project: Former Trabuco Bombing Range Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

Date: 18 August 2005, 1:00 – 5:00 PM

Location: City Hall, Rancho Santa Margarita, California

Purpose: Technical Planning Process Team Meeting 2

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation	Contact Information
Larry Sievers	USACE PM	213.452.3989 larry.a.sievers@usace.army.mil
Fred-Otto Egeler	USACE	213.280.8556 fred.o.egeler@spl01.usace.army.mil
Debra Edwards	USACE	256.895.1626 debra.l.edwards@hnd01.usace.army.mil
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
Jim Austreng	DTSC	916.255.3702 jaustren@dtsc.ca.gov
Omo Patrick	DTSC PM	714.484.5452 opatrick@dtsc.ca.gov
Daniel Cordero	DTSC	714.484.5428 dcordero@dtsc.ca.gov
Rick Convertini	Tijeras Creek Golf Course	949.589.9321 rick@tijerascreek.com
David Honerkamp	Pacific Life	949.719.3773 david.honerkamp@pacificlife.com
Tom Wheeler	City of Rancho Santa Margarita	949.635.1800 ext. 507 twheeler@cityofrsm.org
Paul Catsimanes	City of Mission Viejo	949.470.3056 pcatsimanes@cityofmissionviejo.com
Butch Cleveland	Orange County Fire Authority	
John Gannaway	County of Orange Harbors, Beaches & Parks	714.973.6864 john.gannaway@rdmd.ocgov.com
Shelley Grover	Coto de Caza CZ Master	949.838.3128 cklug@keystonepacific.com
Mark Cleary	RSM resident	949.589.0242 runnermark@cox.net
Steve Thornton	Representative, Congressman Miller	714.257.1142 steven.thornton@mail.house.gov
Frank Manzo	Saddleback Valley Unified School District	949.580.3335 manzo@svusd.org

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.

Mr. Sievers proceeded to his presentation beginning with an overview of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Project Schedule that showed the next TPP meeting was scheduled for 27 October 2005 beginning at 10:00 am. Also scheduled for 27 October is the Public Meeting to be held at the Bell Tower. He added that the 4th TPP meeting will provide an introduction to the RI/FS Work Plan which is tentatively scheduled for January 2006. Mr. Sievers added that there is a 2 month stakeholder review period for the work plan and the USACE has been working with city, county, and state officials, as well as local residents in an effort to make certain that the stakeholders are kept up-to-date with project activities. The USACE is hoping to be in the field completing the intrusive investigation in Spring 2006.

He continued with a review of the project itself which included the history of the former bombing range under the Department of Defense (DoD); the historical boundary lines; and the current proposed project boundaries. The USACE intends to focus on the undeveloped lands since so much munitions screening has already been completed by the developer.

He then reviewed what the end goals are for the project: a conceptual site (CSM) will be developed that will be validated through the field investigation. The FS portion of the project will compare the CSM against the remedial objectives and alternatives available for the site. The remedial alternatives available include the do nothing alternative; institutional controls (administrative controls that could include signage, or use restrictions); construction support; surface removal; subsurface removal; and any combination thereof. He provided an example of the possible combination scenario that included the do nothing alternative in the areas that have already been developed along with some institutional control measures. Those decisions will play out as we progress through this RI/FS process.

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process which has been adopted by USACE was reviewed. Starting with the Preliminary Assessment (PA) that provides confirmation that the site qualifies as FUDS by having been owned, leased, or otherwise possessed by the DoD prior to, or transferred by, 1986. Any sites transferred after 1986 are funded through the Base Realignment and Closure Program (BRAC). Prior to 1986, there was no program in place, and very often the DoD would close up shop and leave behind sites that were not necessarily clean. Congress recognized this as a problem and established the FUDS program to address these former military sites disposed of before 1986.

The Trabuco RI/FS project is hoping to proceed through the Proposed Plan and the Decision Document (DD) document phase; though funds are not in place for all steps necessary. He stated that the USACE is counting on a continuous stream of funds to get the project to the Decision Document phase.

The Proposed Plan provides a description of the preferred cleanup alternative to the public in easy to understand language. Following that, the ROD is developed that will describe in more legal terms the remedial action goals, the roadmap to achieve those goals and how we will measure our effectiveness in completing those goals. All that remains following the decision document phase will be to implement the remedial action alternatives, which brings the project to a very good position.

He continued with an explanation as to the problem definition: The problem being that the military dropped practice bombs and rockets in the area of what is now Rancho Santa Margarita from 1944 to 1956. Pointing to some of the current features: the water tank, golf course, Toyota dealership, he indicated that these are possible former targets. He provided some images of what the munitions look like when removed from the soil after 40 or 50 years. Mr. Sievers stated that these are not high explosives at Trabuco but injury can come from the small spotting charge that sat in the back end of these munitions. This spotting charge is basically a 10-gauge shotgun shell that would send off a smoke signal upon impact to identify its location. Typically speaking, approximately 1 out of 10 of these spotting charges would not go off on impact. There is also the threat of fragmentation hazard associated with these munitions where a high energy burst shoots out a flame (up to about 3 feet) that could cause serious injury to anyone situated too close to the munition.

He then reviewed a figure developed during construction activities that identified three areas of ordnance contamination that included two areas at the southern and northern ends of the project site where no ordnance was located; an area in the center of the site where "minimal" ordnance waste was found; and an area located south of the center site where "average" ordnance waste was found. Jim Austreng, DTSC, asked if there was any indication of ground-based activity at the site. Mr. Sievers answered that all activities were aerial. He showed an aerial photograph that identified the Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) area of investigation completed in 2004 along the bike trail. During bike trail construction activities, Orange County construction crews encountered three munitions exposures that included 11 items. Of those 11 items, three still had the explosive charge sitting in the back end of the practice bombs. The construction crew stopped work immediately and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) established the project and within 6 months had cleared a portion of the bike path approximately 1600 feet long. USACE located one 5-inch practice rocket head (inert), nine 3-lb. practice bombs (inert), one 2.25-inch practice bomb, and one 25-lb. practice bomb. He pointed to where the items were found and stated that this ties in with the problem definition; communities located right on the edge of potentially buried munitions.

He then opened the floor to questions. Rick Convertini, Tijeras Creek Golf Course, asked how deep the munitions were buried that were located during the TCRA. Mr. Sievers replied that the maximum depth where munitions were located was 18 inches. These particular munition items are not expected to be deeply buried. He added that the construction crew was locating items at about 12 inches.

Mr. Austreng asked if they were anticipating the need for any "blow-in-place" (BIP) procedures. Mr. Sievers stated that yes, BIP procedures will be established and will be formally laid out in the RI/FS Work Plan. He added that personnel working on the site during the field activities are UXO trained and, if in the event that munitions were located, the personnel working on the site would determine whether or not the charge is present and will handle accordingly.

John Gannaway, County of Orange Harbors, Beaches and Parks, asked Mr. Sievers if they had an idea as to how many bombs had been dropped. Mr. Sievers stated that there was no way to tell, and added that it was a very busy time for the DoD during those years and one could assume that a large amount of practice munitions were dropped at the former range. The developer took out more than 225,000 pounds during construction activities. Mr. Gannaway asked what kind of equipment was used to survey for munitions during the TCRA. Mr. Sievers indicated that it was an advanced metal detector operated with a GPS so that each item could be located and mapped.

Tom Wheeler, City of Rancho Santa Margarita, asked if they hadn't found an old rifle during the TCRA, to which Mr. Sievers replied that they found what appeared to be an old flint lock rifle.

Michael Short, Parsons, added that there are no explosives in the practice rockets once the motor is expended; that is predominantly what was located during the TCRA. The practice bombs are the items that have the spotting charge on the end.

Mr. Austreng asked if the USACE was expecting any public withdrawals during site activities. Mr. Sievers indicated that they do not and that would of course be addressed in the Work Plan.

Mr. Sievers then introduced Joni Jorgensen-Risk from ITSI who would be presenting the project update. Joni Jorgensen-Risk thanked those present for coming to the meeting and reminded those that had not yet signed in to please do so. Indicating to the TPP Information Package that all participants received, she stated that the package included copies of the Powerpoint presentations, the updated TPP worksheets, project contact list, the meeting agenda, meeting minutes from TPP Meeting 1 held 27 June 2005 that she requested comments by 25 August. She added that the meeting minutes would be finalized the following week and distributed to the stakeholders. The final meeting minutes will be posted to the project web site once the web site is finalized. She added, for the benefit of those in attendance that were not present for the first meeting, that there were extra copies of the Information Package distributed at the June meeting. The information package included copies of the draft worksheets, previously published documents, project schedule and the project contact list. She asked that anyone who was interested to please help themselves.

Ms. Jorgensen-Risk stated that they completed the site visit on 27 and 28 June while the team was in town for the 1st TPP meeting. They are drafting a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the purpose of developing effective two-way communication with the local communities. With that purpose in mind, the USACE has been conducting interviews with public officials that include city, county and state agencies. They have completed a total of 36 interviews and will be moving forward the following week with the interview process focusing on the public. The PIP is scheduled to be released to the public for review and comment on 27 October, at which time they will be conducting a public meeting.

Ms. Jorgensen-Risk provided an update on the project web site stating that the USACE is expected to be reviewing the draft web site by the end of this month, and is expected to be unveiled to the public in September.

The Geophysical Prove-Out (GPO) Work Plan was next on the agenda. USACE completed their review of the pre-draft document on 4 August; response to comments

(RTC) were expected to be finalized that week with the draft Work Plan expected to be released for review by the end of August. USACE is hoping to be out in the field conducting the GPO to test geophysical technology in January 2006.

Ms. Jorgensen-Risk asked Mr. Short to explain the Explosives Safety Submission (ESS) document and the review process. Mr. Short stated that anytime an ordnance investigation and removal action is being conducted an ESS must be prepared and reviewed by USACE who then passes it on to DoD Explosive Safety Board (DDESB) for their review. It is a 14 step document that highlights history, current land use, topography, weather, what is expected to be the most probable munitions, what the greatest fragmentation distance is expected to be, and a discussion on any public withdrawals. Once that is reviewed by USACE and DDESB, then, and only then, can they put a shovel in the ground. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk indicated that they are expected to submit the ESS to USACE for review by the end of September with submittal to DDESB scheduled for mid-October. The DDESB review process will require 90-120 days; the document is expected to be finalized by January 2006.

Mr. Wheeler asked if any of the calculations used under the TCRA for the ESS could be used for this effort. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk replied that they are starting from scratch with the ESS document, but will certainly make use of previous work where possible.

Ms. Jorgensen-Risk concluded her presentation with a summary of coming events: TPP Meeting 3 scheduled for 27 October that will include a briefing on the PIP and the GPO Work Plan; the pre-draft RI/FS Work Plan is scheduled for review submittal to USACE in early 2006; a second public meeting to brief the community on the RI/FS Work Plan is currently planned for Spring 2006. She opened the floor to questions and/or comments.

Omo Patrick, DTSC, stated that Tim Chauvel will be filling in for Leticia Hernandez for the remainder of the year and asked that we provide Tim with any updates.

Mr. Short transitioned the presentation to the technical planning process beginning with a brief review of the first meeting conducted in June. The TPP process was 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 are defined collectively by the team as they move through the technical planning process.

There are four phases that the team will be actively involved in; Phase 1 was reviewed at the first meeting. TPP meeting 2 would be completing Phase 2 and reviewing and completing some steps from Phase 1 as well as completing the worksheets. With the completion of those worksheets, they can progress to Phase 3. Mr. Short stated that the overall objective of the RI/FS is not removal, but rather to properly characterize the site. They will be going out to investigate about 2% of the site (equivalent to 20 acres) in order to characterize the ordnance contamination.

Phase 3 includes the development of data collection options, which will be reviewed later in the meeting. Phase 4 includes a review of the data collected; identifying what they did, what it means, and recommendations. He added that the stakeholders will be apprised of the data collection process on a daily basis via the project web site. The stakeholders will have access to the field data on a daily basis and it is their job to make sure that the team is staying on the path that all have agreed upon.

Mr. Short stated that the team members include the stakeholders; government agencies, regulators, Native American Tribal Nations, public interest groups, user groups, and property owners. Other team members included elected officials and technical experts. He added that the field effort is very focused and disciplined; they will only dig where it is necessary and only dig a hole that is large enough to safely identify and remove or blow-in-place the item found. He stated that they will be leaving the area better than when they got there.

The roles and responsibilities of the team members were reviewed. The primary decision maker is Larry Sievers as the USACE project manager/team leader. Mr. Sievers will set project constraints, acquire and manage the project resources, as well as serve as the primary point of contact with the customers. The technical experts will provide technical guidance. The key products in this process include a true understanding of what the stakeholder concerns are (which are presented in the TPP meetings). The project goal is provided in the site closeout statement that has been assembled from responses developed during the first meeting and will be reviewed later in this 2nd meeting. The project objective for the RI/FS is to determine what is there, and what the logical next step is. The project team thinks that the remedies will likely be a combination of remedies. That will not be known until the investigative effort is completed. Actions to site closeout include the remedial actions and the documents needed to comply with regulatory requirements.

Communication is key to the process of understanding what the stakeholder concerns are. Mr. Short suggested that not all stakeholder concerns will be met, but they want them expressed so that they can do their best to meet them.

The walk away goal (project goal) is the site closeout statement that can change over the course of the project. It could be influenced by future land use, regulatory status, and schedule and budget. Mr. Short reviewed the equipment that will be used and how the data are reviewed and decisions are made regarding where the team will be digging. Once the item is recovered, they will document the orientation, the condition of the item, and the type of item. These data will provide them with a clear understanding of the "character" of the site and where the investigative efforts will be directed. The GPO will provide them with the equipment best suited for the conditions at the site.

Mr. Short then reviewed the assembled Site Closeout Statement and asked if there were any comments. There were no comments and he said that this could certainly change with time, but for now, we will consider the following as the **Site Closeout Statement**:

To manage the munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) risk through a combination of removal, administrative controls, and public education, thereby rendering the site as safe as possible to humans and the environment.

He then reviewed the Conceptual Site Model which is considered a simple model of the relationships between contaminants at a site and the potential exposure pathways to human health or the environment.

The project objectives are short- and long-term issues that need to be addressed and resolved prior to site closeout. Their sources can be regulatory or future land use. The short-term issue is to conduct the RI/FS to determine what needs to be done next and that will determine the long-term response. He provided some examples of project objectives that include determining whether munitions debris requires special treatment and/or disposal procedures and determining the most cost-effective way to characterize UXO contamination in heavily vegetated areas.

His presentation then described the classification of project objectives that included basic (pertaining to the current phase of the project; optimum (pertaining to future project phases); and excessive (does not lead to site closeout). They will be performing the basic objective for the RI/FS phase. That basic information will then roll into the work plan and the investigation effort to optimize what is done and enable the use of optimum information when they get to the removal actions.

Mr. Short indicated the actions needed for site closeout included project milestones, defining alternative actions for site closeout, and recognizing constraints and dependencies (schedule, budget, weather).

He continued with a summary of the 4 phases associated with the TPP: Document Phase 1 will be reviewed later in the meeting; Phase 2 – Determine Data Needs which has been done and will be reviewed later in the meeting; Phase 3 – Data Collection Options focuses on the design of the sampling program. The team believes they will be using the EM61 (electromagnetic instrument) that can map and create a record of the items and their location (by a factor of less than 3 meter accuracy); Phase 4 – Finalize Data Collection Program where they will present the Work Plan and at the end of the project show what they have found and provide their recommendations. Mr. Short opened the floor to questions on his presentation. There were no questions.

Mr. Short then asked those in attendance to open their packets to locate the Site Information Worksheet. He reviewed the items included in the worksheet, where data gaps remain that are still being worked through, and what the data sources are. He asked that if anyone had information pertinent to what data are being gathered to please either contact Mr. Sievers or Ms. Jorgensen-Risk so that the worksheets can be updated appropriately. He then asked if there were any questions on the Site Information Worksheet. There were no questions.

He moved onto the historical document (that will need a title: Conceptual Site Model) that provides a little detail on the project site. As they move farther along in the process they will be able to fill in the last two columns. He explained that the only soil sampling that they are anticipating is, if there is a need to blow-in-place, there will be both pre- and post-blast soil sampling conducted. He asked for questions; there were none.

Mr. Short asked attendees to pull out the Project Objectives Worksheet which he proceeded to review. He noted there are five items, all current under the executable stage. He reviewed the descriptions of each item and what data sources were used for each item, what the data needs were for each line item, and data collection methods and project objective classification. He explained that the effort to determine the presence/absence of MEC, and presence/absence of MC before/after detonation, is classified as an optimum objective because they are not only taking a sample, but they are having it verified by a laboratory and sending a quality control sample as well. Mr. Patrick asked that they address (in future documents) the process of excavation,

removal, BIP, and sampling; the decision process to BIP. Both Mr. Sievers and Mr. Short agreed that will be addressed in the documents.

Mr. Short explained that there is a risk regardless of what they do; possibly to the public or to the environment. What they try to do is move the item so as to remove the risk, but if the condition of the item cannot be determined, a BIP will be completed rather than risk human health.

Mark Cleary asked about the interview process and specifically who was interviewed, to which Ms. Jorgensen-Risk responded that they developed an initial stakeholder list that was further expanded with the assistance Mr. Wheeler. Mr. Cleary suggested that he had a list of local residents that would possibly care to be interviewed if we were interested. Mr. Cleary had gathered signatures during the development phase of the bike trail in an attempt to stop the construction. He indicated that most of the residents in the area of the bike trail were opposed to its construction. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk asked that they talk after the meeting.

Mr. Short moved to Identify Site Approach where he reviewed historical documents used and the aerial photographs that will be provided to the team by the Topographic Engineer Center (TEC). Mr. Austreng asked if he knew what timeframe the aerial photographs covered. Mr. Sievers indicated that any photographs that were available will be reviewed. Mr. Austreng suggested that they will need to review for landscape changes over the years. Mr. Sievers replied that he is expecting major landscape changes and realizes the potential for buried munitions. Mr. Short continued his review of the worksheet and explained the details of the line items. In particular, he explained probable remedies: detonation of MEC found. If munitions are found, they will want to either BIP (because they cannot move it), or put it in a magazine and hold for disposal until the end of the project. They want to keep the explosive limit down to 5 pounds, and for that reason there may need to be multiple shots. If they do find an item that cannot be moved, it must be disposed of before the sun goes down. If items are removed, they will be sent to a smelter for complete destruction, once certified safe.

Mr. Short reviewed some of the institutional control measures that could be provided including fencing, signage, and educating the public. Mr. Gannaway asked what measures are being taken to educate the public, especially outreach efforts to the schools, as to the hazards associated with the site. Mr. Sievers responded that there is not currently an education program in place; however, DTSC spearheaded a public outreach effort during the TCRA. During development of Rancho Santa Margarita, the developer educated the public on the hazards. In addition, there is hazard information provided to homebuyers in their escrow documentation. He added that one of the outcomes of this RI/FS process will be to develop a public education program that will include the schools in particular. Mr. Short added that the team does not want to leave any stone unturned when it comes to protecting the children. *Break was called at 2:30 P.M.*

Mr. Short called the meeting back to order at 2:40 P.M. and continued his review of the Identify Site Approach worksheet; Executable Stages to Site Closeout. He asked if there were any questions of the worksheet; there were none.

The next worksheet to be reviewed was Identify Current Project; he explained administrative constraints and added that, in the event, that they do come across something that is sensitive in nature, they will cease operations in that area, mark the

area, inform Mr. Sievers of the find and request a USACE specialist to review the find. Technical constraints could include the breeding season, topography and vegetation, and close proximity to residential areas and the golf course. Every effort will be made to BIP at the same time every day and to give proper notification to all concerned. Legal and regulatory constraints include the need to be consistent with CERCLA and National Contingency Plan (NCP) and FUDS funding limitations. He noted that "Feasibility Study" needed to be added to "Remedial Investigation" under Current Executable Stage on the worksheet.

The last item for review was the Data Quality Objective (DQO) worksheet. He stated that he only had one DQO and suggested that those in attendance may care to add to it. The intended data use was identified by Mr. Short: to assist in making a determination as to the next step in the investigation process. Mr. Austreng asked if he shouldn't add "and remediation" to "investigation process", to which Mr. Short responded that they may not remediate. He preferred to leave remediation out, to which Mr. Austreng agreed. The data need requirements included verification of the presence or absence of MEC in areas suspected of containing MEC to include the top of the ridge and the valley floor. The goal of the project is to determine the type, distribution, and density of munitions on the site (based on the 2% investigation). He asked if there were any additions or changes to that comment. The determination of how much data is enough was identified as the recovery of one explosively configured item being sufficient to verify the presence of other explosively configured items. He suggested that was about as conservative as you can get.

The data will be collected via meandering paths, transects and grids, and intrusive investigation of selected anomalies. He added that if they are able to identify the target on the ground that has not been developed yet, they can start in the center and go out like the spokes of a wheel to see what the level of contamination is. Supporting data will be maintained in the electronic map that will be developed for the site and included in the RI/FS Report. He opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Austreng asked Mr. Short to define what he is identifying as MEC. Mr. Short responded that what he is defining as MEC is one of those practice bombs with a spotting charge in it. If they find 2.25-inch or 5-inch, they are not explosively configured. He did stress though the need to maintain that everything is explosively configured—for the safety of the community members. Mr. Austreng asked if the determination regarding the 2.25-inch or 5-inch as not being explosively configured should be considered a judgment call, to which Mr. Short agreed. There will always be the possibility of residual risk no matter what they do; they will need institutional controls to supplement any removal action (if that is where they go).

David Honerkamp, Pacific Life, asked if the target site had been identified yet. Mr. Sievers responded that it has been identified, but they are refining that. Mr. Honerkamp asked if that would be the primary objective to find that first and then go from there. Mr. Sievers agreed that is the primary objective and added that the USACE has aerial photos of at least two targets, and records identifying five targets. The USACE is working on verifying what targets were used and where they were located.

Frank Manzo, Saddleback Valley Unified School District, asked about a possible timeline for the public outreach and education effort. Mr. Sievers responded that some measures have been taken under the TCRA, and added that once we gather the necessary data under the RI/FS phase, we will know much more about the site. But that certainly does

not limit the actions of the USACE to provide presentations as to what they do know about the site to homeowner's associations, schools, or any other public forum. Mr. Manzo suggested that it would be helpful, at the very minimum, to have an ordnance awareness brochure of some sort that could provide visuals and a message stating "if you see this, don't touch it". This could serve as a protective measure between now and the completion of the RI/FS. Mr. Sievers also referred to the brochure that DTSC published under the TCRA that Mr. Patrick suggested he could provide copies of. Ms. Jorgensen-Risk also indicated that there will be some educational materials available on the project web site that viewers can download. These materials were developed by DoD and placed on their Denix site that the Trabuco web site will have a link to. She said the DTSC fact sheet will also be posted on the web site.

Mr. Manzo, Mr. Gannaway, and Paul Catsimanes requested electronic copies of the aerial photograph developed for the site that provides boundaries.

Mr. Sievers reminded those in attendance that he is available for any questions that they might have, thanked them for coming, and said that he appreciated their participation. He also said that the USACE is looking into who owns the boundary between the Arroyo and homes along Olympiad, and the USACE will be submitting Rights of Entry before too long to the property owners.

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 PM.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Ms. Jorgensen-Risk will supply electronic copies of the project aerial map to Mr. Manzo, Mr. Gannaway, and Mr. Catsimanes.
- Ms. Jorgensen-Risk will add a title to the CSM and update the TPP worksheets as appropriate.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

- The next TPP meeting is scheduled for 27 October from 10:00 A.M. to Noon.

HANDOUTS:

- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District, TPP2 Package, August 18, 2005. The package included the following items:
 1. Technical Planning Process Team Meeting 2 Agenda, 18 August 2005
 2. Trabuco Bombing Range Project Contact Information.
 3. Draft Meeting Minutes, dated 8 July 2005, for the Project Kick-Off/Technical Planning Process Meeting 1 held 27 June 2005.
 4. Updated Technical Project Planning worksheet package that includes Phase I MFR Worksheet, Conceptual Site Model, Project Objectives Worksheet, and Data Quality Objectives Worksheet.
 5. Implementation of Technical Project Planning For Ordnance and Explosives (OE) Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Projects.
 6. Former Trabuco Bombing Range, DERP—FUDS No. J09CA0209, Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS), Technical Planning Process (TPP), June 27, 2005 Powerpoint Presentation handout.
 7. Trabuco Bombing Range RI/FS Project Update Powerpoint Presentation handout.
 8. Trabuco Bombing Range, Planning for Project Execution, Based on EM 200-1-2; Technical Project Planning (TPP) Process, August 18, 2005, Powerpoint Presentation handout.