

Agenda
Technical Project Planning Meeting No. 2
Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Site Inspection Reports
Formerly Used Defense Sites
Boardman Air Force Range

Date: Wednesday, September 5, 2007

Time: 9:00 AM Pacific

Location: Via Teleconference

1. Introductions

2. General Issues

- a. Draft Final MMRP SI Report issued, review period ended August 27.
- b. ODEQ provided comments, response to comments sent to ODEQ Aug. 29, 2007 for concurrence.
- c. Inland Farms provided comments, responses to comments provided to USACE on Aug. 28, 2007 for review and forwarding on to Inland for concurrence.
- d. No comments received from other stakeholders. Comments received from The Nature Conservancy on August 30.
- e. Revised Draft Final SI Report will be sent to local library for 2 week public information. Note this is not a comment period only a request for additional information.

3. Discussion of Draft Final Report for Boardman Air Force Range

- a. Conceptual Site Model (Appendix J).
 - i. Former Army/Air Force Bombing Range 1941 - 1963.
 - ii. Used for practice bombing, some munitions demolition occurred onsite.
 - iii. Six areas studied during SI: Target No. 1, Target No. 2, Carty Reservoir Bomb Target, Range Complex No. 1, Demolition Area No. 2, and the Impact Area.
 - iv. Potential “munitions and explosives of concern” (MEC) consist of primarily of unexploded practice bombs. Potential for incomplete demolition of other munitions in the demolition areas.
 - v. Munitions constituents (MC) – metals, explosives.
- b. Land use (Section 2.4.2).
 - i. Irrigated agriculture, fossil fuel power plant, technology testing and development, wildlife management.
- c. Sensitive environments (Section 2.4.7).
 - i. Sensitive environments consisting of Washington Ground Squirrel habitat.
- d. Previous investigations (Section 2.5).
 - i. Archives Search Report (ASR) in 1997. Compiled available information for the former bombing range with emphasis on types and areas of ordnance use.

- ii. ASR Supplement in 2004. Identified specific ranges – Target No. 1, Target No. 2, Carty Reservoir Bomb Target, Range Complex No. 1 (INPR Site No. 1, Demolition Area, and Turret Gunnery Range).
 - iii. Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI) completed by Weston Solution for USEPA in 2004. Scope was similar to current SI, but with greater emphasis on perchlorate in around Boardman AFR.
- e. SI objectives, decision rules (Section 1.3 & 3.1).
 - i. Does FUDS warrant further response action due to risk from MEC or MC?
 - ii. Collect data for Hazard Ranking System (HRS) scoring by EPA.
 - iii. Collect data to identify release to initiate Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS).
 - iv. Determine potential need for a removal action.
 - v. Collect data for Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSPP).
 - vi. Confirm presence/absence of MEC/MC contamination.
- f. TPP Meeting No. 1 – July 20, 2006
- g. Field Work – February 26 - 28, 2007
- h. Summary & Conclusions (Section 10.0).
 - i. Target No. 1 – No MEC identified, munitions debris (MD) identified. MEC risk low. MC sampling of soil indicated no impact to soil. No sediment or surface water samples collected. Groundwater results from PA/SI and PGE monitoring indicated no impacts to groundwater.
 - ii. Target No. 2 – Historical finds of MEC (practice bombs) as recently as 2006. MEC risk is moderate. All soil analytical results were below site background, human health, and ecological screening values. PA/SI surface water analytical results indicate that perchlorate is present, the upstream sampling locations with the highest perchlorate concentrations indicate that the perchlorate is not from Target No. 2 or any other known FUDS AOC.
 - iii. Carty Reservoir Bomb Target – No MEC or MD identified during field work, MEC and MD identified during ASR. MEC risk moderate. MC concentrations below site background values.
 - iv. Range Complex No. 1 – No MEC identified during field work. MD was identified at Demolition Area. Historically MD has also been found at INPR Site No. 1. MEC risk moderate. MC concentrations below site background values.
 - v. Demolition Area No. 2 – No MEC identified during field work. MD was observed. MEC has been identified as recently as 2006. MEC risk moderate. MC concentrations were below background values.
 - vi. Impact Area – No MEC, evidence of MEC or MD identified in field work. MEC risk low. All MC sample results were below background.
- i. Recommendations (Section 11.0).
 - i. Target No. 1 - RI/FS is recommended due to potential for MEC, NDAI with respect to MC.
 - ii. Target No. 2 - RI/FS is recommended due to potential for MEC, NDAI with respect to MC.

- iii. Carty Reservoir Bomb Target - RI/FS is recommended due to potential for MEC, NDAI with respect to MC.
- iv. Range Complex No. 1 - RI/FS is recommended due to potential for MEC, NDAI with respect to MC.
- j. Munitions Response Site and MRSP Evaluation (Section 16.2, Appendix K).
 - i. Four MRSs identified
 - 1. Target No. 1 – Draft MRS Priority of 6 (potential rankings range from 1 to 8, highest to lowest)
 - 2. Target No. 2 – Draft MRS Priority of 4
 - 3. Carty Reservoir Bomb Target – Draft MRS Priority of 3.
 - 4. Range Complex No. 1 – Draft MRS Priority of 4.
 - ii. Recommended to be identified as MRS:
 - 1. Demolition Range No. 2 – Additional investigations for MEC recommended. No additional investigations for MC.
 - 2. Impact Area – Additional investigations for MEC recommended. No additional investigations for MC.
- k. Discussion.
 - i. Does team concur with conclusions and recommendations?
 - ii. Other
- l. Next steps.
 - i. Shaw will prepare meeting minutes & distribute via email (this week).
 - ii. Team members will reply to indicate concurrence (this week).
 - iii. Shaw will submit revised Draft Final SI Report for public information this week and allow of 2-week input period.
 - 1. Revisions per comments/responses.
 - 2. Document this meeting (Section 3.8, Appendix B).

4. TPP Meeting Conclusion

- a. Summary.
- b. Action Items.

**Boardman Air Force Range FUDS
Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection Report
Technical Project Planning Meeting No. 2**

Meeting Minutes/Summary of Agreements

A second Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting was held on September 5, 2007 at 0900 via conference call. Meeting attendees were Leslie Nelson – The Nature Conservancy, Bob Levy – Inland Land Co., Geoffrey Tichenor – Inland Land Co. (Stoel Rives, LLP), Steve Anderson – Portland General Electric, Dan McCormack – The Boeing Co., Ken Marcy – US EPA Region 10, David Anderson – ODEQ, Dale Landon – Shaw Environmental, Janie Carrig – USACE Omaha District, Craig Juckiness – USACE Seattle District, Mike Nelson – USACE Seattle District.

An agenda (attached) was provided to all participants prior to the call. Following introductions, Mike Nelson summarized the MMRP process and where Boardman AFR fits into the program. The agenda items were followed in order. Items discussed from the agenda are identified below.

- Briefly discussed that Inland Land Co. had commented and requested some text changes that did not change any conclusions or recommendations but clarified that the identified risk at Boardman is due to Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) and that no recommendation for additional study relative to Munitions Constituents (MC) is made for any range.
- Clarified that a recommendation for Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) meant that a more detailed investigation would be conducted in the future to identify the possible MEC risks. A plan would then be developed on how to reduce the risks. The types of studies could include remote sensing, geophysical methods, visual surveys, and hand digging to locate and remove MEC. Indicated that the timeline for conducting the RI/FS is unknown as it is up to the overall ranking of the site and acceptance and funding approval by congress.
- During the discussion of General Issues, it was discussed that a copy of the Revised Draft Final SI Report is going to the Boardman library for public information but that it is not a request for comment on the content of the report.
- A question was raised for clarification of what constituted MEC and MC. It was clarified that MEC carries an explosive risk hazard and MC is the chemical constituents of munitions (explosive compounds, metals in bomb bodies, propellants in munitions). It was also stated that at high concentrations MC could be a MEC explosive hazard, but usually would occur at a munitions plant not a bombing range.
- Discussed that the MRSPP scoring presented in the SI are draft values only and will be further reviewed by USACE and DoD.
- ODEQ indicated that they agree with the conclusions and recommendations with the exception of perchlorate impacts to groundwater. ODEQ does not

concur with the recommendation of NDAI relative to MC at Range Complex No.1. ODEQ indicated that there are several potential non-DoD related activity sources for perchlorate in groundwater in the Lower Umatilla Basin and until the other source(s) for perchlorate are determined they cannot agree to a determination of NDAI relative to MC at Range Complex No. 1. However, ODEQ and EPA did agree with the findings in the SI Report to an NDAI with respect to MC for Target No. 1, Target No. 2, and Carty Reservoir Bomb Target. Shaw noted that for Demolition Area No.2 and the Impact area, no recommendation for RI/FS or NDAI is made at this point.

- It was agreed that no change to the SI report text was required but that ODEQ's concerns and non-concurrence with the NDAI for MC at Range Complex No. 1 would be documented in the meeting minutes.