Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, Pennsylvania
October 6, 2010 ● East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA

Community Interest Group Members and Project Staff Attendees:

John Chokran	Jim Rice	Jo Anderson, Pennsylvania Army National Guard
Linda Chokran	John Rossey	Kim Harriz, National Guard Bureau
Terry Fetterhoff	Lou Samsel	Nicki Fatherly, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
Larry Herr	Jay Saylor	Major Cory Angell, Pennsylvania Army National Guard
Donald Kleinfelter	Dorman Shaver	John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Mike Kneasel	Paul Shoop	Marty Holmes, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Josh McKinney	Joseph Smith, Jr.	Deb Volkmer, Weston Solutions, Inc.
Joan Renninger	Ruth Smith	Demaree Hopkins, Weston Solutions, Inc.

Other Attendees:

Warren Harris
Randall Hunt, Save Stony Creek Coalition
David R. Keefer
Galen D. Kleinfelter
JoEllen Litz
Jay Megonnell
Frank D. Pokorny
Tom Powers
George Rish
Shirley Shoop
Sam Varnicle, Weston Solutions, Inc.

Handouts from the meeting:

1. Final Agenda for the October 6, 2010 Community Interest Group meeting
2. Draft Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group, Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, PA, June 2, 2010
3. Community Interest Group/Public Meeting Evaluation Form

Acronyms:

FS – feasibility study
FUDS – Formerly Used Defense Site
MD – munitions debris
MEC – munitions and explosives of concern
MRS – munitions response site
PADEP – Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
RI – remedial investigation
SUXOS – Senior Unexploded Ordnance Supervisor
USACE – United States Army Corps of Engineers
EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency
UXO – unexploded ordnance

Welcome – Jo Anderson, Pennsylvania Army National Guard, welcomed the group, introduced the project team and speaker Nicki Fatherly of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and presented the agenda. The agenda is provided in Appendix A. A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the June 2, 2010 meeting minutes.

Kim Harriz, National Guard Bureau, introduced the first speaker, Nicki Fatherly, Project Manager with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Tobyhanna Artillery Range project. During prior meetings the Guard and WESTON referred to the Tobyhanna cleanup project because it is similar to the Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site (Ricochet Area MRS). Tobyhanna is also a munitions site and a portion of it is in a Pennsylvania State Game Lands. WESTON is also working on that site providing part of the cleanup. Ms. Fatherly was asked to present an overview of the Tobyhanna munitions project to answer some of the questions from the public regarding what could be done in moving forward on the Ricochet Area project.

Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, Pennsylvania
October 6, 2010 ● East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA

Overview of Tobyhanna Artillery Range Project – Nicki Fatherly, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, presented the overview. The full presentation of the overview of the Tobyhanna Artillery Range Project is provided in Appendix B.

Nicki Fatherly – The Tobyhanna project is part of the FUDS (Formerly Utilized Defense Site) program. The sites that qualify for this category had military activity or were owned, possibly, by military at one time, and have environmental issues, in this case, munitions and explosives of concern (MEC). At the time that the land was turned over, it was left as is, but since the 1980s and 1990s, USACE now feels there are issues or risk issues that should be addressed; therefore, the site is under the FUDS program. USACE is authorized as the government agency to come in and do cleanup on this site and the funding from the government.

The Tobyhanna site is located in the Poconos near the currently active Tobyhanna Army Depot. The FUDS site surrounds the current Depot. The Tobyhanna Artillery Range site is about 25,000 acres. The site involves two major entities: Tobyhanna State Park and State Game Lands 127. The two site landowners are the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Pennsylvania Game Commission. The game lands section is 14,000 acres and is the larger portion of the site.

Former military activities at the site took place at the turn of the 19th century, around the time of World War I and beginning and into some of World War II. During World War I this area was used for horse-drawn artillery cannon for artillery practice. In the 1930s and 1940s, the Army expanded the installation and ranges moved west because more room was needed. The focus for this site shifted toward a training ground, particularly for West Point cadets to come out and do their summer of hands-on artillery training in the field. Around 1949, the federal government determined that there was an excess of land at the Depot. About 1,000 acres of it was kept as the current Depot and parts of it are still active today, but parts at the sides were transferred to the state. The use determined at that time for the property was as a park in the northeast and part of State Game Land 127 and that has not changed over time. The types of munitions at the site were more artillery oriented: everything from the 37-mm to the 75-mm and 155-mm artillery rounds, which are much bigger pieces. This site is used quite extensively.

Kim Harriz – Ricochet Area MRS also had 75-mm and 155-mm rounds that were some of the unexploded ordnance found.

Nicki Fatherly – The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PADEP) northeast region took a very active interest in the site, particularly the park. PADEP asked USACE to investigate the historical munitions and USACE asked PADEP to wait until funds could be secured. PADEP wanted to expedite the process and decided to pay for and do the remedial investigation (RI) and feasibility study (FS) with oversight and approval from the USACE, which was a unique situation. At that time, USACE did not have the money, but had the expertise. PADEP had the contracts and the money, but they did not have the unexploded ordnance (UXO) knowledge, so a partnership was formed. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was involved early and often so that the agency would understand what PADEP and USACE were doing. And PADEP definitely supplied a lot of local effort to keep this at the forefront of USACE Baltimore District's work.

In 1998, a Time Critical Removal Action was conducted to cleanup munitions in the park campground. This type of removal is determined when there is an imminent risk and the campground area is most likely the place where people will be. In 2004, with PADEP's assistance and partnership, USACE implemented the RI/FS phase and work has continued to the present date.

It is important to determine during the RI what is at the site, how much there is, and where is it. The FS provides the alternatives that could clean up the site; weighs the options against each other; and decides

the cleanup action. MEC and munitions are unusual in that when they are encountered, they have to be dealt with. During the RI, USACE exploded the UXO in place as part of safety procedures as site data were being collected. USACE found 1,139 UXO at the Tobyhanna site. About 95 percent of the items were found in the first 12 inches of the ground. USACE established lower risk and higher risk areas of the site.

The project stakeholders from the community are citizens like the residents concerned about the Ricochet Area MRS. USACE held public meetings to gather input from the residents and to distribute information and documents. That was very helpful because the USACE project team members do not live in the area and do not have the local knowledge that area residents possess. It was local residents that directed USACE to a missing firing point in the Powder Smoke Ridge area of the site.

The FS follows the RI and formulates the best way to mitigate the risk. The FS identified and compared the following five alternatives:

Alternative 1 – No Action. The site is monitored but no cleanup action is performed. The "No Action" alternative is always needed because it serves as a benchmark in the range from doing nothing, to cleaning up the site, to doing a fully comprehensive cleanup to remove every piece of munitions. A purpose of the FS is to give equal attention to various factors on the site so USACE can make the most fair, appropriate, and reasonable decision to clean up the site.

Alternative 2 – Land Use Controls. This alternative suggests to the landowners such things as signage or training or providing brochures to reach out to the local community, do educational presentations, and help with awareness for these areas.

Alternative 3 – Surface Removal with Land Use Controls. This alternative is to pick up munitions on the ground, post signage, and educate the public.

Alternative 4 – Surface Removal to One Foot with Land Use Controls. This alternative involves removing UXO to 1 foot below the surface and implementing signage and public education.

Alternative 5 – Removal of UXO to Detection Depth with Land Use Controls. This alternative is similar to the previous options; however, in this action, the UXO technicians dig until the instrument (magnetometer-type technology) cannot detect munitions any farther into the ground. Land use controls will be implemented at the low and low-moderate risk areas. The high risk areas are where the funding ($52,345,000) should go for the cleanup.

The current status of the site is that the decision document was signed in September. If total funding is made available, the cleanup action may take 5 years, and if funding is awarded in phases, the cleanup action could take 10 to 15 years.

Kim Harriz – FUDS is funded differently than the program the Ricochet Area MRS is under. The Department of Defense considers the historical sites that were transferred prior to 1986, which comprise the FUDS program, differently from the active Army sites, such as the Ricochet Area MRS. The Ricochet Area site is fully funded.

Joan Renninger – Do you anticipate closing off any areas to the public because of this? Is there anything so dangerous that it prohibits public use?

Nicki Fatherly – At this point, no, because USACE has already been working with the land use control person with the landowners so they are aware what information they need to inform people of the remediation activities before we go in and do the cleanup.

Question – What would cause one to go off?

Nicki Fatherly – For these types of munitions, people actively engaging with the munitions could cause an explosion. Engaging entails kicking, using them for target practice, trying to break them open for scrap metal, and dropping them. Just walking by an item does not typically set it off.

Question – John Rossey – Does tramping on one set it off?

Nicki Fatherly – Normally, no; however, a USACE safety specialist isn't here to say that it will never be 100 percent. But more often than not, that is not going to do it.

Marty Holmes – With munitions, it is usually the smaller ones that will hurt you. The main reason is that when they are big, they are heavy and you're not going to want to pick them up. The 37-mm is the munition that has injured the most civilians, because it is so small and light, people can pick it up and take it home. They don't think there is any hazard to it. In most of the 37-mm, the fuze is in the bottom, not in the front, so it doesn't look like it has a fuze on it. People play around with them and that's when accidents happen.

Question – If there would be a forest fire, would that cause a detonation?

Nicki Fatherly – Yes, it would. In early 1998, there was a fire in Black Bear Swamp, which was part of the reason USACE initiated the first Time Critical Removal Action. The swamp is very peaty, and the fire smoldered and it did cook off a round or two.

Question – This was actually an impact area. This is where they intentionally shot high-impact ordnance, compared to our area, which is by accident. So when you are comparing the amount (1,139 UXO at the Tobyhanna site and 9 UXO at Ricochet Area MRS) that is not a fair comparison.

Kim Harriz – Yes, that is correct, the Ricochet Area MRS does not have the extensive ordnance releases that Tobyhanna does.

Nicki Fatherly – Yes, it was intentional at Tobyhanna, and they did it for quite a while, too.

Question – But for them ever clean up the impact area in the Gap, that would be impossible. You would never be able to open that to the public.

Kim Harriz – The impact area for Fort Indiantown Gap? It wouldn't be any different, probably, than this one at Tobyhanna. We could go in and clean it up in the same manner.

Question – Oh, that's right. It would be exactly the same.

Nicki Fatherly – When USACE goes into those areas of higher impact, the intent is, when we are done, that the risk is reduced and we are assuming people will and can use it.

Kim Harriz – Now they would probably never propose a residential use for that area.

Nicki Fatherly – No.

Question – Are there any areas that won't be open to the public out there?

Nicki Fatherly – USACE's intent is that this property stays recreational, and that what we are doing is appropriate safety-wise, that the risk is greatly reduced. And when we get done in those high risk areas, the risk will be greatly reduced.

Question – So as of now, that site is all open to the public?

Nicki Fatherly – Yes. USACE doesn't own the property. Many times USACE installs a fence as a control measure at [federal] government-owned property. USACE negotiated with the state on what the state was

willing to do and adopt for land use controls. That was part of the feasibility process: negotiating signs, and fencing. It is that interaction that helps make the remedy one that everyone can buy into.

Jim Rice – The fact sheet in January had a figure of $95 million. Now you are down to $50 million. Where do you come up with a figure of $50M?

Nicki Fatherly – That fact sheet had a programmatic number, a planning number, for government purposes. Whatever I proposed, I had to take the most conservative cost. I don't get my money all at once. I had to assume that over 15 years or more, I'd be getting $2 to $3M dollars a year. The $55 or $52M is what I would consider the most middle-of-the-road estimate. It still is on the conservative side, I will say that. My hope is, I've convinced USACE the project is worthy to give money to, this is FUDS, by basically demonstrating that I feel that I can get that number down, that I can be more efficient. But for purposes of the record, I needed to be a little more conservative.

Status of Remedial Investigation – John Gerhard, Weston Solutions, Inc. presented the update. The full presentation of the Status of Remedial Investigation is provided in Appendix C. The presentation included an overview of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Military Munitions Response Program, and field work conducted from March to May 2010.

The data that the field work generated included a density map using a predictive model that calculates the number of items per acre based on a 100 square meter sample size. Three different scenarios were prepared: MEC only, MEC and select munitions debris, and MEC and all munitions debris.

In the first scenario (presentation slide #18), MEC only, it appeared that there was very low density of UXO at the site; however, it is important to keep in mind that the model is not a finite number. The model predicted 52 UXO at the site. In the second scenario (presentation slide #19), MEC and select munitions debris, the model predicted 1,700 items. The third scenario (presentation slide #20), MEC and all munitions debris, predicted 3,800 items. The government (Pennsylvania Army National Guard, National Guard Bureau, USACE, and PADEP) will review the WESTON remedial investigation report, the hazard assessment numbers, and the risk management assessment to determine how to manage the site.

Kim Harriz – The numbers will help in the following phases of the investigation. The contractors who bid on the cleanup alternative will use those numbers to price their proposals. The National Guard Bureau will receive more reasonable cost estimates from contractors using the estimates provided in the scenarios.

John Gerhard – During the field work 313 lbs. of debris were recovered. These items included airplane debris, bolts, cans, chains, a chisel, a hinge, horseshoes, knives, pipes, railroad spikes, and a railway part.

Question – Find any money or coins?

Marty Holmes – The metal detectors (magnetometers) that we used would not pick that stuff up. We used ferrous metal detectors which only pick up anything a magnet would pick up. We did not use any all-metals detectors

Question – Larry Herr – Did the items stay in the ground?

John Gerhard – If they were a large size they stayed in the ground. At the last meeting the cultural items recovered were displayed.

Question – Larry Herr – I have a picture from along the creek that I'd like you to look at. [The item in the picture looked like a large piece of slag.]

Marty Holmes – It looks like slag from the railroad tracks.

Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, Pennsylvania
October 6, 2010 ● East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA

Question – John Rossey – So basically what the contractors used out there was metal detectors. Anybody can run a metal detector, correct? These contractors in the future, will they be public knowledge? I want to know what contractor you would hire in the future if you decide to remediate the rest of the site.

Kim Harriz – When we hired WESTON it was through an open solicitation through the General Services Administration (GSA) where anyone in the country could propose to do this remedial investigation. In fact we had seven contractors who were qualified to propose on the job.

Question – John Rossey – Do you have prerequisites for the contractor? Does it have to be all military guys?

Kim Harriz – Personnel have to be UXO-qualified technicians. It isn't just somebody out there with a metal detector; you have to actually have qualified technicians. There are training programs for UXO technicians. It is specified in the Department of Army regulations what the training is required to function as a UXO technician. There are actually multiple levels of UXO technicians with various types of experience that comprise a UXO response team.

Marty Holmes – I'm a Senior UXO Supervisor (SUXOS), an industry term. I spent 10 years in the Army. There are civilian schools, Texas A&M offers one and Tennessee. When a person goes into the field after finishing a civilian school they are required to work with someone with prior UXO military duty. That person is required to have 3 years of experience before they can move up to a new level of technician. It isn't hard to operate a metal detector; it is the knowledge needed to recognize the different ordnance.

Kim Harriz – The metal detectors are only a part of the entire remedial investigation. The investigation also includes the sophisticated modeling to determine whatever we found at the site.

Question – John Rossey – I don't have a problem with that. You're doing a great job. What I'm trying to understand is that anyone can run a metal detector.

Kim Harriz – There is a lot of liability associated with using explosives. They have to know how to blow things in place. They have to be able to run the GPS (global positioning system), and the geophysical positioning equipment. There is a lot of documentation in this business. It seems simple but actually many different parts are quite complex.

John Gerhard – There is a lot of safety protocols the Department of Defense stipulates with this work in the contract, and the contractor follows so the work is done in a safe manner, along with very strict quality control standards.

Question – No one got blown up.

Kim Harriz – That's because we did a safe job and all the safety protocol was in place.

Question – In the picture with white flags and the next picture with the guys with shovels, as far as safety all they are wearing is an orange vest.

Marty Holmes – We actually dig next to the item and then dig our way over to it so we can identify it. There are procedures in place. We understand the hazard when we take the job. We set up an exclusion zone where no one is allowed. We stop work if someone enters the exclusion zone. If we do have an accident we don't want any of the public exposed to it.

Question – JoEllen Litz – Why aren't we using military to do this work?

Major Angell– Our EOD (Explosive Ordnance Disposal) assets are used overseas. The closest EOD team is in Aberdeen. These investigations are driven by the Department of Defense, not by the Department of the Army.

Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, Pennsylvania
October 6, 2010 ● East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA

Major Angell – The Pennsylvania National Guard has no EOD assets and EOD also blows in place. This seems more advanced; looking at historical data and trajectories. If we were to build a range, we would have a contractor do ricochet analysis.

Question – Jay Megonnell – What is the cost to blow one item up?

Kim Harriz – It depends on the specific situation: whether they have people mobilized in the field at the time they blow it up; what explosive charges going to be used; where it is in the valley; how many sandbags have to be taken to that particular location. There are a number of different variables.

After the meeting, a cost estimate was determined of a blow-in-place event for one 75-mm High Explosive UXO:

- *$3,100 – Blow-in-place with UXO Technicians already on-site.*
- *$8,500 – Blow-in-place if UXO Technicians must be mobilized to the site.*

Question – Jay Megonnell – When the sandbags are ready to be exploded, what depth of charge do you use?

Marty Holmes – We use a small shape charge; no bigger than a shot glass with black powder – shape charge.

Question – Jay Megonnell – And when it goes off, can you make a determination that it could have been exploded by itself? Or the powder in them was no good anymore? Can you determine if it was a live round or not?

Marty Holmes – Yes, absolutely. The shape charge will actually just blow a hole right through the metal. If it was a training round, it would blow a hole in it and when we're done we'd just have a hole in it.

Question – Jay Megonnell – How many of these nine that were exploded could have actually gone off?

Marty Holmes – All nine of them. All nine had live explosives in them.

Question – Does dampness in areas affect the munitions and make them inactive?

Marty Holmes – Explosives do not really break down very much, especially TNT. We did a job in Virginia where in the 1940s they steamed munitions to reclaim the metal. The steam liquefied the TNT that melted into the ground. The TNT was left in the ground in a cast form. We dug it up in 2007 and 2008 and when we reached it, the TNT was still intact. We broke it up into 5-pound chunks and disposed of it. It was high order TNT.

Question – What makes a munitions ricochet? Does it hit a rock or what?

Marty Holmes – Direct fire weapons, such as tanks, shoot at high velocity so they have a better chance of ricocheting. They could hit the target, rocks, or just the ground.

John Gerhard – The crew logged where the American Holly was found during the field work. This site is the most northern reach of the native American Holly population in Pennsylvania. At first DCNR was concerned how the field work could affect the holly. DCNR was very pleased with the results and the map of holly locations. The staff wore snake chaps for protection. There were 20 encounters with rattlesnakes.

Kim Harriz – Regarding the schedule, the project is a little behind from where we thought we'd be in June. We promise the RI report will be available to you at the next Community Interest Group meeting. We are expecting the draft from WESTON next week. The Pennsylvania Guard, National Guard Bureau, and USACE will review that draft. Another draft will be prepared incorporating revisions/comments on

the first draft. In mid-January 2011, PADEP and EPA will have a 30 to 45 day review period. And then we have to respond to their comments and make the revisions to finalize the report.

As the process for the RI report is being finalized, we're also beginning the feasibility study. The Pennsylvania Guard, National Guard Bureau, and USACE will review a draft feasibility study in mid-November and discuss the alternatives with WESTON that we're going to consider for the remediation. And again the follow on dates are a little more approximate. The draft final of the feasibility study for PADEP and EPA to review will be in February 2011 with the final document submitted in June 2011.

As the feasibility study is being finalized, the Pennsylvania Guard and National Guard Bureau are going to look at the different alternatives to select the cleanup option and develop the proposed plan. The proposed plan is the official document for the community to review the remedies Pennsylvania Guard and National Guard Bureau propose for the cleanup. There will be a 30-day public comment period. Whatever comments that you have in terms of how you would like to see the site cleaned up will be considered in preparing the decision document.

The decision document is the definitive statement; the agreement made between Pennsylvania Guard and National Guard Bureau and PADEP as to what exactly will be done to remediate the site. A remedial action at the site is expected to be implemented from 2012 to 2013. WESTON is contracted up through the FS; however, their contract may be modified for them to do the proposed plan and decision document because they are minor tasks, expense-wise. Pennsylvania Guard and National Guard Bureau will definitely be putting out a solicitation to do the agreed upon remediation. We do that to ensure that the government is getting the best value for the money.

Question – John Rossey – When you say "best for the government" are you talking about Fort Indiantown Gap or "we the people" as the government?

Kim Harriz – We're looking for the best value. In other words, we're getting a qualified contractor who knows what they're doing for a reasonable price. If we kept awarding it to the same people that we were using, no offense to WESTON, but they could potentially go with "we got this and so we'll propose/throw in an extra couple million for profit." This is the way we keep the contractors honest in terms of what a best value price would be. It's actually your tax money.

Question – John Rossey – I know it is our tax money that is taking away the last wilderness area left in eastern Pennsylvania. And I ain't happy about it.

Kim Harriz – We have no intention of taking the land.

Question – John Rossey – I know you don't but that's what you say anyway.

Question – You don't intend to remove munitions debris?

Kim Harriz – I had a discussion with Deputy Assistant Secretary of Army's Secretariat for Munitions about this very issue. That's why we segregated out the different types of items.

Question – I thought you were just using that for modeling or to find UXO.

Kim Harriz – We wanted to find out what areas had what, so there's definitely an area where we have munitions debris that could be MEC and other areas where it is inert and probably would not cause an explosive hazard. Our problem is if the public finds munitions debris they have no idea if the item is inert or MEC. The Pennsylvania Guard has to respond to the item, so there is still liability for us to have EOD personnel come out and pick up any munitions debris because the public does not know if it is MEC. So there was a discussion with the Secretariat on whether to pick up the munitions debris, because we would then not need to respond to it at a later time and the public doesn't need to be concerned that your

enjoyment of the game lands is in any way jeopardized by running into a MEC item that we didn't find. We figure there's approximately 52 items out there, that doesn't mean that if we find 52 that there's not another item out there that you guys would find, take home, and blow up. So we don't want to say OK guys we took out all the MEC, all that munitions debris you find out there is inert and you can take it home. We have to pick up the munitions debris, too. Now we might not be as aggressive in looking for the debris. We will be very aggressive in looking for the MEC but the debris we might take a different tactic in how we pick it up. We might not do any subsurface removal on the debris. So those are the things we evaluate as part of the feasibility study.

Question – What about Tobyhanna? Are they going to remove shrapnel and stuff like this?

Nicki Fatherly – Yes, we will remove munitions debris.

Question – John Rossey – It's been established that you'll never ever clean up all this stuff up, ever. Will that have any weight that we go hunting there this year and no one has been blown up in the last 30 years so we go in there this year and that should have some weight on this decision whether we close this down and give it to Fort Indiantown Gap or we keep it as the last wilderness area in eastern Pennsylvania.

Kim Harriz – We're not going to close it down or give it to Fort Indiantown Gap. That's not an alternative that we will consider. Now the thing that you said about that no one's been blown up; however, we know before we started this project people have picked up stuff and taken it home. In fact, a week before the open house [February 18, 2010] a man who had seen the advertisement for the open house and called Fort Indiantown Gap and said he picked up an item and do you want me to bring it in. And we said, oh no, stay there, we'll come look at it. That item was a full up 75-mm round. He had pictures of him and his dog with the round propped up against his truck. So already our efforts, even by advertising the fact there is a hazard, have proved effective to protect the public.

Video of Planned Explosion During Field Work in Ricochet Area – John Gerhard introduced a video of a planned explosion conducted during the field work. The video featured a 75-mm APHE (armor piercing high explosive) round.

Marty Holmes – It was a command detonation. We use a remote firing device. We had complete control over the explosion.

Question – There's been some discussion that there's still bags lying around, is that true?

Marty Holmes – Our last visit was the end of July and we went back to all of the sites. There was one site that still had two or three sandbags high up in the tree that we still could not get out. We did revisit all of the other sites and they were clean. There was just the one site with a couple sandbags still up in the trees that we could not get. The sandbags are made of nylon.

Kim Harriz – If you see stuff out there that you think was contributed by our investigation take a picture, send it to the Guard, and we'll come out and clean it up.

Question – Larry Herr – I personally brought 25 bags out of the valley. I think there's a couple out there yet but I think most of them are gone.

Kim Harriz – We can have the guys revisit the site and do another check.

The next day, October 7, 2010 two members of the WESTON field crew inspected three of the six blow-in-place locations at the site to look for remnants of sandbags. A copy of the site report is provided in Appendix D. Briefly, the site report states that one sandbag remains in the tree canopy and the other two demolition sites were clear of sandbags and material. The remaining three sites of the six demolition sites were previously identified as clear of sandbag debris in July 2010.

Meeting Minutes, Community Interest Group
Ricochet Area Munitions Response Site in State Game Lands 211, Pennsylvania
October 6, 2010 ● East Hanover Township Building, Grantville, PA

Question – How small are fragments that are left and lying around after an explosion?

Marty Holmes – The munitions break up really small.

John Gerhard – We try to get as many of the fragments in the blast and the hole.

Announcements – Jo Anderson and Major Angell gave an update on Lt. Col. Cleaver serving in Afghanistan.

Major Angell – LTC Cleaver is thinking about retiring and volunteered to serve in Afghanistan. He's been over there the past 2 months and will be there a total of 6 months. He's in Kabul. He was greeted by indirect fire as he was coming off of the aircraft when he arrived in country. He is also having an interesting experience; he met General Petraeus and was in several briefings with him; he's working for an Admiral who is in charge of detainee operations in Afghanistan. He is doing well and when he gets back he might retire. In the meantime, I am more than happy to talk with anyone. Feel free to call the same number for LTC Cleaver [(717) 861-8468].

Jo Anderson – You probably are aware that Adjutant General Jessica Wright is moving to Washington, D.C. and has accepted a position in the Pentagon. The new appointee is Major General Stephen M. Sischo.

Major Angell – Major General Stephen M. Sischo will serve as the new acting TAG (The Adjutant General) at least until the new administration comes in. The newly elected governor will appoint the next Adjutant General.

General Jessica Wright is going to serve as assistant to the deputy for strength under the Secretary of Defense. Strength is personnel or manpower. She will be an assistant for all of the Reserves (Marine Corps Reserves, Army Reserves, Air Force Reserves, and National Guard) and their strength management. She's retiring from the military and will be working as a civilian.

Jo Anderson – Our next meeting will be late January or early February. Does anyone have any suggestions for presentations at the next meeting? Thank you all for coming.

Adjournment – Jo Anderson adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Agenda
Appendix B	Overview of Tobyhanna Artillery Range Project
Appendix C	Status of Remedial Investigation
Appendix D	Daily SUXOS Site Report/October 7, 2010 (Recovery of sandbags)
Appendix E	Coordinates of Blow-in-Place Locations