M67001.AR.006845
MCB CAMP LEJUENE
5090.3a

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES REGARDING THE UXO-19 PROPOSED PLAN HELD ON 8 APRIL 2015 AT THE COASTAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE MCB CAMP LEJUENE NC

04/08/2015

CAROLINA COURT REPORTS INC

PUBLIC MEETING

UXO-19 PROPOSED PLAN
MCIEAST - MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE

APRIL 8, 2015
COASTAL CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
444 WESTERN BOULEVARD
JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 28546

* *

MEETING MODERATOR - MR. MATT LOUTH
DOI CO-CHAIR
MCB CAMP LEJEUNE EMD/EQB
BUILDING 12, McHUGH BOULEVARD
CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA
28542-0004

PRESENTER - MR. MATT LOUTH, CH2M HILL

COURT REPORTER - AIMEE C. RIGSBY

CAROLINA COURT REPORTERS, INC.
105-A Oakmont Drive
Greenville, North Carolina 27858
TEL: (252) 355-4700 (800) 849-8448
FAX: (252) 355-4707

ATTENDEES

Patti Venture - MCIEAST-MCB CAMLEJ

Dave Cleland - NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic

Jose Parra - NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic

Gena Townsend - EPA

Randy McElveen - NCDENR

Michael Curtis - RAB Co-Chair

Laura Bader - RAB Member

Glenn Spradling - RAB Attendee

Dale Weston - RAB Member

Kim Henderson - CH2M HILL

Matt Louth - CH2M HILL

James Macdonell - Sepi

Thomas Rigsby - RAB Attendee

COURT REPORTER NOTE: The public meeting portion of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting convened at 7:00 p.m., in Room 105 of the Business Technology Building, Coastal Carolina Community College.

MS. PATTI VENTURE: Well, good evening everybody. I'm obviously not Charity. My name is Patti, and I have the pleasure of announcing that -- that the Delaney's welcomed Anna Melissa Delaney into the world on January 13th. And you get to see her what she looks like right now. Charity -- Charity will be back at the next meeting. In fact, today was her first day back from maternity leave. I'm going to let you explain a little bit more about what a public meeting is.

MR. MATT LOUTH: Sure, sure.

MS. PATTI VENTURE: But we have two presentations from CH2M HILL, and then one from SEPI. And I want to welcome -- there is a few new faces that expressed interest when they were interviewed by the committee involvement plan. You guys were doing that. And so I hope you will start coming to RAB meetings and you are welcome to join the group; but they are always a public meeting, so you can come any time.

MR. GLENN SPRADLING: Yeah. I just thought I'd find something out.

MS. VENTURE. Okay. Well --

MR. LOUTH: Okay.

MS. VENTURE: -- have at it.

MR. LOUTH: All right. My name is Matt Louth, and I am with CH2M HILL. And maybe we can real quickly have some of the key stakeholders of the department team. Dave and -- you know, just introduce yourself.

MR. DAVE CLELAND: Yeah. I'm Dave Cleland. I'm with NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic.

MS. GENA TOWNSEND: Gena Townsend with the Environmental Testing Agency out of Atlanta.

MR. RANDY MCELVEEN: Randy McElveen, North Carolina.

MR. LOUTH: So we're going to first start out with the public meeting, which we do have a court reporter as part of the -- the it's certainly important to have a court reporter record our public meetings. So if you do have a question, if you could just announce your name so she can hear you. And that way it can be documented what your questions are and by whom. So we also have a sign-in sheet up here if you haven't signed in. And an agenda also of the proposed plan.

So for our community meeting, what we're going to be talking about -- we've talked about a lot with the folks -- RAB members who have been here a long time. It was over at UXO-19 that we were at Camp Devil Dog and did the clean up work over there in support of MILCON initially. But it's under the emissions response program, we have to follow

1 certain process. And we've done a lot of initial site
2 investigation work, and now we're ready for -- to present the
3 proposed plan and what the alternative will be moving into
4 the record of the City.
5 So tonight -- we're going to go to the next slide,
6 Dave -- we're just going to go through. You know, part of
7 the community meetings is having public outreach. Having the
8 public having an opportunity to have input on what the chosen
9 alternative if selected. So we have a, you know, public
10 comment period to provide those plans. You know, having the
11 records. So if you need it, you can get all the information
12 related to the decision in the Record of Decision to read,
13 and ask questions, and then provide input into the remedy for
14 the ROD. So tonight is the opportunity for the public to
15 have some input. We'll walk through the proposed plan. Give
16 you some of the site history. What our remedial active --
17 active -- remedial action objections are. The remedial
18 alternatives that we evaluate as part of our assessment. And
19 what the preferred alternative and rationale that the
20 partnering team are proposing for UXO-19. And then just lets
21 you know where the information is available. A lot of you
22 all, you know, received the public -- the proposed plan.
23 But, for folks who can't be here tonight, there is plenty of
24 outlets. It will be at the Onslow County Library to obtain
25 the information from the Admin Record. So next slide.

Just as far as the community participation. You know, it's key to our decision-making process and following CERCLA. We have the public comment period. It initially started in February. We were supposed to have this meeting back in February. But, as you all know, had some snow to cancel the meeting, so rescheduled for tonight. So what we decided to do as a team is extend the comment period out to the end of this month, April 24th, to allow folks to -- you know, if you didn't hear about it back in February or coming tonight, have an opportunity to provide those comments during the period -- the comment period. So -- and then, you know, any responses that we receive from the community, they do go into the Record of Decision. We have to provide responses to the questions and comments. It's documented, and it can be part of the decision making process in the ROD. Tonight's our public meeting. So everyone should have received the proposed plan up here. If not, you know I can get you one. Next slide.

Some of the history about UXO-19. For folks who this is your first time here about UXO-19, it's over at Camp Devil Dog which is off Route 17 just south of the air station area. From the 50's until present day, it's an infantry combat training area. This is our focus area, the area in yellow, was our initial boundary for investigating the site. Like I said, it was initially in support of MILCON because there had

been a lot of construction out there to enhance the training facility out there. So we went in and did an investigation. As you can see, the different colors in and around the boundary are different active ranges. Present and -- so the site itself has a long history of different munitions that were used out at the site. As far as, you know, grenades, and flame throwers, booby traps. You can read the list there of items that were used as part of this training infantry troops. So a long history there from the 50's to current day.

Just a little bit about the military munitions response program and our investigations out there. You know, basically the partnering team goes through an approach called CERCLA to do our investigations. And, basically, for MR sites, the first thing they do a site walk doing a site sweep looking for any munitions that may be at the surface that may cause a safety concern. There are safety regulations that we have to follow in accordance with Marine Corps Ciscom Command to make sure that we are working safety on an UXO site. Once we do the site walk, we go in and we do a veg clearance. Anything less than six inches in diameter we will do veg clearance which provides clearance for pathways for our digital geophysical mapping that we go in and do some geophysics to identify sub-surface anomalies that we'd have to dig on and investigate to see if it was a munitions item,

1 or a soda can, or a hubcap; if it is metallic, we'll pick it
2 up. So, you know, remove obstructions, demolishing some
3 structures -- structures if needed. You know, within reason.
4 Obviously working with the base to identify what those would
5 be. And then surveying our transects and doing a DGM as far
6 as part of the site prep.
7 So then -- next slide -- you know, we have to do
8 sampling; environmental sampling. Munitions investigations
9 is not just munitions items. Whether they be high
10 explosives, or practice, or -- or just munitions debris.
11 It's also the environmental component of doing soil sampling
12 and ground water sampling to assure that those munitions
13 haven't impact -- had an impact to soil and groundwater and
14 human health and the environment by any releases of munitions
15 constituents or metals to the environment. So we did
16 extensive sampling of site media and analyzed the soil and
17 groundwater for explosive residues and metals. And then we
18 do -- basically analytic results. Receive it back from the
19 lab, and do our risk assessments to evaluate human and
20 ecological receptors in that process.
21 Here are some pictures of the geophysical mapping
22 that's done at the site. In UXO-19 we did 100 percent.
23 Which, for most sites in the munitions response program, we
24 go out and we do a 10 percent geophysical mapping to get an
25 idea of what's out there and if more mapping is needed. For

this site, you know, we did our initial geophysical mapping and we realized in areas, through Milcon construction and then further expansion of the area, we did 100 percent. So this is just the apparatus that we used as far as doing the geophysical mapping. Which is, you know, basically sending coils in the sub-surface to try to pick up any type of metal debris or objects in the sub-surface. And basically this whole area, and you can see, we covered this whole area 100 percent besides the white or, like, buildings and structures. You can see the area is just covered from a geophysical standpoint as far as sub-surface metal debris. This is kind of inset of showing -- this was called Green Town over in the -- in the training area. And this, you know, area, looking at what we're seeing in the sub-surface as far as -- which allows us to know where to dig and where -- as far as doing our investigation and identifying anomalies.

So next slide. So that's the next step. Once we identify these anomalies, we have a geophysisist, you know, evaluate all the data and identify which anomalies we feel like should be investigate. And basically, everywhere you see a pin flag, is -- was an anomaly pointed out. So, you know, based on the history of the site and active training, varied materials -- we did quite an extensive intrusive investigation across the whole area doing an intrusive investigation. So this is just some of the UXO technicians

1 doing the investigation work out at the site.
2 So when we find things -- munitions or munitions
3 debris, it's also identified as a high explosive. Or if the
4 UXO technician can't tell if it is a high explosive, or
5 practice, or not, we have to do a blow-in-place from a safety
6 perspective. So these are just showing different pictures
7 of, you know, for safe things that we can move that still
8 need to be blown up, we can consolidate them into a trench,
9 use engineering controls that can minimize the blast. But if
10 they are things, items, that can't be moved then C4 has to
11 be, you know, attached to the item and blow it right there in
12 place if the UXO technician feels that it's not safe to move.
13 And then they use these engineering controls. You know, they
14 backfill the hole, put plywood over it, sandbag it to
15 minimize the blast. And you can see, here is a couple of
16 photos from when we did have to do some demolition work out
17 at the site. We tried to focus where we could. We had to do
18 consolidation trenches to the back part of the site that's
19 not impacting the training ongoing with the Marines. It has
20 to be during, you know, safe times to do it and there is a
21 lot of safety protocols to even do the demo.
22 So next slide. So this is kind of, you know, a quick
23 schedule of, you know, the investigations that took place.
24 We started back in 2008 doing some of the focused preliminary
25 assessment/site investigation work where we did a lot of

1 sampling. Collected over 160 surface soil samples, over 50
2 sub-surface soil samples, and 27 groundwater samples across
3 the site to assess if we had munitions constituents or metals
4 that would pose a risk to human health or the environment.
5 And then doing the DGM across the initial part of the site
6 where we found that over 4,000 anomalies were investigated
7 and 42 items were identified as munitions items that had to
8 be blown up; which was our first indicator that more work was
9 needed out at the site. In doing our human health and
10 ecological risk screening, some of this analytical data,
11 there was no risk or unacceptable risk from the site media
12 and analytes to human health and the environment. So --
13 which was a very positive thing out at the site.
14 So next slide, Dave. So this kind of shows where we
15 sampled across the whole site and where we had anomalies dug
16 across the entire site. Just to kind of give you an idea of
17 the areas that we looked at from the --
18 MR. GLENN SPRADLING: Are the dots where you dug?
19 MR. LOUTH: The dots are -- well, the little dots are
20 our initial and geophysical anomalies. So, as you can see,
21 they kind of go in rows. And then we investigated all those
22 dots. And there where you have the yellow dots, that was
23 where we had surface and sub-surface soil sampling. And then
24 the green dots are where we did, you know, surface soil
25 locations across the site to try to pair up, you know, our

sampling with where anomalies were so we could assess these zones.

MR. SPRADLING: What about that square there?

MR. LOUTH: This was a very focused area. It was an area where they were going to do construction to the support facility, so we went ahead and did 100 percent in this area initially. So this is all geophysical anomalies that we also dug up. I'm sorry, your name, sir?

MR. SPRADLING: I'm sorry. My name is Glenn Spradling and I am with the local Chamber of Commerce.

MR. LOUTH: Okay. Thank you. Next slide? So that was our initial investigation. And from 2011, 2012 we expanded the site. You know, initially the previous slide focused in this area with our investigation. Then we just continued in 2011, 2012 with our investigation across the entire site to do 100 percent coverage over 85 acres of the site. You know, for undeveloped areas, down to two feet below grade. And, in doing that geophysics and intrusive investigation, there were 46,000 anomalies were identified. And 24 saturated areas. And, what that is, that's an area that's so much metal that's it's just a big bog and we call it a saturated area for a highly geophysical term, if you will. But it's just a big area with a lot of metal, so they had to go in. And they investigated as one area, but it's a massive area. So, like, a lot of these red dots would be

1 considered saturated zones. And, in doing that, we had over
2 400 items that were considered munitions of explosive
3 concern. And then we had to do demolition work on those
4 items to dispose of them. And then so all the work from the
5 expanded SI rolled into our -- because it was so extensive --
6 you know, typically, you know, your site investigation work
7 is a little more limited. But, because of the amount of the
8 work that was done as part of our expanded SI, we rolled all
9 that work into our remedial investigation document based on
10 everything else found. And that was, you know, the remedial
11 investigation and feasibility study defines the nature and
12 extent of what we found. Looks at the potential hazards and
13 explosive hazards. And then, you know, looks at the remedial
14 action objectives and alternatives as part of the feasibility
15 study.
16 MR. MIKE CURTIS: I have a question for you.
17 MR. LOUTH: Yes.
18 MR. CURTIS: Mike Curtis. There's a nice, neat
19 boundary around there around UXO-19.
20 MR. LOUTH: Yes.
21 MR. CURTIS: Were the Marines that good a shot that
22 they're all within that boundary? There -- can we assume
23 that there are unexploded ordinance outside of that boundary?
24 MR. LOUTH: Yes. And -- and I didn't explain that
25 well enough at the start of the meeting. But everywhere

outside the yellow boundary is considered an active range. So, yes, you are correct. There would be items outside of this boundary. But it's active range, and we investigate closed ranges as part of the initial response program. And then also in support of Milcon projects on ranges. So, yeah -- yes, you have a lot of active ranges in and around here. Our focus was on the closed portion of the range. Which you'll see in a later slide is, you know, this is a whole area here. In a later slide, the range folks wanted to take back an area. So you'll see a little circle right here where they wanted to reinstitute active training in that area. So -- okay.

So here is just a pie chart showing, you know, a good summary of our investigation. As you can see, over 22,000 MPPEH items. And then, you know, the 27,000 anomalies that was non-munitions debris related items. But you can see here, you know, 436 munitions explosive concern items that were uncovered and disposed of as part of our investigation. So over 50,000 anomalies in that 85 acre area were investigated.

MR. SPRADLING: Glenn Spradling again. What was the -- do you have a breakdown of what those unexploded ordinance items was?

MR. LOUTH: I do. Yeah, I sure do. I think that might be the next slide or -- it's coming, yes. As far as

rockets and -- yes, sir.

MR. SPRADLING: Yeah.

MR. LOUTH: Yeah. So -- so this is kind of the extent. This goes to your question, Mike, as far as the areas outside the active range and the extent of the MPPEH. And this is where I was talking about that circle coming into play where the base said, "We want to make this active range training area again." You know, after we cleaned it up, did the 100 percent. And then, also, you know, some of the areas, you'll see the buildings. If there was a building, structure, a road, standing water -- there were some areas -- utility lines, we can't get but so close to utility lines -- that we could not investigate. So what you'll see moving forward in our evaluation is we call areas undeveloped and developed areas. Undeveloped areas is everywhere we did investigate. Developed areas where you have housing, roads, infrastructure in place.

MR. MCELVEEN: What are the colors of the dots? Randy McElveen.

MR. LOUTH: Yeah. Yeah, this is -- what this is is looking at the colored dots. The green dots are flares, yellow dots are fuse -- fuses, the orange dots are grenades, the red dots are mines, the yellow squares -- I don't know if you can make them out or not -- but those are projectiles, the red items are small arms ammo, the green is 51 millimeter

1 mortars, and the magenta color are 60 millimeter mortar
2 items.
3 MR. MCELVEEN: Thank you.
4 MR. LOUTH: All right. Dave? Here is that table I
5 was talking about as far as the breakdown of items. Finding
6 the flares and grenades and mines and projectiles, rockets.
7 Mostly were mortar projectiles. There was a mortar range
8 just adjacent to our active area that they would fire area --
9 or fire into the area. So that was, you know, why we saw a
10 significant amount of the projectiles -- mortar projectiles -
11 - in the UXO-19 area. And then the breakout of MPPEH items
12 as well. And so this is a bucket showing, you know, MPPEH
13 items that are not munitions of explosive concern or items
14 that are parts of rockets or parts of projectiles that we had
15 to dispose of as well.
16 All right. So as part of our remedial investigation
17 and feasibility study we had to do, you know, the keys for
18 remission sites are human health, the environment, and then
19 explosive concerns, as far as looking at risk. So since we
20 early on did all the environmental sampling and established
21 there was no human health ecological assess -- risk
22 assessment or risk out at the site, based on doing 100
23 percent investigation across the site in the areas that we
24 were able to investigate, we had to do an explosive hazard
25 evaluation of the site to look at moving forward in our

1 feasibility study getting to the ROD. So we looked at, you
2 know, site factors as far as, you know, what's out at the
3 site. Buildings, physical features, site accessibility -- is
4 it easy for someone from the public to gain access to the
5 site or not or if it's restricted area. The human factors;
6 who's going out to the site, how often they're there, what
7 are they doing there. And then the ordinance factors based
8 on that table that we looked at. What did we find out there?
9 What's the size, the type, and the density that we find out
10 at that site? And so all that information goes into our
11 assessment tool, and it looks at the different uses, and the
12 ordinance factors, and it has a range of, you know, 1 being
13 the highest hazard and 4 being the lowest hazard as part of
14 our evaluation.
15 So the next slide. So in looking at our risk out at
16 the site from the munitions constituents from the
17 environmental sampling of media, and they're human health and
18 ecological like we talked about earlier, but they're looking
19 at our explosive hazard evaluation. Since we did 100 percent
20 removal at the site, in our developed areas there is still
21 some potential risk because we weren't able to access
22 everywhere. Underneath buildings, utility lines. But then
23 also since the majority of our investigations went down two
24 feet for anomalies for most of them, you know, there is --
25 there is a risk associated with items being below two feet in

1 areas that weren't investigated. So for the areas that were
2 100 percent investigated, the risk was low. And then the
3 areas where, you know, the MPPEH was considered a principal
4 waste as we moved forward in the FS. So, basically, the take
5 away here is in areas we got 100 percent investigation, low
6 risk because we were able to get down to two feet. And in
7 some areas we did go lower because what the UXO techs do is
8 that, you know, they get an anomaly, they dig on it, they
9 have to do a QC. After they remove that item they -- they
10 hear a ring off on their stat, they keep digging until they
11 don't have a ring off to ensure that that spot's clear. So
12 in some areas we did have to go a little bit different than
13 two, but the average for the site was right at two feet,
14 which was consistent with the types of items that were fired
15 into the site. So this last bullet here, because you know
16 the mission of explosives concern is it can go off depending
17 on, you know, the severity of the item, the type of item with
18 all the triggers in place from a safety standpoint, we have
19 to treat it in our evaluation as a principal threat waste.
20 Which means, you know, it's serious. So keep that in mind as
21 we move forward through the next couple of slides here.
22 So we did our RI, we did our investigation, and in
23 evaluating our alternatives into our feasibility study, we
24 have to come up with our objective. You know, what do we
25 really want to do as far as our remedial action here. And so

the team came up with this, "To reduce or prevent the potential for direct physical contact with MEC/MPPEH to allow current and reasonably anticipated land use (infantry training) at the site to continue." So basically, you know, in talking with the base and their mission, you know, the site's not planned to change use. It's going to be used to school infantry moving forward. So that was our planned use moving forward in our evaluation for the risk evaluation, but also looking at our objectives from a remedial action standpoint.

So next. Knowing that, this kind of gives you the conceptual site model of our investigation. These colored areas, Mike, are the different active ranges adjacent to the site and areas where they may have fired into our area or over phase. But basically you'll see -- this is what we're calling the developed area where there was infrastructure, structures in place, buildings, utilities, and then everything else outside is considered the undeveloped areas. This kind of gives you an idea of what's going on at the site.

So the next slide. So the next -- okay. So we have all this information we've collected, and now we evaluate all our alternatives for what do we do moving forward with the proposed plan and ROD. As far as CERCLA, the number one alternative we have to look at, no action. That's just to

have our baseline for our alternatives. So the next alternative that we looked at was land use controls. And folks who are new to the terminology, land use controls are restrictions put on that land for certain uses that are controlled. There's a survey plat, and it's part of the deed. There is, you know, institution of patrols at times. There can be restrictions on leaving construction support. So there are a lot of different factors that go into play for restricting that land use as part of an alternative. So what we came up with, in areas that were investigated that were undeveloped -- and remember that's 100 percent; we investigated everything. You know, from a land use control standpoint, doing -- looking at warning signs around the perimeter. We know it's active training, it's going to stay active training, but we need to ensure that, you know, people who may be coming into the site, they understand how it is in a UXO -- for a UXO site that they are entering. Restrict intrusive activities to less than two feet below grade. Since we cleared across the site an average of two feet, anything below two feet would be restricted and would need UXO support, in that third bullet there, if they're going deeper than two feet, and then in munitions safety awareness training for base personnel and subcontractors. Anybody doing anything out at the site, that they are aware if they find something, that they know how to, you know, recognize,

1 report, retreat, and to tell proper authorities as far as
2 from a safety perspective. There is a whole training series
3 from that. And then in the developed areas, the areas that
4 we couldn't get in to do the investigation. Warning signs
5 around the perimeters. So restrict intrusive activities
6 within the entire developed area. And that would say that if
7 they decided to demolish a building in the future, maybe they
8 want to do something else there. Since we haven't
9 investigated underneath that building, we would need to go in
10 if they were planning to do some type of intrusive work
11 underneath that building, we would investigate to make sure
12 there is nothing buried underneath that building, you know,
13 before that building was built. So we would write that
14 construction support to any intrusive activities. And then
15 also the safety training as part of -- for base personnel and
16 subcontractors doing the work. So that's alternative two.
17 So now we're moving to alternative three and four,
18 which are a little more robust as far as, you know, removing
19 the hazard as far as subsurface removal of the MEC items
20 through investigations and more DGM and intrusive
21 investigations, but still having land use restrictions in
22 place even though more intrusive work is being done. And --
23 and to do that, you know, in the undeveloped areas basically
24 we'd go in and do DGM and intrusive activities to get down to
25 six feet. So we have two feet clearance right now. What

this is saying is let's clear down to six feet. Whether we do it lists to ensure that there is more security and safety from zero to six feet. And then the developed areas, it would just be the land use controls carrying forward with that until that, you know, land use changed if they chose to tear down the building. And then four gets a little more robust. Looking at sub-surface removal of MEC and land use control. But that's doing the excavation and then sifting the soil that we bring up to see if there is items that are in the soil. So that's even more, you know, removal down to six feet, doing the investigation, and then sifting all the soil, and putting the soil back into the hole once it's been cleared down to six feet. So pretty extensive, pretty robust. And then for the developed areas, land use controls again until the land use changes.

So the next slide, Dave. It kind of gives you a comparative analysis. This is part of the feasibility study. What we have to look at is these different CERCLA criteria as far as looking at protection of human health and environment; compliance with the ARARs which are, you know, laws; and then the primary balancing criteria as far as effectiveness, you know, reducing the threat, what's the short-term effect in this, implementing the action, how easy or how difficult, and then the cost associated with it. So you can see no action, that's our baseline. There is no costs associated with that.

1 And then land use controls, how it balances out. The higher
2 ranking are the solid dots which is a favorable ranking.
3 Moderate is the donut holes. And then low is the -- just the
4 circles there. And then associated costs. So, as you can
5 see, the more robust we move in our evaluations across, you
6 know, you get some higher favorable results as far as
7 removing some of the, you know, the risks. But then you also
8 look at the cost associated with, you know, doing more robust
9 removal action, and you still have some land use controls put
10 in place because of the potential risk for future use,
11 especially in the developed areas. So that's something that
12 we take into consideration and talked about as a partnering
13 team. And so the preferred alternative that the partnering
14 team came up with is the land use control option, which is
15 basically, you know, putting some restrictions. We've done
16 so much work out there, 100 percent down to two feet, it's
17 going to stay a training area. If we put some land use
18 controls -- land use controls in place to restrict the
19 activities, provide training, and any construction support to
20 intrusive activities, we feel like that will be, you know, a
21 safe option moving forward. So land use control was the
22 selected alternative.
23 So the next slide, Dave. The land use controls. So
24 basically you can see there the rationale. Basically by us
25 doing the 100 percent significantly reduced the risk. And

that -- the receptors potentially in the future, it would be -- I'm sorry -- military personnel working out there or training out there, and then having the UXO support on site for any other activities. And then, you know, with any UXO site, any type of removal, you know, you can't say -- you know, there is never 100 percent assurance that everything is gone. So even though alternatives three and four are little more robust as far as, you know, doing the digging and soil sifting down to six feet, we still can't say that we've got everything. So there still would be land use controls in place that would be carried forward for those alternatives. So -- so basically our rationale, the team felt, that alternative two was a good balance of, you know, continuing site use, being protective, but also cost effective and moving the site forward in the process.

So the next slide. So these are our proposed alternatives. And this is that circle I was speaking about where they took back active training. So this would be our undeveloped land use controls and then this would be our developed areas of -- of land use controls moving forward.

So the next slide, Dave. So basically our path forward, that's, you know, the Navy and the Base, in working with the EPA and State, will make the final decision for the remedial action and the ROD, but any information or comments you may have, as part of the public comment period, can be

1 submitted. You know, if you have questions tonight or if you
2 choose to write in questions or provide any comments, you can
3 do them during the comment period to respond to those in
4 taking consideration for the ROD. Then basically, once the
5 comment period is over on April 25th, you know, the selected
6 remedy that was proposed, unless there is any significant
7 changes as far as the public input, we'd move forward in the
8 record of decision, and that would be provided in the
9 responsive summary in the record of decision on detailing
10 that land use controls would be the preferred and recommended
11 alternative moving forward in the -- in the ROD.
12 So next slide, Dave. So, yeah, as I spoke about
13 earlier, as far as this information on the investigations,
14 they are in the admin record. It's on the web, and also
15 these proposed plans are in the Onslow County library back in
16 the media center for -- it's out there for public use to read
17 and understand the site investigations leading up to the
18 decision in the ROD. So I think that's --
19 Point of contacts, as they introduced themselves
20 earlier. Dave, Gena, Charity -- who is not here, but -- and
21 then Randy if you have questions, or comments, or to provide
22 input, you can feel free to contact them as well.
23 And then lastly -- I think that's it. This concludes
24 our public meeting. Any questions, comments from anyone?
25 Yeah, Mike?

MR. CURTIS: One quick question before we break, what is the source of funding for the CERCLA coming in? For the $570,000.00, assuming that that's the adopted plan.

MR. LOUTH: Yeah. Dave, do you want to -- and this is from the instance response program.

MR. CLELAND: Correct. In the instance response program, NAFAC is the lead on that, and it falls under -- basically it's MRP funding. It's the same source of funding, kinda, as we do our other IR sites. So I -- I'm the responsible RPM for the MRP at Lejeune. I prepare the cost estimates and we go through a process where we -- we develop a cost to complete. All that runs up through the chain, and I think our CNO is our resource -- I forget the name of it -- but everything runs up through CNO, and that money -- that money channels down to me. So --

MR. CURTIS: The $570,000.00, does it include ongoing monitoring of the -- of the property?

MR. CLELAND: That 570 will --

MR. LOUTH: Yeah.

MR. CLELAND: -- yeah, will carry this through.

MR. LOUTH: Yeah. Basically I think like 50,000 of it is to do the actual land use controls and get a survey plat put in place. But then because UXO support will be needed moving forward, there's, like, $500,000.00 set aside if, you know, the base wants to, you know, run some

electricity lines through the undeveloped part, we'd go in and provide construction support as part of that land use control. Yeah. Yes, sir.

MR. SPRADLING: Access to it. There's no fencing around this facility that I know of. So any public intrusions reported? I'm Glenn Spradling. I'm sorry, I'm Glenn Spradling. Any known intrusions or -- from the civilian populous or any incidence -- historical record of any of that?

MR. LOUTH: No, not that I am aware of. I'm not going to say it's never happened, but it is part of the fenced in area. There is a gate there. It's a little more secure nowadays, but it's not completely fenced in as its own site. But there is some -- I haven't had reports of citizens going out to the site.

MR. SPRADLING: Thank you.

MR. LOUTH: Yeah.

MR. MCELVEEN: I was just going to mention -- Randy McElveen. MEC and MPPEH were mentioned about 10 or 15 times or documented in the -- in writing. That's munitions of explosive concern, which is an actual known explosive. High explosive. And then MPPEH, munitions potentially presenting an explosive hazard. We're not sure if it's explosive or not. It could be. So that's what those two are.

MR. LOUTH: Thank you, Randy. All right. Any

others?

ATTENDEES: (Indicate negative.)

MR. LOUTH: Okay. Thank you. What we're going to do as the court reporter -- we're done with the community meeting. The court reporter's got to pack her stuff. We'll take a short break and -- so she can head out, and then we'll get started again with the community involvement plan and then UXO-23 afterwards. So maybe a five to ten minute break. Thank you.

* * * * * THE PUBLIC MEETING CONCLUDED AT 7:48 P.M. * * * * *

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)

) C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-I-O-N

COUNTY OF PITT)

I, AIMEE C. RIGSBY, A COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE AFORESAID COUNTY AND STATE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES ARE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE CH2M HILL PUBLIC MEETING, UXO-19 PROPOSED PLAN, MCIEAST - MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE, WHICH WAS TAKEN BY ME BY STENOMASK, AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NOT FINANCIALLY INTERESTED IN THE OUTCOME OF THIS ACTION, A RELATIVE, EMPLOYEE, ATTORNEY OR COUNSEL OF ANY OF THE PARTIES, NOR A RELATIVE OR EMPLOYEE OF SUCH ATTORNEY OR COUNSEL.

THIS THE 30TH DAY OF APRIL, 2015.

NOTARY PUBLIC NUMBER 200525000114.

AIMEE C. RIGSBY
COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC
CAROLINA COURT REPORTERS, INC.
105 OAKMONT PROFESSIONAL PLAZA
GREENVILLE, NC 27858