# APPENDIX B
# TECHNICAL PLANNING PROCESS (TPP) SESSION DOCUMENTATION/MEETING MINUTES

# Technical Project Planning Memo:

**Subject:** Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)
Documentation of Technical Project Planning Team Concurrence
for Site Inspection Phase

**Site:** ***Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range*, A06LA030901, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana**

**Contract:** Contract Number W912DY-04-D-0005, Delivery Order 0009

This document records the proceedings of the Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting for the ***Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range (BGR)*** Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS). The TPP Team members listed below indicated concurrence with the Site Inspection (SI) Technical Approach as developed during the TPP meeting held at the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) building in Baton Rouge, Louisiana on February 14, 2008, from 9:30 am to Noon. Participants at this meeting included representatives of Parsons, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Fort Worth District, USACE Albuquerque District, the LDEQ, Tangipahoa Parish Sheriff's Office, and local landowners.

An initial Technical Approach (as presented) was developed using the collaborative experience of Parsons and USACE technical experts in conjunction with available site information, including the 1996 Inventory Project Report (INPR), 2003 Archives Search Report (ASR), 2004 ASR Supplement, and other pertinent documents and interviews. The TPP Team discussed and refined this initial Technical Approach during the course of the TPP meeting, yielding a Final Technical Approach for implementation at Hammond BGR.

The TPP Team's agreed Final Technical Approach is documented herein and includes field sampling and qualitative reconnaissance (QR) for reasons discussed in subsequent paragraphs. A Site-Specific Work Plan (SS-WP) will be prepared, followed by an SI Report, which will summarize the existing project information and document the SI recommendation. The SS-WP and SI Report will be submitted to the TPP Team members for review. The details of the TPP meeting are included with this TPP Memorandum and include maps, a Conceptual Site Model (CSM), and a Conceptual Site Exposure Model (CSEM).

Hammond BGR, in Hammond, Louisiana, is part of the former Hammond Army Airfield (AAF) training ranges. Hammond AAF was a sub-base of Harding AAF, Gulf Port AAF, Key Field, Stuttgart AAF, and Esler AAF. The site was operated for practice bombing by aircraft from Harding AAF. It is presumed the area was used for gunnery, rocket, and bombing practice between 1942 and 1945. General Order 131, issued September 7, 1945, formally closed Hammond BGR. The land was returned to the previous owners

and the majority of the land is currently owned by a trust and managed by the Bennett-Peters Company. The land is managed for lumber production and hunting clubs, with some portions of the land used for residential and business properties.

There are five munitions response sites (MRS) identified at Hammond BGR: Bomb Target No. 1 (BT1 or MRS01) (649 acres), the Multiple Use Target (MUT or MRS02) (3,108 acres), Bomb Target No. 2 (BT2 or MRS03) (649 acres), the Rifle Range (RR or MRS04) (999 acres), and the Gunnery Range (GR or MRS05) (640 acres). Munitions associated with these MRSs include AN-M30 100-lb. general purpose bombs, MK I 100-lb. general purpose bombs, M85 100-lb. concrete practice bombs, M38A2 100-lb. practice bombs, M5 2.25-inch practice rockets, M1A1 spotting charges, general small arms ammunition, 0.50 caliber machine gun ammunition, AN-MK4 3-lb. practice bombs, AN-MK5 3-lb. practice bombs, AN-MK23 3-lb. practice bombs, and AN-MK43 4.5-lb. practice bombs.

The Hammond ASR describes a "demo area" indicated on historical maps, though no other documentation was located that confirms use of this area. In 1995, the site was given a risk assessment code (RAC) score of 2. The site was re-scored in the ASR Supplement. BT1 (MRS01), the MUT (MRS02), and BT2 (MRS03) received scores of 4, while the RR (MRS04) and GR (MRS05) received scores of 5. Interviews conducted with landowners during preparation of the ASR concluded that no live ordnance had been found on the property other than small arms debris. Landowners reported sand-filled bombs being located near target areas in the past, though they were extremely rusted. No incidents involving explosive ordnance have occurred during plowing according to the landowners that were interviewed. A 2002 site visit noted that a four-wheel drive vehicle was necessary to traverse the logging roads. The 2002 site visit team noted high explosive (HE) cratering and fragments of HE bombs at BT1 (MRS01) and BT2 (MRS03). The site visit team also noted numerous practice bomb fragments of unknown type, AN-M38 practice bombs, tail fins, suspension leg bans, parts of M1A1 spotting charges, 0.30-caliber projectiles, and 0.50-caliber projectiles.

During the 2008 TPP meeting, Mr. Tom Davidson of the Tangipahoa Parish Sheriff's Office, provided details regarding past ordnance-related findings at Hammond BGR. Mr. Davidson identified the location of the "demo area" at the eastern end of the GR MRS (MRS05). In addition, Mr. Davidson identified the location of the berm area for the RR MRS (MRS04), noted that numerous ordnance findings occurred north of BT2 (MRS03), identified the location of the MUT (MRS02) firing fan (the firing point should be pivoted southward), and stated that rockets had been found just south of the BT1 (MRS01) boundary. These locations are displayed on Figures 3A and 3B. Mr. Davidson stated that Maxwell Air Force Base has old aerial photographs of the site dating back to 1950. Mr. Davidson gave the TPP Team members a copy of "Hammond Army Airfield and Early Aviation in the Hammond Area," a book he helped write about the history of Hammond BGR.

Three instances occurred where Mr. Davidson had to respond to live ordnance findings during the 1969-1970 timeframe. Ms. Jeanine Connelly, a landowner consultant, stated she has heard of no ordnance findings within the last 17 years.

The TPP Team discussed the initial CSM and CSEM for the site and agreed that complete MEC and munitions constituents (MC) exposure pathways were likely for all Hammond MRSs. BT1 (MRS01), the MUT (MRS02), and BT2 (MRS03) are associated with HE munitions, which are explosively hazardous, while the RR (MRS04) and GR (MRS05) are associated with small arms ammunition, which are not considered explosively hazardous, but may leach MC to soil and other media. Therefore, the MEC exposure pathways were strongly suspected to be complete at BT1 (MRS01), the MUT (MRS02), and BT2 (MRS03) because of the potential presence of explosive hazards. Additionally, MC exposure pathways may also be complete at all five MRSs. Consequently, because of the presence of potentially complete exposure pathways, it was agreed during the TPP meeting that QR and MC sampling are appropriate for this site.

Based on this information, the TPP Team agreed the SI Report will support a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) recommendation for the site. Because only small arms ammunition were used at the RR MRS (MRS04) and GR MRS (MRS05), a No Department of Defense (DoD) Action Indicated (NDAI) recommendation may be made for these two MRSs. To this end, Parsons will conduct QR and MC sampling at all Hammond MRSs. The TPP Team agreed that rights-of-entry (ROE) could be obtained through contacting Bennett-Peters Company representatives.

According to the TPP Team, there are no wetlands within Hammond BGR and the area is not anticipated to be an important ecological place. *Subsequent to the TPP meeting, the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) database was accessed and shows several wetland areas exist south of the Hammond BGR site, but no wetland data is present within the site. From the appearance of the wetland areas south of the site, it is likely that wetland areas exist within Hammond BGR in the form of intermittent stream areas.*

In summary, the TPP Team concurs with the Technical Approach as refined at the TPP meeting on February 14, 2008 with the following issues and resolutions, as summarized below:

- The technical approach described in the Advance Packet was generally agreed to by the TPP Team, with changes as described in this TPP Memorandum and the associated documentation. The approach to be used for Hammond BGR will involve a focused site visit to confirm the presence of MC and MEC-related features and a supplemental data collection effort to further support the expected RI/FS recommendation.

- The TPP Team concurred with the presented CSM and CSEM and agreed with the conclusion that complete MEC and MC exposure pathways were likely for Hammond BGR MRS01, MRS02, and MRS03. Only small arms were used at MRS04 and MRS05; therefore, no complete MEC exposure pathways are expected.

- The TPP Team concurred that field sampling and QR would be required for this site, and the Site-Specific Work Plan would document the agreed to sampling locations and QR paths. Some sampling locations and QR paths were revised based on historical information from Mr. Tom Davidson.

- ROEs must be obtained through the trust that owns the land. The Bennett-Peters Company should be contacted for ROE and notified when plans are complete for the SI fieldwork.

- There is no municipal water supply in the site area. Any water supply in the site area will consist of privately owned wells.

- Mr. Schneider stated he thought no wells exist onsite, but ditched and low-lying areas will likely contain surface water. Subsequently, a well report has shown groundwater wells to be present at the periphery of the FUDS boundary.

- During the SI fieldwork, target features should be identified and sampled using 50-meter by 50-meter grids with 50 sampling increments. If target features cannot be identified the size of the grid will be expanded as far as vegetation allows.

- One ambient sample will be collected in the southern portion of the site. A 50 meter by 50 meter sample grid with 50 sampling increments will be used.

- Background criteria for the site will be three times the United States Geological Survey (USGS) criteria for Tangipahoa Parish and the ambient sample results. If no USGS value is available, the ambient sample result will be used as background.

- All non-ambient sampling results will be compared to residential Risk Evaluation/Corrective Action Program (RECAP) soil to groundwater criteria. The Human health soil screening levels are the lower of either the direct contact RECAP screening level or the RECAP screening level based on the protection of groundwater via leaching from soil. The LDEQ risk assessors recalculated the RECAP values to be FUDS-specific. According to the LDEQ, these values are more appropriate to use for munitions-related contaminants than the originally published RECAP values.

- The TPP Team did not identify any site-specific issues requiring an expedited project schedule or document reviews for this site.

- All findings will be fully documented in an SI Report for the Project Team and other stakeholder review. The SI Technical Approach described above will not be modified without consultation and agreement by the Project Team whose names appear below.

**Ms. Patience Nwanna**
**USACE, Fort Worth District**
**Project Manager**

**Mr. Brian Jordan**
**U.S. Army Range Support Center**
**Design Integrator**

**Mr. Matt Masten**
**USACE Albuquerque**

**Mr. Mike Miller**
**LDEQ**
**Project Manager**

**Mr. Tom Davidson**
**Tangipahoa Sheriff Department**

**Mr. Carl Schneider**
**Landowner**

**Mr. Eric North**
**Parsons**
**SI Report Lead**

**Mr. Noel Bennett**
**USEPA Region 6**
**Project Manager**

**Ms. Julie Burdey, P.G.**
**Parsons**
**Texas SI Team Leader**

**Ms. Jeanine Connelly**
**Landowner Consultant**

| TPP Team | EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.1.1 | |
|---|---|---|
| **Decision Makers** | | |
| **Customer** | USACE Fort Worth District (CESWF) | |
| **Project Manager** | Patience N. Nwanna, CESWF | |
| **Regulators** | Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality; EPA Region 6 | |
| **Primary Stakeholders** | Local Trust (managed by Bennett-Peters Company); Various Private Landowners | |
| **Data Types** | **Data Users** | **Data Gatherer** |
| **Demographics/Land Use** | Risk, Responsibility, and Compliance Perspectives | Parsons (Senior Scientist, Risk Specialist) |
| **Site Conditions** | Remedy Perspective | Parsons (Geologist, Senior Scientist) |
| **Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC)** | Risk and Remedy Perspectives | Parsons (UXO Technician III or higher, Risk Specialist, Senior Scientist) |
| **Munitions Constituents (MC)** | Risk and Remedy Perspectives | Parsons (Chemist, Risk Specialist, Senior Scientist) |
| **Archaeology** | Compliance and Remedy Perspectives | CESWF, Parsons (Staff Scientist, Senior Scientist) |
| **Endangered Species** | Risk and Compliance Perspectives | CESWF, Parsons (Staff Scientist, Risk Specialist) |

| CUSTOMER'S GOALS | EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.1.2 | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Areas of concern (AOC)** | **Contaminant Issues** | **Future Land Use** | **Site-specific Closeout Goal (if applicable)** |
| Bomb Target #1 | MC, MEC | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Bomb Target #2 | MC, MEC | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Multiple Use Target | MC, MEC | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Rifle Range | MC | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Gunnery Range | MC | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Remaining Land | TBD | Residential, recreational, commercial | See below |
| Site Closeout Statement | | | |
| To manage the potential risk resulting from the munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and munitions constituents (MC) risk through a combination of remedial action, administrative controls, and public education; thereby rendering the site as safe as reasonably possible to humans and the environment and conducive to the current and anticipated future land use. | | | |
| **Customer's Schedule Requirements** | | | |
| Site Investigation and Reporting Complete by **April 6, 2009** | | | |
| **Customer's Site Budget** | | | |
| Site Investigation and Reporting: Fully funded for SI phase | | | |

| IDENTIFY SITE APPROACH | | |
|---|---|---|
| **EXISTING SITE INFORMATION & DATA EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.1.3 and 1.2.1** | | |
| **Attachment(s) to Phase I TPP Memorandum** | **Located at Repository** | **Preliminary Conceptual Site Model** |
| Preliminary Assessment (Archives Search Report) | N/A for SI Phase; Implemented in post-SI Phase as warranted | No |
| Site-Specific SI Work Plan | N/A for SI Phase; Implemented in post-SI Phase as warranted | Yes |
| **POTENTIAL POINTS OF COMPLIANCE EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.1.3** | | |
| Determination of absence or presence of MEC/MC | | |
| If MC is detected, comparison against 3 times USGS background levels, ambient data, and LDEQ RECAP Levels (SSLs). | | |
| Avoidance of sensitive conditions: wetlands, endangered species, archaeological sites | | |
| | | |
| **MEDIA OF POTENTIAL CONCERN EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.1.4** | | |
| Qualitative review of MEC presence. | | |
| Quantitative screening of MC in surface soil and groundwater. | | |
| | | |
| **SITE OBJECTIVES EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.2** | | |
| Collection of sufficient MEC and MC data to determine if concentrations are high enough to warrant further study or action. | | |
| Eliminate from further consideration those releases that pose no significant threat to public health or the environment. | | |
| Collection of sufficient data to perform MRSPP scoring and EPA to conduct MC-related HRS | | |
| Completion of the SI. | | |
| *See Programmatic and Site-Specific Work Plan* | | |
| *See Attached Worksheets Developed by the Project Team* | | |
| **REGULATOR AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.3** | | |
| **Regulators** | **Community Interests** | **Others** |
| TBD | TBD | TBD |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| **PROBABLE REMEDIES EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.4** | | |
| RI/FS characterization, if not NDAI | | |
| Institutional controls / public education | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| **EXECUTABLE STAGES TO SITE CLOSEOUT EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.2.5** | | |
| NDAI | | |
| RI/FS, if necessary | | |
| Decision Document | | |
| Remedial Design (RD) (as necessary) | | |
| Remedial Action (as necessary) | | |
| | | |

| IDENTIFY CURRENT PROJECT | | |
|---|---|---|
| **SITE CONSTRAINTS AND DEPENDENCIES EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.3.1** | | |
| Administrative Constraints and Dependencies | | |
| Rights of Entry (ROE) | | |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Funding beyond the SI | | |
| Concurrent planning programs | | |
| Scheduling | | |
| Technical Constraints and Dependencies | | |
| Property owner/leaseholder site activities (Site access) | | |
| MEC avoidance screening of MC sample locations for safety | | |
| Cultural Resources | | |
| Topography/vegetation | | |
| Environmentally sensitive areas | | |
| Legal and Regulatory Milestones and Requirements | | |
| Consistent with CERCLA and NCP | | |
| Public, stakeholder, and regulatory involvement and review of key documents (see schedule) | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| **CURRENT EXECUTABLE STAGE EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 1.3.3** | | |
| TPP Technical Memorandum | | |
| Site-Specific Work Plan | | |
| Site Inspection | | |
| SI Report Recommendation | | |
| *See Attached Worksheets Developed by the Project Team* | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| **Basic** (For Current Projects) | **Optimum** (For Future Projects) | **Excessive** (Objectives that do not lead to site closeout) |
| Site Inspection | RI/FS or NDAI | |
| | | |
| | | |

**Acronyms**

AOC - Area of Concern
CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CESWF - U.S. Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District
EPA - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FUDS - Formerly Used Defense Sites
HRS - Hazard Ranking System
MC - munitions constituents
MEC - munitions and explosives of concern
MRSPP - Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol
NCP - National Contingency Plan
NDAI - No Department of Defense Action Indicated
PCL - Protective Concentration Levels
PQL - Practical Quantitation Limit
RI/FS - Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study
SI - Site Inspection
TBD - To be determined
TPP - Technical Project Planning

DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE WORKSHEET

SITE: **Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range**

PROJECT: **MMRP Site Inspection / FUDS No. A06LA030901**

DQO STATEMENT NUMBER: **1 of 4**

| DQO Element Number[a] | DQO Element Description[a] | Site-Specific DQO Statement |
|---|---|---|
| **Intended Data Use(s):** | | |
| 1 | Project Objective(s) Satisfied | Evaluate presence/lack thereof of MEC |
| **Intended Need Requirements:** | | |
| 2 | Data User Perspective(s) | Risk, Remedy |
| 3 | Contaminant or Characteristic of Interest | MEC, Munitions Debris |
| 4 | Media of Interest | N/A |
| 5 | Required Sampling Locations or Areas and Depths | N/A |
| 6 | Number of Samples Required | N/A |
| 7 | Reference Concentration of Interest or Other Performance Criteria | Indications of targets or impact areas. Visual confirmation of MEC. |
| **Appropriate Sampling and Analysis Methods:** | | |
| 8 | Sampling Method | Qualitative Reconnaissance |
| 9 | Analytical Method | N/A |

[a] Refer to EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 4.2.1

DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE WORKSHEET

SITE: **Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range**

PROJECT: **MMRP Site Inspection / FUDS No. A06LA030901**

DQO STATEMENT NUMBER: **2 of 4**

| **DQO Element Number**[a] | **DQO Element Description**[a] | **Site-Specific DQO Statement** |
|---|---|---|
| **Intended Data Use(s):** | | |
| 1 | Project Objective(s) Satisfied | Evaluate presence/lack thereof of MC |
| **Intended Need Requirements:** | | |
| 2 | Data User Perspective(s) | Risk, Remedy |
| 3 | Contaminant or Characteristic of Interest | Aluminum, antimony, chromium, copper, lead, zinc, perchlorate, and explosives |
| 4 | Media of Interest | Surface soil and groundwater (source determined during TPP process) |
| 5 | Required Sampling Locations or Areas and Depths | As shown on Figures 3.1 and 3.2, and agreed on during TPP meeting |
| 6 | Number of Samples Required | 8 surface soil samples and 3 groundwater samples |
| 7 | Reference Concentration of Interest or Other Performance Criteria | LDEQ RECAP soil to groundwater criteria for non-ambient samples; lower of USGS background or ambient results for background |
| **Appropriate Sampling and Analysis Methods:** | | |
| 8 | Sampling Method | Composite samples in accordance with the PSAP and PSAP Addendum |
| 9 | Analytical Method | Metals (SW6010B), perchlorate (SW6850), and explosives (SW8330B) |

[a] Refer to EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 4.2.1

DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE WORKSHEET

SITE: **Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range**

PROJECT: **MMRP Site Inspection / FUDS No. A06LA030901**

DQO STATEMENT NUMBER: **3 of 4**

| DQO Element Number[a] | DQO Element Description[a] | Site-Specific DQO Statement |
|---|---|---|
| **Intended Data Use(s):** | | |
| 1 | Project Objective(s) Satisfied | Completion of MRSPP Scoring sheets |
| **Intended Need Requirements:** | | |
| 2 | Data User Perspective(s) | Risk and Remedy |
| 3 | Contaminant or Characteristic of Interest | Explosives, chemical, and health hazards, if any, associated with field team observations |
| 4 | Media of Interest | Surface soil and groundwater |
| 5 | Required Sampling Locations or Areas and Depths | N/A |
| 6 | Number of Samples Required | N/A |
| 7 | Reference Concentration of Interest or Other Performance Criteria | Completion of Explosive Hazard Evaluation (EHE) Tables 1-10, Chemical Warfare Materiel Hazard Evaluation (CHE) Tables 11-20, and Health Hazard Evaluation (HHE) Tables 21-25 |
| **Appropriate Sampling and Analysis Methods:** | | |
| 8 | Sampling Method | N/A |
| 9 | Analytical Method | N/A |

[a] Refer to EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 4.2.1

DATA QUALITY OBJECTIVE WORKSHEET

SITE: **Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range**

PROJECT: **MMRP Site Inspection / FUDS No. A06LA030901**

DQO STATEMENT NUMBER: **4 of 4**

| DQO Element Number[a] | DQO Element Description[a] | Site-Specific DQO Statement |
|---|---|---|
| **Intended Data Use(s):** | | |
| 1 | Project Objective(s) Satisfied | Collection of USEPA HRS MC-related information |
| **Intended Need Requirements:** | | |
| 2 | Data User Perspective(s) | Risk, Compliance, and Remedy |
| 3 | Contaminant or Characteristic of Interest | Aluminum, antimony, chromium, copper, lead, zinc, perchlorate, and explosives associated with the range and the observations of the field team |
| 4 | Media of Interest | Surface soil and groundwater |
| 5 | Required Sampling Locations or Areas and Depths | N/A |
| 6 | Number of Samples Required | N/A |
| 7 | Reference Concentration of Interest or Other Performance Criteria | Results of the MC analytical testing for USEPA to complete the MC-related HRS scoring |
| **Appropriate Sampling and Analysis Methods:** | | |
| 8 | Sampling Method | N/A |
| 9 | Analytical Method | N/A |

[a] Refer to EM 200-1-2, Paragraph 4.2.1

# Technical Project Planning Memo:

**Subject:** Munitions Military Response Program (MMRP)
Documentation of Second Technical Project Planning Meeting

**Sites:** Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana

**Contract:** Contract Number W912DY-04-D-0005, Delivery Order 0009

This document is intended to record the events that occurred during the second Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting for the ***Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range*** formerly used defense site (FUDS). The meeting was held at the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality offices, Baton Rouge, Louisiana on Thursday, January 22, 2009. The meeting was attended by LDEQ, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Fort Worth District (CESWF), the Tangipahoa Sheriff's Department, a property owner/owner representative, and Parsons. All attendees attended in person. No attendees participated by telephone.

During the meeting, the results of the Site Inspection (SI) Report were summarized. Mr. Schneider and Ms. Connelly voiced their concern with the recommendations, stating that the report may negatively affect the value of the land. In addition, Mr. Schneider and Ms. Connelly were concerned that it may take several years or more for USACE to clean up the property, if that is deemed to be necessary during the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). Mr. Mike Miller (LDEQ) asked Mr. Schneider and Ms. Connelly to submit formal concerns to him and he urged Ms. Patience Nwanna (CESWF) to find an avenue to put USACE lawyers in touch with Mr. Schneider and Ms. Connelly to work towards a resolution on prioritizing future investigations/cleanup activities for their property.

LDEQ and USACE concurred with the recommendations for a RI/FS to be conducted at the Bomb Target No. 1, the Multiple Use Target, and Bomb Target No. 2 Munitions Response Sites (MRS), a recommendation of No Department of Defense Action Indicated (NDAI) for the Rifle Range and Gunnery Range MRSs, and a recommendation for further investigation of the area of interest (AOI) referred to as the "area of potential cratering," as presented in the Draft Final SI Report. No written comments had been received on the Draft Final SI Report at the time of the second TPP Meeting.

During the meeting, Mr. Schneider explained that his grandfather purchased the land in the late 1940's/early 1950's and the land is on its third round of deforestation since that

time. When Mr. Schneider's grandfather purchased the land, it was deforested from its prior military use. Mr. Schneider explained that he believed tree stump blasting (in the interest of turpentine harvesting) had occurred in the "area of potential cratering," which may have contributed explosives contamination to the area and may be responsible for the nitroglycerin detection in the sample collected from this area during the SI. This activity occurred, in Mr. Schneider's estimation, approximately 12-15 years prior to our investigation and left 10-foot diameter craters in the area. In addition, Mr. Schneider and Ms. Connelly stressed that the ownership of the land should be listed as the Reimers Company in the SI document.

Deputy Sheriff Davidson stated that he knows a couple of planes crashed in the Gunnery Range and Rifle Range MRSs, but does not know the exact location. Mr. Davidson was present during the Inventory Project Report (INPR) site visit and accompanied USACE personnel during the visit. Anecdotal reports claim that use of 100-lb. bombs was conducted for a short time at the site, but was discontinued based on complaints from local residents. According to Mr. Davidson, these types of bombs left 40-foot diameter craters on the property. Mr. Davidson reiterated that the site was used by Harding Field, which is consistent with the Archives Search Report (ASR) and reflected in the SI Report Chapter 2.

The Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSPP) score sheets were also reviewed for each MRS, and the TPP Team generally concurred with the MRSPP scores assigned for each of the four MRSs.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Ms. Patience Nwanna**<br>**CESWF** | **Mr. Mike Miller**<br>**LDEQ** |
| **Mr. Carl Schneider**<br>**Landowner** | **Ms. Jeanine Connelly**<br>**Landowner Representative** |
| **Mr. Tom Davidson**<br>**Tangipahoa Sheriff's Department** | **Mr. Steve Rembish**<br>**Parsons** |
| **Mr. Eric North**<br>**Parsons** | |

**Hammond Daily Star**

P.O. Box 1149, Hammond, Louisiana 70404
Phone: Area Code (985) 254-7827

STATE OF LOUISIANA
Parish of Tangipahoa

I, Kathy Dufour, the Accounting Clerk of the Hammond Daily Star, a daily newspaper of circulation in Hammond and Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana, do certify that the following insert/advertisement appeared in the said Hammond Daily Star in its regular edition on:

February 13, 2009
February 15, 2009
Date

Legal Number

Kathy Dufour
Kathy Dufour
Accounting Clerk

Sworn to and subscribed before me

this FEB 17 2009

day of

A.D.

Robert W. Tillery
Notary Public

Robert W. Tillery, Notary Public
Bar Roll No. 12790

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

**Request for information about the former Hammond Bombing and Gunnery Range (BGR)**

Recently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed a Site Inspection at the former Hammond BGR. This site was used as a bombing and gunnery range from August 1942 through September 1945.

The former Hammond BGR is one of many former military installations throughout the United States that will be reviewed under the Department of Defense's Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol. This protocol is used to assess sites that may have unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions or munitions constituents, and to assign priorities for any additional investigation or munitions removal that may be required.

The evaluation criteria, including types of munitions that may be present, ease of access to the site and number of people living near the site, are available for public review in the Site Inspection Report located at the Hammond Branch Library, 314 East Thomas Street, Hammond, Louisiana 70401.

For more information or if you have additional information about past activities related to the former Hammond BGR, please contact Patience Nwanna, project manager by email at Patience.N.Nwanna@usace.army.mil, via phone at (817) 886-1470 or by mail at USACE, Fort Worth District, ATTN: CESWF-PER-DI, 819 Taylor Street, Room 3A28 Fort Worth, Texas 76102-0300.