

**Impact Area Review Team
1803 West Outer Road
Camp Edwards, MA
September 25, 2007
6:00 – 7:30 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

<u>Members:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	<u>Attendees:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>
Hap Gonser	IAGWSP	John McDonagh	IAGWSP
Ben Gregson	IAGWSP	Pam Richardson	IAGWSP
Mike Minior	AFCEE/MMR	Lori Boghdan	IAGWSP
Lynne Jennings	US EPA	Kris Curley	IAGWSP
Len Pinaud	MassDEP	Paul Nixon	IAGWSP
Ellie Grillo	MassDEP	Dave Hill	IAGWSP
Dick Conron	IART/Bourne	COL Bill FitzPatrick	E&RC
		Mark Begley	EMC
<u>Facilitator:</u>	<u>Organization:</u>	Jane Dolan	US EPA
Pamela Harting-Barrat	US EPA	Mark DeSouza	US EPA
		Shouvik Gangopadhyay	ECC
		Amanda Lehmert	Cape Cod Times
		Jane Shea Moran	Innovar Environmental

Agenda Item #1. Welcome, Agenda Review, Approval of 8/28/07 IART Meeting Minutes

Ms. Harting-Barrat convened the meeting at 6:03 p.m., asked the Impact Area Review Team (IART) members to introduce themselves, and reviewed the agenda. Ms. Harting-Barrat also asked if there were any changes to the August 28, 2007 IART meeting minutes. No changes were offered and the minutes were approved as written.

Agenda Item #2. Late-Breaking News, Responses to Action Items

Mr. Harting-Barrat confirmed that there was no late-breaking news to report at this time.

Mr. Conron noted that his comments on the Small Arms Range (SAR) “audit/monitoring” chart (which was generated in response to his request at the August 28, 2007 IART meeting) had been distributed to the group through Jim Murphy. Ms. Jennings said that she would review the chart later in the meeting, after the SAR Update.

Agenda Item #3. Remediation & Investigation Update

Demolition Area 1 Injection Well Installation

Mr. Gregson stated that installation of the replacement injection well for the Demolition Area 1 (Demo 1) comprehensive treatment system should be completed soon, after which the Frank Perkins Road portion of the system will be pumping 800 gallons per minute (gpm) or 1.3 million gallons per day. He also noted that the Pew Road portion of the system is continuing to pump at 100 gpm, and that the predicted cleanup time for the Demo 1 plume is about 11 years.

J-1 South Groundwater Rapid Response Action Construction

Mr. Gregson reported that the J-1 South Groundwater Rapid Response Action (RRA) system, which involves the use of a mobile treatment unit that’s no longer needed at Demo 1, is nearly completed, with initial system startup scheduled to occur next week. He also showed some photographs of the J-1 South RRA system construction work.

J-2 Range Update

Mr. Gregson displayed a figure that showed the conceptual layout of the proposed J-2 Range alternative, Alternative 6 Try 6. He also showed a chart containing details on the evaluated alternatives for J-2 North and J-2 East, and noted that it includes cost information. He then said that under Alternative 6 Try 6, the RRA system that's been running at J-2 North will continue to run at its current rate, with plume cleanup expected to be achieved by 2027. The J-2 East component will involve three extraction wells with an overall pumping rate of 425 gpm and plume cleanup (to 2 parts per billion [ppb] for RDX, the health advisory; and to 2 ppb for perchlorate, the Massachusetts maximum contaminant level [MCL]) is expected to be achieved by 2022. Mr. Gregson noted that RDX is the driver for the cleanup year, and added that when considering 0.06 ppb as the RDX cleanup goal, which represents a one-in-a-million cancer risk, the cleanup year is 2049. He also explained that some of the RDX is bound up in low-permeability layers, which will take a long time to clean up; however, the usable portion of the aquifer would be cleaned up by 2024. He further noted that perchlorate is the driver for the J-2 North cleanup year of 2027.

Mr. Gregson then showed an animation for the J-2 Range perchlorate plumes, as well as an animation for the J-2 Range RDX plumes, pointing out the small area where the RDX is bound up in low-permeability layers. He also reported that the Impact Area Groundwater Study Program (IAGWSP) has completed the contracting work for this project and the system is expected to be in place within the next year. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Gangopadhyay, to discuss the geophysical survey work at the J-2 Range.

Mr. Gangopadhyay reminded the group of the geophysical survey work performed at the Southeast Ranges in 2000/2001 and the several phases of investigation that were conducted in follow-up, including some RRA excavations at portions of the J-2 Range. He then said that in 2006/2007 some quality-control (QC) geophysical surveys were conducted at 45 grids at the J-2 Range. In addition, two other areas that were not previously surveyed were selected based on a data gap assessment that looked at areas of potential sources to groundwater. Mr. Gangopadhyay stated that pre- and post-clearance data were assessed in order to gauge the completeness of earlier clearance work, and select targets were investigated.

Mr. Gangopadhyay then showed three figures depicting the J-2 Range areas (Area 1, Area 2, and Area 3) where QC geophysical surveys and new geophysical surveys were conducted, and pointed out the targets identified for further investigation. He explained that the targets were selected based on the comparison of pre- and post-clearance data and on areas where many unexploded ordnance (UXO) items had been found. The selection of targets in areas that were not previously surveyed was based on whether they met the criteria for potential sources to groundwater. Mr. Gangopadhyay further noted that although many of the remaining signals had not met the criteria, for the sake of "due diligence" it was decided that quite a number of those would be investigated as well in order to ensure that they didn't contain any potential sources.

Mr. Gangopadhyay then showed a two-panel figure (2000 survey and 2006/2007 survey) depicting Grids N15, O15, P15, and P16, where pre-QC survey activity included RRA excavations and a polygon investigation. He also reviewed the text accompanying the figure: the pre- and post-survey assessment showed significant reduction in anomaly response in investigated areas, with current signals indicative of limited residual anomalies outside investigated areas and well construction materials; previous finds were mostly debris, along with one 30-mm projectile, one 60-mm projectile, and one 3.5-inch rocket; and based on previous finds and the low level of existing signals, no additional investigations were conducted (as this grid area had been effectively cleared).

Mr. Gangopadhyay showed a figure depicting Grids N19, N20, and O19, where pre-QC survey activity included polygon investigations (at N19 and N20), a Priority 1 Grid Investigation (at O19), and a Discrimination Analysis Target Investigation (at N19). He also reviewed the text accompanying the figure: the pre- and post-survey assessment showed an overall reduction in anomaly response in most areas previously investigated, with current signals likely indicative of residual metallic debris consistent with that portion of the range being adjacent to a small impact area; previous finds were large quantities of debris, sixty 30-mm projectiles – the majority of which were found in a burial pit at N20, and a small number of various projectiles, mortars, and 3.5-inch rockets; and current investigation results showed scattered sub-surface debris from within previously investigated areas (Polygon 16) and previously uninvestigated areas.

As a final example of the geophysical survey work done at the J-2 Range, Mr. Gangopadhyay showed a figure depicting Grids P20 and P21, where pre-QC survey activity included a polygon investigation. He also reviewed the text accompanying the figure: the pre- and post-survey assessment showed a significant reduction in anomaly responses in cleared areas, with isolated anomalies observed outside of the cleared area; previous finds included large quantities of debris, eighteen 37-mm projectiles, a handful of 57-mm and 105-mm projectiles, 60-mm and 81-mm mortars, and 3.5-inch rockets – mostly in burials pits at both grids; and current investigation results showed scattered sub-surface debris and a single point detonating fuze (at P20), and scattered sub-surface debris, timber, and spikes (at P21).

Mr. Gangopadhyay then reviewed the 2006/2007 investigation summary slide: 71 targets in 32 grids were investigated; just debris was found at 57 of the locations; a burial pit was found at Grid L19, which contained one-hundred-and-three 30-mm projectiles; a burial pit was found at Grid I12, which contained twenty-one 30-mm projectiles and 63 rocket fuzes; 71 fuzes were found at a single location in Grid J16; and twenty-one 20-mm projectiles were found at a single location in Grid N36. Mr. Gangopadhyay also noted that findings from the investigation will be compiled with previous data and presented in the J-2 Soil Remedial Investigation Report that's due to be issued in spring 2008.

AEC Tungsten Workplan Phase II

Mr. Gregson reviewed a slide pertaining to the goals of Phase II of the U.S. Army Environmental Command (AEC) tungsten study workplan, which noted: drive-points and monitoring wells were installed to assess the nature and extent of tungsten contamination; lysimeter clusters were installed at B Range to assess the transport of tungsten in the unsaturated zone; drip tests/column studies are being conducted to determine dissolution rates; batch & column adsorption/desorption laboratory studies are being conducted to quantify the tungsten interaction with surface and subsurface soils; unsaturated zone modeling is being conducted to help predict the tungsten transport rate; groundwater modeling is being conducted to determine the tungsten transport rate and predicted extent; and a geochemical determination of the species of tungsten is being done. Mr. Gregson also reminded the group that groundwater sampling showed very little tungsten in groundwater, only some low levels near the detection limit. He also said that the tungsten study is expected to take about 1.5 to 2 years to complete.

Mr. Pinaud asked Mr. Gregson to point out the lysimeters on the study area map, which he did. Mr. Pinaud then asked if there are other lysimeters in the area. Mr. Nixon noted that there are lysimeters at B Range, C Range, Former D Range, and Tango Range. Mr. Gregson added that the lysimeters at Former D Range are focused on lead rather than tungsten, and Mr. Gonser noted that not all of the lysimeters mentioned are part of the AEC study.

Agenda Item #4. Small Arms Ranges Update

COL FitzPatrick showed a photo of the STAPP bullet-catcher system at Tango Range and noted that there are 43 seams across the face of the structure, each seam about 23 feet long. He also showed a close-up photo of expected wear on the system membrane, pointing out the little dashes where bullets have entered the membrane and the small gouges where bullets entered the membrane at a sideways angle after having tumbled from first striking the target frame. COL FitzPatrick then reported that the glue issue pertaining to the seams has essentially been resolved, and since August 4, 2007 only 3% of the entire seam length has required repair. He also said that the Massachusetts Army National Guard (the Guard) is making note of the date on repaired seams and continues to test and track different glue types when patching the membrane.

COL FitzPatrick then showed a photo of what's considered acceptable wear of the STAPP membrane at other locations, noting that the STAPP at Tango Range will never be allowed to get to that point before the membrane is replaced. He explained that the Guard is being very conservative in order to ensure elimination of the potential for lead to be released at the range area.

COL FitzPatrick also reviewed next steps for Tango Range: training will occur in October and November; bi-weekly and pre- and post-firing inspections will be conducted, as noted in the Operations & Maintenance (O&M) Plan; maintenance of the system will be conservative; monitoring will include looking at weathering and the glue (with future applications occurring during the coolest part of the day), as well as sampling the lysimeters, soil, and groundwater; and the first Quarterly Report, as required by the Environmental Management Commission (EMC), will be issued in October.

Agenda Item #5. Open Discussion

Ms. Jennings reminded the group that at the last IART meeting, when the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had presented a one-page outline of its monitoring activities at the SARs, Mr. Conron had requested additional information on the roles, responsibilities, and activities of the various parties providing oversight there. In response to Mr. Conron's request, a chart (entitled "SAR Working Group T Range Pilot Program Operational Inspection & Oversight") was developed.

Ms. Jennings noted that the first column of the chart is a listing of the various oversight/monitoring activities that will occur at Tango Range, and the second column, "Execution," identifies the primary entity responsible for executing the activity, which in most cases is the Guard. The next two columns, which are entitled "Oversight/Audit" and "Review/Analysis," both pertain to oversight activities, with the former having to do with active oversight, such as field inspections, sampling, and so forth, and the latter having to do with paperwork type exercises such as reviewing and evaluating the Guard's inspection reports and comparing the information to action levels, the best management plan, and the like.

Ms. Jennings also said that the easiest way to respond to Mr. Conron's comments on the chart will be to provide a written response. She also noted that she found Mr. Conron's specific questions to be the most helpful of his comments – for example, his question about which sampling result would be considered acceptable for split samples tested by both the Guard and EPA – for which an answer can be provided. She further noted, however, that some of Mr. Conron's other comments about duties, relationships, coordination, and the like, will be more difficult to answer, and added that the "Review/Analysis" column of the chart shows that many oversight activities are performed by all three agencies – EPA, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP), and EMC. She also said that all three agencies have oversight authority, although the authorities for each are different, and it's hard for her to

envision a scenario where one of the agencies would disagree with the others about an activity that needs to be changed.

Ms. Jennings further stated that she doesn't know to what extent it would be possible to create a more detailed document than the one that's been provided. She also indicated that she thinks it makes sense to recognize that the Tango Range pilot period is a time of learning and at the end of the pilot period, an assessment will be done of what works, what needs to be changed, what can be improved, and so forth. Therefore, documenting a lot of the procedures now may not be a worthwhile task to undertake. Ms. Jennings also encouraged Mr. Conron to continue to forward his specific questions, which she again noted are helpful. She also mentioned that EMC and MassDEP had provided outlines of their respective oversight activities, similar to the one EPA had distributed at the last IART meeting.

Mr. Conron noted that he and Mr. Begley (director of the EMC) had discussed this matter yesterday. He also said that he believes that some formal procedures are needed because staffing changes occur and he thinks that a member of the public should be able to pick up a document and learn exactly what each of the agency's activities are on Tango Range. He also said that he's disappointed if this can't be done. Mr. Conron further noted that he doesn't understand if that's too much to ask, but also said that he agrees that the pilot period is the time to develop procedures.

Mr. Conron also remarked that he doesn't think generating multiple papers is a good approach. Instead, he'd like to see the information from all the agencies pulled together into one document, which might be appended to the Tango Range O&M plan. He noted that he thinks it's important to formalize such a document, and added that he's never been associated with a military organization that doesn't formalize its documents. Mr. Conron then assured the group that his purpose is not to stop lead bullets from being fired on the range, but to request a document that outlines everybody's responsibilities. He noted that the chart mentions an activity – Satellite Accumulation Area Inspection – and he would like to know MassDEP's role in that, for example. He also said that he is amazed that the document generated to control "this whole process" doesn't have a control number on it. Mr. Conron further indicated that although he's willing to accept "if it can't be done" and is willing to have the agencies work things out during the pilot period, in the long run he wants to see a document that's easily understood by the public so that the public has a level of confidence that the right things are being done at the range. He then said that while he supports everyone's efforts, as a resident of the area he is asking for "another cut at this stuff."

Ms. Grillo said that she appreciates all of Mr. Conron's comments and concerns. She also said that she's not certain that the agencies have made clear all the levels of involvement. She then explained that there are numerous players involved – including community involvement staff and project managers from EPA, MassDEP, the IAGWSP, and the Environmental & Readiness Center (E&RC), whose goal is to resolve a lot of the technical issues – but understanding the need for different levels of chain of command, with whom the project managers communicate. She then spoke about the formation of what's known as the Command Group (senior leadership within the Guard, EPA, MassDEP, EMC, and AEC), which she described as the level for issues not resolved by the project managers, and noted that the group meets for updates and to discuss ways forward, and was put in place to keep the process working.

Mr. Conron said that what he doesn't understand is what activities are going to happen at the SARs and who is in charge of those activities. Ms. Grillo suggested that it would be the Command Group, and then asked if COL FitzPatrick is getting a lot of direction from the Command Group, in addition to the Guard's chain of command. COL FitzPatrick replied that he is, but that's not the easy answer, and added that although there are various management levels

overseeing Tango Range activities, the question is “who’s really got the hammer” if something is done incorrectly.

Mr. Conron said that he’s not looking just at the hammer, and added that with respect to the firing of lead bullets, he’d like to see the responsibilities “cut horizontally” rather than “organizationally.” He then explained that it’s his understanding that the Guard does the firing, is responsible for the physical maintenance of the facility, and has established procedures to maintain and inspect. Then, the EMC is the first line of monitoring of the Guard’s activities, ensuring that the Guard is conforming to the procedures that were defined. Ms. Jennings asserted that the EMC is not necessarily the first line of defense, adding that EPA could be out in the field conducting an inspection on a certain day. Mr. Conron replied that based on his understanding of Chapter 47 of the Acts of 2002, Mr. Begley is “the guy” and the EMC is the organization responsible for ensuring that the Guard is doing what it’s supposed to do. He also said that he really doesn’t know what MassDEP’s responsibility is. Ms. Jennings clarified that all three of the agencies (EMC, MassDEP, and EPA) are equally responsible. Mr. Conron replied that the way he reads the legislation, MassDEP has been written out, and while he sees the federal government as the overseer of the whole process, EPA is not on site every day. Ms. Jennings agreed, but noted that neither is Mr. Begley on site every day. Mr. Conron said that he’s trying to understand – looking at the basic functions of Tango Range (firing, maintenance, protection of the water and soil, and testing) – how the responsibilities are split up. He also said that he finds it hard to understand how it can be said that all three agencies are responsible.

Ms. Grillo noted that as a result of Chapter 47 of the Acts of 2002, which established the base as a water supply reserve, the former Joint Program Office (JPO) was transformed into the E&RC, whose goal is to have training that’s compatible with protecting the environment. She explained that this was an additional protection or acknowledgement by the state to protect the water supply reserve. She also mentioned EPA’s administrative order (AO) and added that MassDEP has been at the table since 1986. Mr. Conron stated that he understands MassDEP’s role in the cleanup. Ms. Grillo replied that she thinks it’s helpful to know this background information in order to understand the roles and responsibilities associated with the SARs. She said that she thinks there’s been an evolution to bring the parties together for both missions (training and environmental protection/cleanup), which is why there are so many “different levels of protection, oversight, and ongoing training” and “it isn’t simple.” Mr. Conron said that he’s just asking for documentation for the public, and he doesn’t think that can be accomplished with fact sheets and the like.

Mr. Gonser said that he thinks that the fact sheets can certainly be pulled together. He also tried to explain the SAR oversight arrangement by comparing it to a crime situation involving the local police force, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation – each of which would be looking at the specific aspect of law enforcement pertaining to that group’s job, but would be working together. He noted that similarly EPA has the job of enforcing the AO, MassDEP has the job of enforcing the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP), and the EMC has the job of enforcing Chapter 47 of the Acts of 2002 – and while these are separate areas, there is overlap in this case – but with each entity having its focus and its authority. Mr. Conron replied that he just wants someone to draw a picture and document it so that it can be presented to and easily understood by the public because “reading all these documents” isn’t working for him.

Ms. Harting-Barrat asked if the IART has a Technical Assistance Grant (TAG), and Ms. Grillo replied that it does not. Ms. Harting-Barrat then asked if Mr. Conron has specific environmental or public health concerns that relate to the documentation he is seeking. Mr. Conron replied that he does not, but just wants “an explanation that links everything together,” which a resident could read in order to understand what the firing of lead will or will not do, how the groundwater and

soil will be protected, and what the agencies' roles are. He also noted that the recent IAGWSP publication on the cleanup program, which he thought was a very clear document, is the type of thing he'd like to see – so that when the use of lead ammunition is expanded to additional ranges, the public will have a level of confidence that the same procedures will be in place, that they will be revised and updated as required, and that “accountability and traceability” will be covered. He also said that he doesn't see how an environmentally-sensitive business can be run without these kinds of controls.

Mr. Conron further stated that he doesn't think he's asking for a great deal of work to be done but needs a “road map” of how the process works – one that shows each organization's role, whether or not it is overlapping. He also said that while perhaps all three organizations monitor the lysimeters, for example, making that a constant in the audit of the ranges, there may be other things that are not constant, and he needs to have all of that laid out and amended to the procedures that were written when use of the STAPP system began.

Mr. Begley remarked that Mr. Gonser's reference to law enforcement was a good example to describe the oversight process at the SARs. He then offered another example, based on his 20 years of emergency response work for the state, where when dealing with an inland spill, for instance, the local fire department, the state, and EPA (depending on the magnitude of the event) would all work together and set up a unified command – with each agency fulfilling its various roles and responsibilities. He also mentioned the Buzzards Bay oil spill as another example, where the state, EPA, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the responsible party worked together with a unified command. Mr. Begley then said that the three agencies are comfortable with each having a role, but not necessarily any one of them being in charge over the other. He also noted that all three have a common goal, which is to ensure that the aquifer is protected.

Ms. Grillo referred to Ms. Harting-Barrat's earlier question about a TAG, and said that the IART does have a Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC) advisor, Kevin Hood, who could perhaps be tasked to work with the community involvement people on this issue. Ms. Harting-Barrat said that she thinks that's a great idea. She also mentioned the idea of researching the administrative record to pinpoint some references.

Mr. Conron stated that his requests for formal documentation are not for him, but for the public, which he thinks deserves an explanation of how everything comes together. He also referred to Mr. Begley's oil spill analogy and said that he is talking about “day-to-day monitoring and auditing,” and while he doesn't anticipate difficulties with the process, he still thinks that the public is owed some kind of explanatory document. He added that “pieces of paper from different organizations don't work” for him.

Ms. Jennings said that she thinks a very good effort has been made to try to present the information (requested by Mr. Conron) in a variety of formats. She mentioned the chart and the individual papers, and also noted that there are fact sheets on the website. She then said that if Mr. Conron really believes that the right document hasn't been created, she'd like to take that back and think about it, and perhaps hear from other members of the public who feel the same way. Ms. Jennings also said that usually comments of this type at other sites indicate distrust that the regulators aren't doing their job, in which case she invites the commenter to “come watch us,” and doing so generally provides a sense of comfort that the process is working. Ms. Jennings said that this issue has been discussed a lot, but at this point she isn't going to commit on behalf of EPA to creating another document, although it would have to be considered if other members of the community said that they want such a document.

Ms. Harting-Barrat asked Mr. Conron if he would be willing to attend some of the technical meetings where he could see the agencies at work. Mr. Conron replied that it would depend on his availability. Ms. Harting-Barrat added that it also may be helpful if other citizens with similar

concerns expressed them to the group. She then asked if Ms. Jennings could let Mr. Conron know when some of the technical meetings are scheduled, and Ms. Jennings agreed to do so.

Ms. Grillo referred to Mr. Conron's email about the public involvement aspects of the Senior Management Board (SMB), the Plume Cleanup Team (PCT), and the IART. She then noted that Mr. Begley is the director of the EMC, which has two advisory councils – the Community Advisory Council (CAC) and the Scientific Advisory Council (SAC), all of which have been organized since 2002, and which are also reviewing SAR documents. Ms. Grillo added that she thinks Mr. Conron's official comment about team membership is timely, and assured him that the public involvement members of the respective agencies will be giving it a great deal of thought.

Ms. Harting-Barrat reiterated her recommendation to contact the IART's TOSC advisor. Mr. Conron informed her that unfortunately that contract was not renewed, with Mr. Hood having attended his last IART meeting in August. Ms. Harting-Barrat said that she would ask Mr. Murphy to look into that, as he is one who deals with the TOSC program.

Mr. Conron also noted that he is favor of having a citizen team summit to discuss reorganizing or possibly combining the teams. Ms. Jennings said that discussions about this idea have been taking place for quite a while, and there seems to be agreement that a team summit is the right next step. She said that the plan is to ask one of the organizations – perhaps the IAGWSP, or the Installation Restoration Program (IRP) with Patrick Field as the facilitator – to take the lead in organizing a summit – and if everyone agrees to combine the teams, determine the process for doing that. Ms. Jennings also said that currently the various teams are reintroducing the merger idea at each of the meetings, and she suggested having a more robust discussion on the topic at one of the upcoming IART meetings in order to get a general idea of whether the team members are in favor of merging teams and whether they agree on basics steps for a way forward. She then said that key points for this conversation could be discussed at the next IART planning meeting. Ms. Harting-Barrat noted that it would make sense for Mr. Murphy to take the lead in planning that discussion and the associated team summit.

Agenda Item #6. Adjourn

Ms. Harting-Barrat noted that the date for the next IART meeting is Tuesday, October 23, 2007 at 1803 West Outer Road, Camp Edwards – although there has been discussion about the possibility of cancellation. She then adjourned the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

.....

Action Items:

1. EPA (Jim Murphy) will check on the status of the TOSC advisor for the IART.
2. EPA (Jim Murphy) will take the lead in planning an IART discussion on the IART/PCT merger concept and associated MMR citizen-team summit.

Future Agenda Topics:

- Remediation & Investigation Update
- J and K Small Arms Range Investigation Scope

Handouts Distributed at the Meeting:

1. Responses to Action Items from the August 28, 2007 IART Meeting
2. Presentation handout: Remediation & Investigation Update
3. Presentation handout: Small Arms Range Working Group Tango Range Update
4. Chart: Small Arms Range Work Group T Range Pilot Program Operational Inspection & Oversight

-
5. Information paper: Environmental Management Commission Small Arms Range Oversight
 6. Information paper: MassDEP Small Arms Range Oversight
 7. Fact sheet: Camp Edwards; The Process to Reinstate Small Arms Training with Lead Ammunition, Winter 2007
 8. UXO Discoveries/Dispositions Since Last IART (Ending 9/21/07) All Awaiting CDC
 9. News Releases, Neighborhood Notices, and Media Coverage 8/25/07 – 9/23/07