

Camp Navajo
Stakeholder Advisory Group

Thursday, February 11, 2010
Camp Navajo Security Building 8
Bellemont, AZ

Minutes

Members in attendance:

Nicole Coronado, ADEQ
Lee Luedeker, AGFD
LTC Mary Williams-Lynch, Camp Navajo
Randy Wilkinson, NGB
Matt Ryan, Community member
Shaula Hedwall, USFWS
Shannon Clark, Coconino National Forest
Tom Burkhardt, City of Flagstaff

Interested Parties:

Gavin Fielding, ADEMA
Janet Lynn, ADEMA
Wayne Miller, ADEQ
Diana Deming, ADEQ

Guests:

Dana Downs-Heimes, CH2M HILL
Sarah Reif, AGFD
Jeanne Trupiano, Coconino County

Members absent:

Tom Britt, Community member
Karen Underhill, Community member

The following acronyms may be used throughout this document

ACUB	Army Compatibility Use Buffer
ADEMA	Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs
ADEQ	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
AGFD	Arizona Game & Fish Department
API	Arizona Preserve Initiative
AZARNG	Arizona Army National Guard
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, & Liability Act
COPC	Contaminants of Potential Concern
DD	Decision Document
DoD	Department of Defense
EDMS	Electronic Data Management System
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
HERA	Human Health & Ecological Risk Assessment
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
IAP	Installation Action Plan
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
LTC	Lieutenant Colonel
LTM	Long Term Management
MAMMS	Multiple Award Military Munitions Services
MAP	Management Action Plan
MC	Munitions Constituents
MD	Munitions Debris
MEC	Munitions and Explosives of Concern
MPPEH	Munitions Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard
MRWA	Munitions Response Work Areas
MWP	Master Work Plan
NAAD	Navajo Army Depot
NAU	Northern Arizona University
NGB	National Guard Bureau

OB/OD	Open Burn/Open Detonation
PCP	Post Closure Plan
ppb	Parts Per Billion
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RC	Response Complete
RIP	Remedy in Place
ROD	Record of Decision
SAG	Stakeholder Advisory Group
SRL	Soil Remediation Level
TPP	Technical Project Planning
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
UXOQCS	Unexploded Ordnance Quality Control Specialist

1. **Welcome, Announcements and Action Items from October 2009 SAG Meeting**

Lee Luedeker welcomed everyone to the meeting. Lee indicated that there are no action items from the October 2009 meeting to discuss. However, Lee reported that Tom Britt would like to discontinue participation as a community member with the SAG.

This meeting summary and the PowerPoint presentations made at this SAG meeting are posted on the two project websites:

- <http://www.CampNavajoEnvironmental.org>
- <http://www.azdeq.gov/envIRON/waste/sps/state.html>

LTC Mary Williams-Lynch, the new Camp Navajo commander and a new SAG member, introduced herself.

Lee also introduced Janet Lynn (CN Natural Resources), Sarah Reif (AGFD), and Jeanne Trupiano who will make a presentation at this meeting regarding the interface between ACUB and API efforts and the status to secure the Rogers Lake parcels. Randy asked Janet to replace Zach Reichold as an interested party, to which she agreed. Randy will send out an updated contact list.

2. **Camp Navajo OB/OD Area Field Projects Update**

Dana Downs-Heimes, CH2M HILL, discussed the status of the MD management project, the soil stockpile management project, and the MRWA 02 vadose zone monitoring program.

MD Management Project. The MD Management project consists of the collection, segregation, inspection, certification and recycling of Munitions Debris, which has been consolidated throughout the OB/OD Area work sites. This includes grid cells that have been investigated or cleared, open detonation pits/primary source areas that were investigated and cleared, removal action areas, geophysical prove-out areas, and consolidated QC seed and miscellaneous areas.

The interim work plan was approved in early October 2009. Additional minor changes were made and the work plan was approved by ADEQ on January 15, 2010. Field activities were conducted Nov 2 – Dec 22, 2009 and were suspended prior to completion due to deep snow accumulation. To date, MD has been recovered from:

- 1,174/1,279 grid cells (~134,000 lbs)
- 8/24 ODP/PSAs (~15,340 lbs)
- NAAD 07 Removal Action Area (~3,150 lbs)
- NAAD 09C Removal Action Area (~442,170 lbs)
- QC Seed Consolidation Area (~500 lbs)
- 3/10 Misc Consolidation Areas (~1,000 lbs)

Following collection, all MD was transferred to a central inspection and segregation area. Every piece of MD was inspected and certified by subcontractor UXOQCS, and then re-inspected and verified by the CH2M HILL UXOQCS. The MD was then segregated into MD fragments, MD that retains shape, and range-related debris (RRD). All segregated, inspected, certified and verified MD was placed in secured and sealed bins.

As of 12/22/09, 59 tons of MD fragments plus shaped MD were shipped to California Metal X for shredding and smelting. Shredding operations were completed January 11-15, 2010. Smelting operations for approximately half of the MD were completed on January 15, 2010. Also, 212 tons of RRD were shipped to Page Steel for direct recycle. The MD Management operations will resume Spring 2010.

Soil Stockpile Management Project. The Soil Stockpile Management project consists of the on-site management of soil stockpiled at NAAD 09C and NAAD 02 and includes screening of soils to remove MEC/MPPEH and MD 20 mm and larger size, the collection of soil samples to confirm chemical constituents are below Arizona NR-SRLS, and backfilling of OD pits known to retain rainwater and snowmelt. This work is being conducted with Brown and Caldwell and is a continuation of work that began in May 2009. The final soil stockpile management work plan was approved by ADEQ July 27, 2009. This work returns OD pit areas back to original grade and reduces number of pits with standing water. At NAAD 09C, approximately 10,000 cubic yards of soil was generated from the 2005 removal action and at NAAD 02, approximately 2,300 cubic yards of soil was generated from the 2007 removal action and transferred to NAAD 09C for processing.

Q: How many OD pits have been backfilled (Ms. Hedwall)?

A: About 18 pits so far (Mr. Wilkinson).

Q: How many of the prioritized OD pits have been backfilled (Ms. Hedwall)?

A: Eighteen of the 30 listed pits have been backfilled, and the remaining soil may backfill another 6 or so. We ended up with less soil and bigger pits than initially anticipated (Mr. Wilkinson).

The soil stockpile management field activities will be completed in 3 intervals. The first interval, completed May - July 2009, was suspended due to exhaustion of contract funds. The second interval, completed Nov - Dec 2009, was suspended due to deep snow accumulations. The third interval is scheduled to begin during spring of 2010 following snowmelt.

All soil sieving operations were completed on Nov 17, 2009. Laboratory analyses indicated soil chemical constituents in all sieved soil batches were below AZ NR-SRLS. 18 ODPs were backfilled to date, with another 2 in progress. Additional ODPs have been identified for backfill. Upon completion of all ODP backfill operations, the sites will be restored and seeded with native grass seed. Analytical results from samples taken from the soils beneath the NAAD 02/09B stockpile will be incorporated into the final NAAD 02 risk assessment. The risk assessment results will be used to support the NAAD 02 chemical constituent Decision Document. Also, an After Action Report will be prepared upon completion of the field work.

MRWA 02 Vadose Zone Monitoring Project. Project consists of monitoring and sampling of 20 shallow wells to assess the potential for migration of munitions constituents in the vadose zone from infiltrating precipitation. The project included the installation of dedicated water level

monitoring equipment in all wells. Eleven of the 20 wells accumulated sufficient water for sampling. Sampling/monitoring events completed Feb, March, April, May, June, July and August 2009.

Samples were collected from 11 wells for Primary COPCs which included perchlorate and explosives. Also, samples were collected from 9 wells for Secondary COPCs which included nitrate, semi-volatile organic compounds, and metals.

The spring 2009 monitoring data showed good correlation between snowmelt and migration of saturated conditions through the vadose zone. All wells were dry after August 2009 due to low monsoon precipitation.

All sample analytical results have been summarized in a Draft 2009 Annual Report, in preparation. The sampling team will return to 3 wells during the 2010 snowmelt to resample for perchlorate due to laboratory error.

The 2010 Vadose Zone Monitoring activities include the installation of telemetry for automated water level monitoring in selected wells, replacement of the rain gauge that was damaged by lightning, and the implementation of an updated sampling plan that includes additional sample analytes.

3. **OB/OD Area Program Update**

Randy Wilkinson, NGB, provided an OB/OD Area Program update.

Closure Strategy. The characterization and studies are separated into two parts: 1) chemical contamination issues, and 2) munitions and explosives issues. In addition, closure is focused on RCRA sites that were operated under interim status. The plan for RCRA post closure activities is in development.

NAAD Site Closure Status: Since the last SAG meeting, the Decision Document for Open Burn sites NAAD 05, NAAD 06, NAAD 08B and NAAD 09B was finalized. The NAAD 02 Decision Document is getting underway, and will be supported by the NAAD 02 risk assessment. The NAAD 20 DD is in preparation.

The soil stockpile management project for NAAD 09C and NAAD 02 resumed field operations in early November, but was suspended in late December due to heavy snow accumulation.

The following table summarizes the status of NAAD sites as of February 11, 2010. Items in red are changes since the October 2009 SAG meeting.

Site	Type	Contractor	Fieldwork	RI/RSE	HHRA	ERA	DD
01	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
02	RCRA	B&C	Ongoing	Final	Future	Future	Future
03	CERCLA	B&C	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
04	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
05	RCRA	AMEC	Complete	Final	Final	Final	<i>Final</i>
06	RCRA	AMEC	Complete	Final	Final	Final	<i>Final</i>
07	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	Final	Final	Final

Site	Type	Contractor	Fieldwork	RI/RSE	HHRA	ERA	DD
08A	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
08B	RCRA	AMEC	Complete	Final	Final	Final	<i>Final</i>
09A	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
09C	RCRA	B&C	Ongoing	Final	___	___	Final
09D	RCRA	AMEC	Complete	Final	___	Final	<i>Final</i>
10	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	Final	Final
13	RCRA	B&C	Complete	Final	Final	___	Final
20	CERCLA	B&C	Complete	Final	Final	___	Future
E76	CERCLA	MKM	Complete	Final	___	___	Final

MRWA Site Closure Status: The surface MEC removal project was completed in July 2009 and the after action report for this project is pending the arrival of funding. Field operations for the MD management project at MRWA 01, MRWA 02 and MRWA 20 began in early November but were suspended in late December due to deep snow accumulations. Warning signs were installed around MRWA 02-03 that read the same as those installed around the ICM Waiver Area. As part of the site closeout activities, these signs will be replaced with signs that warn authorized users of the potential for subsurface MEC hazards, but allow authorized surface uses.

The Decision Document and Proposed Plan for MRWA 01 and MRWA 20 were finalized in December 2009. Also, the Draft MRWA 02 MEC EE/CA will be distributed for agency review early next week.

The following table summarizes the status of MRWA sites as of February 11, 2010. Items in red are changes since the October 2009 SAG meeting.

MRWA	Type	Investigation	Removal	RI	EE/CA	PP	DD
01	CERCLA	Complete	Complete	Final	Final	<i>Final</i>	<i>Final</i>
02	RCRA	Complete	Complete	Final	<i>Draft</i>	---	Future
20	CERCLA	Complete	---	Final	Final	<i>Final</i>	<i>Final</i>

The following Decision Documents have been completed:

- NAAD 09C DD and ESD (B&C site)
- 7 OB/OD Area CERCLA Sites (MKM sites)
- NAAD 03 (B&C site)
- NAAD 13 (B&C site)
- 4 OB Sites (AMEC sites)
- MRWA 01 and 20 (CH2M HILL)

The following Decision Documents are undergoing NGB review:

- 5 IRP LTM Sites (B&C) – Client Draft @ NGB
- 28 IRP Buyout Sites (B&C) – Client Draft @ NGB
- 18 IRP Non-Buyout Sites (B&C) – Client Draft to NGB in March

The following Decision Documents are to be prepared:

- 7 IRP Ineligible Sites (B&C/CH2M HILL)
- NAAD 02 (B&C/CH2M HILL)
- MRWA 02 (CH2M HILL)

No Decision Documents are currently undergoing ADEQ review.

Program Schedule

- Winter 2009-2010 completed projects
 - Field work suspended
 - Completed ~80% of soil management project field work
 - Completed ~80% of MD management project field work
 - Finalized reports
 - Four RCRA OB sites DD
 - MRWAs 01 & 20 PP& DD
- Winter 2009-2010 ongoing projects
 - Prepare reports
 - MRWA 02 EE/CA report
 - Year 1 vadose zone monitoring report
 - Year 2 vadose zone sampling plan addendum
 - MRWA 02 surface MEC removal after action report
 - NAAD 02 risk assessment
 - Final Explosives Safety Submission
- Spring 2010
 - Resume field work
 - Soil management project
 - MD management project
 - Final open detonation event
 - Vadose zone monitoring
 - Prepare reports
 - MRWA 02 DD
 - NAAD 02 DD
- Summer 2010
 - Prepare reports
 - Soil management project after action report
 - MD management project after action report
 - RCRA post closure permit application
- Fall 2010
 - CERCLA long term management
 - New contract for IRP LTM (ER, A funds)
 - NAADs 11B, 40, and 43
 - MRWA 01
 - RCRA post closure care
 - New contract for RCRA post closure care (O&M funds)
 - MRWA 02

Q: What will become of the vadose zone monitoring well program (Mr. Ryan)?

A: The vadose zone monitoring well program is part of what will be a long term groundwater monitoring program at Camp Navajo. The program will continue to monitor the vadose zone wells. In addition, the program will include monitoring of local regional aquifer water production

wells. The 2009 monitoring data will be considered baseline information, and will be used to evaluate long term trends in the data (Mr. Wilkinson).

Under RCRA Post Closure, the site must have some form of long term monitoring. It is known that munitions will be left on site. The estimated rates of corrosion of munitions casings have been calculated, and thus, the estimated time intervals until potential releases of munitions constituents may occur. A long term monitoring program will serve to detect potential releases (Ms. Coronado).

4. Arizona Preserve Initiative

Lee opened this discussion by explaining that Camp Navajo desires to expand its training mission, and wishes to develop an Army Compatible Use Buffer (ACUB) around the training areas. Concurrently, Coconino County is attempting the purchase of state land parcels around Rogers Lake for conservation and recreation under the Arizona Preserve Initiative (API).

The Rogers Lake land parcels would provide additional buffer zones to the newly proposed range expansion in the existing Camp Navajo buffer zones. To succeed, Coconino County is seeking funding partnerships.

Lee introduced Ms. Jeanne Trupiano, Coconino County Parks and Recreation, who provided the following presentation on API and how it relates to the AZ ARNG ACUB proposal.

Jeanne provided an ACUB summary prepared by the AZ ARNG of the following expected positive impacts if ACUB is funded:

- The buffer zone will protect training opportunities for current and future soldiers – with an estimated increase from 72,000 to 186,000 training days in FY09.
- Establishes positive public support which may help ensure or avoid issues related to increases in traffic and noise related to proposed increase in activity and construction.
- Provides potential habitat and wildlife corridors for Threatened and Endangered Species and other wildlife displaced or affected by increased training days and habitat loss.
- Assists with mitigation measures that may be required by USFWS and requested by AZGFD with construction and use of newly proposed range expansion.
- Supports the AZARNG mission to act as responsible land stewards and maintain diverse training area for soldiers.
- A high potential to reduce costs of mitigation measures that may be required for the range expansion.
- Establishes Camp Navajo as proactive in its mission to meet the AZARNG sustainability goals and objectives.
- Maintains positive and cooperative relationships with the USFWS, AGFD, Coconino County, Naval Observatory Flagstaff Station (NOFS), and other stakeholders of the community that are currently involved with ACUB as well as the Enhanced Use Lease (EUL) program.
- Acquisition of the Rogers Lake ACUB by Coconino County is highly supported by voters and would be widely publicized. Positive public support gained from the ACUB would assist with future support for the EUL. Support would provide positive public support for future ACUB proposals, the EUL, Camp Navajo in general, and the AZARNG.

A summary timeline of ACUB activities with focus on the Rogers Lake land parcels was also included in the summary document:

- November 2002 - Coconino County voters approved an Open Space Initiative and a 1/8th cent sales tax to fund acquiring lands including the ACUB proposed Priority 1 “Rogers Lake” and Priority 2 “Old Growth” areas.
- January 2008 - Coconino County submitted an API petition to Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) requesting the rezoning of 2,200 acres of Rogers Lake Area for conservation use.
- July 2009 – ASLD held public hearing on API in Flagstaff. Also, Camp Navajo noise contour study was completed. Also, the Rogers Lake Stakeholders Group was established along with the development of land “Management Objectives”. Group members include agency representatives as well as local ranchers and land owners.
- November 2009 – ASLD Citizens Advisory Committee held public meeting on API in Phoenix.
- December 2009 – the revised ACUB proposal was completed and submitted to ADEMA for internal review. Review is currently ongoing.
- January 2010 – ASLD signed agreement that lands can be disposed for conservation.
- June 2010 – Partner funds must be committed for Growing Smarter application.
- Fall 2010 – Rogers Lake Stakeholders Coordination Plan to be submitted to ASLD.
- November 2010 – Auction of Rogers Lake parcels.

Rogers Lake Targeted Value – \$15 M (actual value will be determined by appraisal). The due diligence activities have been delayed due to deep snow – no access. However, commitment letter from Coconino County is currently in preparation. They expect only 3-4 applications.

Q: What is the process going forward? For the Growing Smarter application, is there anything else you need from Camp Navajo (LTC Williams-Lynch)?

A: There is a Rogers Lake Stakeholders workshop to be held next week. Members will contact the Garrison Commander if the members determine anything else is needed from Camp Navajo (Ms. Trupiano).

Q: Who are the other bidders (Mr. Ryan)?

A: Typically, the other bidders do not make themselves known until the day of auction. However, because there is considerable due diligence that must be done for this property (for archeology and wildlife concerns), prospective developers may not be as interested (Ms. Trupiano).

Q: Who sets the starting price at auction (Mr. Ryan)?

A: The ASLD will be setting the starting price (Ms. Trupiano).

Jeanne explained that although the ACUB is divided into the “core” and several surrounding buffer parcels, Coconino County will definitely try to purchase the core and as many of the buffer zone parcels they can. All parcels of the property will be included at the auction.

Janet explained the development of the ACUB to provide funds to installations to partner with neighbors for the establishment of conservation easements to be used as buffer zones to the installation. In 2006, a partnership was established between Camp Navajo, USFWS, AZGFD, and NOFS.

First, a proposal was developed in 2007 that provided an evaluation of the supporting reasons for the action and was submitted to NGB. However, NGB returned the proposal citing insufficient information regarding the amount of funds available for purchase and no appraisal value. Also, NGB cited the need for noise contours and requested information regarding what complaints might be expected and what additional area should be acquired for the buffer. A hiatus in the process occurred from 2008 to 2009, however the new

commander addressed this issue immediately. However, this is apparently a “dry” year for ACUB, with only 5-6 installations receiving funding approval.

LTC Williams-Lynch explained that a revised proposal was submitted to NGB again in January, 2010. According to process, the ACUB program manager will review. DoD will only provide a certain amount of funding. Once approved by NGB, the ACUB proposal is forwarded to a Pentagon review committee. This committee will provide a decision as to the feasibility of the proposal. If approved, the proposal will be forwarded to the Army for approval. Due diligence activities still need to be completed – however, this is a high priority and the commander is doing her best to coordinate with all entities for the June 2010 deadline. So far, she has heard positive remarks from the Pentagon review committee and their decision may support the new ranges that are programmed for 2014-2015.

Q: What can Coconino County do to help (Mr. Ryan)?

A: This is a budget issue and legislative support and involvement may be needed. The Camp Navajo commander is currently very involved in the process and met with Guard Bureau. It is imperative we avoid failure by not getting funding response before the June deadline (LTC Williams-Lynch).

Q: Does Coconino County have an opportunity to pull this from State level to avoid losing this opportunity (Mr. Ryan)?

A: A bridge funding source must be established to make this work (Ms. Trupiano).

Q: What will future land use be (Ms. Downs-Heimes)?

A: The Rogers Lake Stakeholders Group have established Management Objectives that summarize proposed land uses, including recreation, conservation and other multi-use opportunities (Ms. Trupiano).

Q: How can AZ GFD help (Mr. Luedecker)?

A: It will depend on Guard Bureau and Pentagon decision. However, participation in the stakeholder meetings is encouraged – getting involved in the process (Ms. Trupiano).

5. Post-closure Safety Controls

Lee began this portion of the meeting by iterating that the SAG functions as a forum for review of characterization and closure activities conducted at the OB/OD Area. Lee explained that to begin the discussion on post-closure controls, Randy Wilkinson will provide a brief summary of OB/OD Area post-closure and Janet Lynn will provide a summary of background information regarding fences and wildlife at Camp Navajo.

Randy began by explaining that NGB has provided a general vision for post-closure care of the area within the ICM Waiver Area boundary. This includes continuation of existing mission-related land use controls, as well as adopting additional land use controls that would provide additional measures of management and safety.

With the development of MRWA 02 closure documents, NGB and ADEQ are entering detailed discussions regarding the nature of land use controls. Previous NGB presentations have indicated that, with the exception of post-closure care activities, there is no future human use for land within the ICM Waiver Area. However, opportunities to manage the area as an ecological resource have not been discussed.

The ecological concerns associated with fencing were discussed early in the planning process. As the lead agency, NGB has developed a plan for site controls around the area. However, as the site transitions into RCRA post-closure, ADEQ will assume the lead agency role. Under RCRA, the regulations cite the need for some sort of physical barrier to the post-closure area.

Pursuant to both CERCLA and RCRA, stakeholder involvement is important. During this meeting, we would like to further discuss the need for installation of a fence around the ICM Waiver Area.

Nicole read the following from the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40 – Protection of Environment, Chapter I – Environmental Protection Agency, Part 265 – Interim Status Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste, Subpart B, General Facility Standards, Section 265.14:

(a) The owner or operator must prevent the unknowing entry, and minimize the possibility for the unauthorized entry, of persons or livestock on to the active portion of his facility, unless:

(1) Physical contact with the waste, structures, or equipment with the active portion of the facility will not injure unknowing or unauthorized persons or livestock which may enter the active portion of a facility, and

(2) Disturbance of the waste or equipment, by the unknowing or unauthorized entry of persons or livestock onto the active portion of a facility, will not cause a violation of the requirements of this part.

(b) Unless exempt under paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section, a facility must have:

(1) A 24-hour surveillance system (e.g., television monitoring or surveillance by guards or facility personnel) which continuously monitors and controls entry onto the active portion of the facility; or

(2)(i) An artificial or natural barrier (e.g., a fence in good repair or a fence combined with a cliff), which completely surrounds the active portion of the facility; and

(ii) A means to control entry, at all times, through the gates or other entrances to the active portion of the facility (e.g., an attendant, television monitors, locked entrance, or controlled roadway access to the facility).

Nicole explained that ADEQ views the active portion of the facility as the waste management area, and represents the area subject to post-closure controls. ADEQ is requesting the fencing be installed around the ICM Waiver Area, but is willing to listen to other ideas.

LTC Williams-Lynch explained that there are signs installed at 100-ft intervals along the entire length of the ICM Waiver Area boundary that warn of the danger and are marked “Keep Out”. She indicated that the hunters that trespassed into the area last fall were former employees of Camp Navajo and were well aware of where they were and the potential danger associated with the area.

Gavin explained that the key words are “unknowing” and “unauthorized” entry, which may require some agreement on the metrics to measure the success or failure of land use controls.

Randy reminded all that NGB’s toolbox consists of both physical and administrative controls for the ICM Waiver Area. The discussion today is to gather input as to whether a fence surrounding the ICM Waiver Area should be part of the toolbox.

Nicole iterated that ADEQ is willing to consider other options. Those options would include the establishment of obvious controls that the area is restricted.

Janet presented information regarding fences and large ungulates at Camp Navajo, explaining that there are three species of ungulates of concern on Camp Navajo; elk, mule deer, and pronghorn. Janet presented a slide showing movement of collared individual elk over a 6.5-month timeframe. The slide showed movement from the north to the south boundary, with the

greatest amount of movement within the Limited Area, the proposed ACUB area, and the OB/OD Area. Pronghorn are on the installation from April through October, and fawn during May.

Janet explained that these areas, especially the OB/OD Area, provide the highest quality habitat, with open meadows and tall grasses for grazing.

Shaula added that not only do ungulate species use the area, but also a number of bird species, including Mexican Spotted Owls.

Janet indicated that the total Camp Navajo installation boundary fence consists of 4-ft barbed-wire fence that is 39.5 kilometers long, with 65 crossings and 30 elk-jumps. The lower wire on a large portion of the fence still needs to be replaced with barbless wire. The Limited Area perimeter fence is 56.7 km, with 112 crossings and 69 elk jumps installed along its length. The Limited Area boundary fence is posted and patrolled by Security at least once during every shift.

Janet explained that fence mortality of elk and pronghorn occur every year. There are wildlife entanglement issues even along fences that have jumps. Camp Navajo hired the Coconino Rural Environmental Corps to help remove old pasture fences, the fence around the old composting area, and considerable piles of discarded wire. Removal of the fence around the old landfill will be evaluated during the first 5-year review.

Shaula stated that the USFWS would prefer that the amount of fencing in this area be minimized. Volunteer Wash is a beacon for many species. The PAC (Protected Activity Center) represents a minimum area – the home range of Mexican spotted owls is much larger and it is likely that owls forage in the OB/OD area as it represents a good prey area with plentiful native bunch-grass habitat.

Lee added that fencing is the biggest detractor and remediable effort. The animal corridor track record is well documented. Lee indicated that AGFD also requests that the imprint of fences be minimized.

Nicole and Diana iterated that ADEQ's preference is for the installation of fencing around the ICM Waiver Area, but is willing to consider other options (e.g. increased visibility of signage and randomly-timed patrols).

Randy reminded all that the installation fence serves as the principal physical barrier to Camp Navajo. Also, many land use and access controls are already in place as a result of the munitions storage mission. It is important that in this discussion, the installation be considered as a whole, not just this small area.

LTC Williams-Lynch explained that the Camp Navajo hunting program was previously managed by AZ ARNG in Phoenix. This year, management of the program was returned to Camp Navajo. In the transfer process, a detailed review of installation hunting regulations was conducted. Under the new program, any hunter that trespasses into the ICM Waiver Area will lose their current hunting tag as well as a two year suspension of their license to hunt at Camp Navajo. Also, as part of the hunt application process, the hunters must read and agree to a binding agreement regarding trespassing into unauthorized areas. Upon entering the installation, all hunters must pass through security check points and are again informed about the no-go areas.

Nicole expressed that ADEQ recognizes that this issue cannot be resolved today, but this discussion is helpful to coordinate with others and listen to the issues.

Wayne indicated that ADEQ has heard about the establishment of new training areas, and is concerned about potential trespass of training personnel into no-go areas.

LTC Williams-Lynch reminded all that there is no future training mission for the former Open Detonation Area. The Camp Navajo Surface Danger Zones are clearly defined as part of the training SOP.

Janet indicated that the proposed land navigation area is on the west side of the installation. There is only one road that goes from the east buffer to the west buffer and this road is in horrible condition. The road traverses the PAC and use is currently limited

LTC Williams-Lynch indicated that all soldiers will have a map showing the Surface Danger Zones and no-go areas. There is no reason for the soldiers to be in the no-go areas.

Randy added that it is also important that the neighboring community is satisfied that the site safety controls are protective. The lack of community interest implies that they are, but we would like to hear more from the local community, and obtain additional information regarding their concerns.

Matt added that providing education and information to the public is very important. By engaging the public, Coconino County can bring questions and concerns back to Camp Navajo.

Randy asked for suggestions to enhance involvement by the local community.

Matt indicated that the Flagstaff Meadows community represents the closest and easiest community to access. Other community members, including ranchers and members of the Rogers Lake Stakeholders Group, should be invited. Also, the media should be engaged to get the word out.

As a member of the community, Dana indicated that although there is no one living close to the installation southern boundary, locals do travel close to the fence using ORVs/ATVs while scouting for hunts and other activities. It is important that the prominence of the installation boundary fence be maintained in these areas.

Randy suggested that local residents be targeted for the June 2010 SAG meeting, with an evening meeting at a more neutral site – at a location on the north side of Highway 40.

Matt responded that he will help in distributing community/public notices and work with representatives from Flagstaff Meadows to set up a meeting at the fire station or other common area.

6. Call to the Public

No one from the public asked questions or made comments.

7. Next SAG meeting

The next SAG meeting will be June 10, 2010 at a time and location to be announced. .