

Castner Range Fort Bliss meetings and published or printed reports.docx 11/28/2023

By Richard Teschner, editor and author.

The following sections' items are listed chronologically, i.e., by date of meeting, date of publication and/or date of document's release. At the time it was collected, an asterisked item was unavailable online. All non-asterisked items carry online addresses.

Once UTEP's Spring Semester had ended on May 14, 2023, I started assembling the present annotated bibliography of several hundred items on Castner Range that I had been collecting over the last two decades. "Annotated" means that each item is accompanied by quotes from it, along with descriptions, comments and explanations as appropriate when possible. An item simply listed and not described offers little except its title to guide the reader, whereas annotated bibliographies go beyond that, in some cases to a considerable extent.

The title of this annotated bibliography—*Castner Range Fort Bliss meetings and published or printed reports.docx*—goes a long way toward explaining what its focus is. Since the fall of 2009, I've attended all sixteen meetings of the Fort Bliss RAB ('Restoration Advisory Board'); it is the information from those that constitutes the bibliography's primary focus. RABs were held in 2009, in 2010 (thrice), in 2011 (again thrice), in 2013, 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2022 but not in 2012, 2015 or 2021. The most recent RAB meets on December 6, 2023.

But Fort Bliss-sponsored or –collaborated meetings are not limited to RABs. Indeed, the other twenty-first-century meetings I'm aware of—and that figure in this annotated bibliography—include FL ('Feasibility Study'), FUDS ('Formerly Used Defense Sites'), MMRP ('Military Munitions Response Program'), RI ('Remedial Investigations'), TPP ('Technical Project Planning') and WAA ('Wide Area Assessment') events, sometimes held conjointly and sometimes held alone. There following several explanations as to what they consist of.

FS: "The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) **Feasibility Study** is a formal three-year process used to identify problem areas, develop solutions to address them, and determine if there's any federal interest in investing in local infrastructure. If federal interest is identified, a report is delivered to Congress ..." (Google, Feb. 27, 2020)

FUDS: **Formerly Used Defense Sites**. The Department of Defense (DOD) "is responsible for the environmental restoration (cleanup) of properties that were formerly owned by, leased to or otherwise possessed by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense prior to October 1986. The U.S. Army is DOD's lead agent for the FUDS program. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers executes the FUDS Program on behalf of the U.S. Army and DOD. The U.S. Army and DOD are dedicated to protecting human health and the environment by investigating and, if required, cleaning up potential contamination or munitions that may remain on these

properties from past DOD activities.” (From:

<https://www.usage.army.mil/missions/environmental/formerly-used-defense-sites/> .)

MMRP: “In 2001, DOD established the **Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)**. The MMRP addresses munitions response sites (MRSs) at active installations, Formerly Used Defense Sites [FUDS], and Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] locations. MRSs are sites that are known or suspected to contain unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions, or munitions constituents (MC). Through the MMRP, DOD complies with environmental cleanup laws, such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA], also known as Superfund.—To prioritize funding and cleanup of MRSs that pose the greatest threat to safety, human health, and the environment, DOD uses the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSP). The MRSP consists of three separate modules to evaluate hazards associated with explosives, chemical warfare materiel, MC, and other incidental environmental contaminants. The MRSP scores affect how DOD sequences MRSs for cleanup. In addition to relative risk, DOD considers other factors such as economic, programmatic, and stakeholder concerns, as well as reuse and redevelopment plans, when prioritizing sites for cleanup.” (From: <https://www.denix.osd.mil/mmrp/about/> .)

RI: “A **remedial investigation** is an in-depth study designed to gather data needed to determine the nature and extent of contamination at a Superfund site, establish site cleanup criteria, identify preliminary alternatives for remedial action, and support technical and cost analyses of alternatives.” (Google, Nov. 24, 2023) Also see: <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-remedial-investigationfeasibility-study-site-characterization> , on which the following appears: “After a site is listed on the National Priorities List (NPL), a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) is performed at the site.—The remedial investigation (RI) serves as the mechanism for collecting data to characterize site conditions, determine the nature of the waste, assess risk to human health and environment, and conduct treatability testing to evaluate the potential performance and cost of the treatment technologies that are being considered. The feasibility study (FS) is the mechanism for the development, screening, and detailed evaluation of alternative remedial actions.—The RI and FS are conducted concurrently—data collected in the RI influence the development of remedial alternatives in the FS, which in turn affect the data needs and scope of treatability studies and additional field investigations This phased approach encourages the continual scoping of the site characterization effort, which minimizes the collection of unnecessary data and maximizes data quality.”

TPP: **Technical Project Planning**. See the following document—

<https://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/Technical-Project-Planning> —for an introduction to the many materials related to TPP at United States Army Corps of Engineers sites. Consult the following information from that website: The “US Army Corps of Engineers. Environmental Quality. Technical Project Planning Process. EM 200-1-2 29 February 22016” at https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/EngineerManuals/EM_200-1-2.pdf Here are some quotes from the *Technical Project Planning (TPP) Process Engineer*

Manual (EM 200-1-2, 31 August 1998), <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/> : “The TPP process helps ensure that the requisite type, quality, and quantity of data are obtained to satisfy project objectives that lead to informed decisions and site closeout. ... The four-phase TPP process is a comprehensive and systematic planning process that will accelerate progress to site closeout within all project constraints [.] Project objectives are identified and documented early during Phase I of the TPP process to establish the focus required to achieve site closeout for the customer. Phases II and III provide a framework to develop data collection options for the customer’s consideration during Phase IV. The project-specific data quality requirements established ... are then documented as data quality objectives during Phase IV. Many other documentation tools within this [Engineer Manual] also encourage detailed data collection planning and contribute to maintaining institutional site knowledge.”

WAA: Wide Area Assessment. (From <http://www.cpeo.org/techtree/ttdescript/waa.htm> :)
“**Description[:]** Wide Area Assessment is a characterization strategy using a variety of platforms to cost-effectively delineate areas where unexploded ordnance (i.e., bombs and shells, or UXO) is likely to be found on the vast munitions ranges throughout the United States. By narrowing the footprint of potential UXO locations, WAA saves times [sic] and money on conventional characterization.—Conventional detection and characterization technologies involved hand-held magnetometer operated by technicians who must slowly walk across a survey area, or using a towed array of sensors that is driven across an area. These methods can be utilized more efficiently after after [sic] high-level aircraft take high-resolution photographs to detect topographic anomalies and low-altitude helicopters (flying about three meters above the surface) delineate magnetic anomalies. ... **Limitations and Concerns[:]** No existing technology for characterizing buried UXO achieves the 100% detection rate sought by many neighbors of military property containing UXO, though they approach that for items on or just below the surface. Wide Area Assessment is a tool that focuses on detecting areas with high concentrations of munitions, not one single target. ... Magnetic and electromagnetic detectors have diminished accuracy in highly magnetic soils. High-density magnetic clutter can make it nearly impossible to locate target areas.—Where vegetation exists or topographic anomalies exist such that aircraft or towed arrays cannot be used, handheld magnetometer must be used. ... —The tools used in Wide Area Assessment do not replace the need for historical research.”

List of the sixteen RAB [Fort Bliss] Restoration Advisory Board] meetings that I attended:

[Note: "The Fort Bliss RAB was established on 06 October 1997." *Fort Bliss Installation Action Plan*, p. 9 (January 2003).]

Oct. 15, 2009

Jan. 13/14, 2010.

Aug. 4, 2010.

Nov. 10, 2010

April 6, 2011.

July 13, 2011.

Oct. 19, 2011

Feb. 27, 2013

March 19, 2014

March 9, 2016

March 28, 2017

Dec. 5, 2018

Dec. 10, 2019

Dec. 2, 2020 (an on-line "pre-brief" to the Dec. 9, 2020 meeting)

Dec. 9, 2020 (on TEAMS)

Oct. 12, 2022 (on TEAMS)

List of the nineteen post-2008 FS/FUDS/MMRP/RI/TPP/WAA* meetings. (The ones I attended are highlighted in boldface.)

*Feasibility Study. Formerly Used Defense Sites. Military Munitions Response Program. Remedial Investigations. Technical Project Planning. Wide Area Assessment.

June 26, 2003 (“Town Hall Meeting”)

May, 2006.

December, 2006

July 28, 2009.

Oct. 15, 2009.

Oct. 16, 2009 (sole meeting labeled “WAA”).

Jan. 14, 2010.

June 16, 2010.

Oct. 20, 2010.

Feb. 10, 2011 (multiple meetings that day).

April 25, 2012.

Feb. 27, 2013.

April 3, 2013.

Feb. 27, 2014.

Feb. 11, 2015.

May 13, 2015.

Jan. 19, 2017.

Nov. 7, 2017.

June 30, 2023. *(Not an FS/FUDS/MMRP etc. meeting but, instead, an event convoked by and “on behalf of the Installation Commander [Major General James P. Isenhower III, Fort Bliss].” Also present were Ms. Amy Borman (Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), Ms. April Gray (Interim Superintendent, Castner Range National Monument, Chief of Staff, G-9), Mr. Matt Dayoc and Mr. Mike Bowlby (both U.S. Army Environmental Command). This event was also attended by ca. 100 civilians and military.

Acronyms, Bylaws, Glossaries, Guidelines from 2008 onward.

**Acronyms and Abbreviations* [as of 2010]. [Two sides of one single sheet. Contract W912QR-08-D-0011, Task Order DK01.]

**Acronym Definitions*. [Two separate documents, with much repetition within the two. Neither one gives a date of publication, though my recollection is that both date back to 2010-2012.]

**Bylaws Fort Bliss Texas and New Mexico Restoration Advisory Board*. [Three separate publications, the most recent of which gives “4 DEC 2017” as its date of publication. My handwritten notes state that what appears to be the oldest was issued “Aug. 8, 2000.”]

**Glossary: Terminology from Memorandum for the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management. Subject: Munitions Response Terminology, dated April 21, 2005*. 8 pp.

**Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)*. 5/5/2015. Three-page summary of background, program drivers, program oversight, program activities, guidance documents, useful links, etc., along with a two-page Fact Sheet addressing Range and Site Inventory, Site Inspections, etc.

**Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies & Treatability Studies & Costing*. 2015. A two-sheet summary of RI/FS activities and purposes.

Remedial Investigation into Feasibility Study.docx 11/12/2017

**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Implementation Guidelines*, the Department of Defense and the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Sept. 27, 1994. 19 pp.

EM 200-1-2- Technical Project Planning Process-EM_200-1-2.pdf—
[publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/Engineer Manuals/EM_200-1-2.pdf](http://publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/Engineer%20Manuals/EM_200-1-2.pdf)

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Technical Project Planning (TPP) Process*. EM 200-1-2. Aug. 31, 1998. (Printed out: A one-page introduction, a two-page Table of Contents, a five-page Foreword and the first nine pages—“Chapter 1: Identify Current Project (Phase I)” —of the 132-page full document.

There follow 211 published/printed-out items arrayed chronologically and then author/title alphabetically by year of issue, followed by “address” location (if one exists) in my Outlook files, along with key quotes from the report when appropriate.

1983-2008 (i.e., the first twenty-six years)

Feb. 8, 1983: Castner Range National Monument 2015 Status of Castner Range From excess to excess cancelled in 1983.msg . “Congressman [Richard C.] White pointed out that two large construction projects (Transmountain Road and Fusselman Dam) turned up nothing” by way of MECs and UXOs that would require subsurface clearance.

March 7, 1989: Castner Range National Monument 2015 Status of Castner Range From excess to excess cancelled in 1983.msg .

*Nixon, Phil et al. *OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report for Fort Bliss: Castner Range. Revision: Draft*. Huntsville, AL: U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center Huntsville and Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. Huntsville, AL, March 1998. Ca. 400 pp. (non-continuous).

*_____. *OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report for Fort Bliss: Castner Range. Revision: Final*. Huntsville, AL: U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center Huntsville and Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. Huntsville, AL, May 1998. Ca. 400 pp. (non-continuous).

March 1998/April 9, 1998. **OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report for Fort Bliss: Castner Range. U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville. Revision: Draft*. Prepared by: Parsons Engineering Science, Inc. (This ca. thousand-page “memorandum” is popularly known as “the Parsons Report.” As of the date of the present entries—June 4, 2023—it is the most comprehensive multi-component document yet prepared on Castner Range. The Parsons Report contains seven “sections” and two appendices, each of whose components range from just one—Section 7, Appendix A, Appendix B—to a grand total of 69 [Section 4]. In addition there’s a “List of Figures”—15 lists all told—, a “List of Tables” [a total of 29] and a “List of [34] Acronyms and Abbreviations.”) The Report begins with a two-and-a-fraction-paged “Executive Summary.”—The Parsons Report is so chockablock with information (and with substantial résumés of its own) that the present summations can only skim the surface while also quoting statements that lead the way to recommendations as to “what to do” with Castner Range.

*EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: “The Army has determined that Castner Range is excess property which is no longer needed to support the mission of Fort Bliss.” Table ES-1, p. ES-2: “Removal of OE [‘ordnance and explosives’] Items to a Depth of One Foot ... Capital cost: \$38,600,000-\$39,000,000. Operating Cost: None expected.” “ES6: It is recommended that surface clearance be performed over the entire area of Castner Range where surface clearance is feasible. The feasible areas include the eastern region which is fairly flat, as well as the mountain alleys, ridges, and side slopes that are accessible by foot. Inaccessible areas will include steep valley walls, cliff areas, and sheer rock outcrops. In addition to surface clearance, an educational institutional control program should be implemented to mitigate risk associated with subsurface UXO and UXO in the areas that do not receive surface clearance.” “ES7: “It is estimated that the cost of implementing the combination of the surface clearance and institutional control alternative will be less than the \$18,900,000 value presented above because the inaccessible areas will not be cleared.”

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION: “The Army and the City of El Paso conducted surface sweeping of 1,247 acres [of the Range’s final size of 8,328 acres] in 1971 so that they could be returned to the Public ... These returned lands [to the east of the US 54 North-South Freeway] have subsequently been developed into commercial and residential areas, a community college, and public parks.” (p. 1-1) If the Castner Range land is determined to be accessible, “then Fort Bliss must determine the level of clearance that will be required prior to releasing the land and prepare an unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance plan. The Department of the Army approves the UXO clearance plan and provides funding to perform the clearance. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performs the UXO clearance and places any restrictions on the use of the land based upon the level of clearance. Once the property is cleared for release, the General Services Administration (GSA) oversees the distribution of the land by the following process: [1] the land is first offered to other Federal agencies (i.e., DoD, DoE, Bureau of Land Management). [2] If the Federal agencies refuse the land, the GSA offers the land to the state and local governments. ...” “1.0.8{:} This document provides an OE Characterization Report and Cost Analysis based upon: [1] Determination of the nature and extent of OE contamination at the site through a review of previous site investigations; [2] Analysis of the risk posed by the remaining OE hazards present at the site; [e] Identification and development of OE removal alternatives including clearance costs; [4] Screening of OE removal alternatives; and [5] A comparative analysis of the remaining OE removal alternatives.” “1.1 PURPOSE[.] The purpose of this project is to evaluate the results of past OE investigations at the Castner Range to determine the feasibility, cost, and risk to the public from potential OE removal alternatives. The objective of this project is to implement the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) non-time critical removal action process to recommend a feasible and cost[-]effective OE removal alternative that meets acceptable levels of protection to human health with respect to the intended future land use.” “1.2.5[:] Section 121(d)(1) of CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), requires that remedial actions must attain a degree of cleanup that assures the safety of human health and protection of the environment. Moreover, all potential Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) must be outlined. ARARs include federal standards, requirements, criteria, and limitations under state environmental or facility[-]siting regulations that are more stringent than federal standards.” (p. 1-7)

The remaining pages (1-8, 1-9 and 1-10) of SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION deal with ARARs. See sub-section 1.2.9.1 (“Chemical-Specific ARARs”), pp. 1-9’s “Table 1.2-1 Potential ARARs For OE Removal Castner Range, and p. 1-10’s narrative expansion on those tables’ references. Of note are the following p. 1-10 comments: “1.2.9.3. Action-Specific ARARs: ... If the site is left in its natural state for use as a park, then this ARAR is covered by a categorical exclusion which exists for actions in support of other agencies/organizations involving community participation projects where that agency/organization is the proponent for that action. The clearance and removal of OE materials from the site is also covered by a categorical exclusion applicable for land regeneration activities of native trees and vegetation including site preparation. Fort Bliss will be required to prepare and submit a Record of Environmental Consideration to the Department of the Army describing the proposed action and justifying the use of the categorical exclusion.—1.2.9.3.2 One action-specific TBC, Army regulation AR 385-64, requires that safety measures be taken for the handling of explosive ordnance. Moreover, DoD 6-55.9-STD requires that specialized personnel be employed to detect, remove, and dispose

of ordnance. This standard also defines safety precautions and procedures for the detonation or disposal of ordnance.”

SECTION 2 SITE CHARACTERIZATION: See, in particular, unnumbered pp. 2.5 (for “Figure 2.1-2 History of Castner Range in the 1940’s” and “Figure 2.1-3 History of Castner Range in the 1950’s”). Figure 2.1-2 shows the location—in the 1940’s—of the two-dozen-some firing points (referred to as “ranges” or “areas”). Figure 2.1-3 shows the “1953 Firing Range Site” and the “1953 Firing Range Fans for 3.5 Rockets and Mortars.” Figure 2.1-4 (“... Castner Range in the 1960’s”) only differs from Figure 2.1-3 in the sense that its northern third is now free of target areas, firing areas and mortar ranges, mostly relocated to the Range’s southern half. Section 2’s p. 2-15 makes a point that is often repeated throughout the Parsons Report: that “Castner Range has remained largely in its natural state since 1966 when live fire exercises ceased. Few biological studies have been conducted on the range since the land has remained inactive to Fort Bliss activities. Castner Range now supports a diverse Chihuahuan ecosystem.” Covered on pp. 2-15/2-23 are “Vegetation,” “Wildlife,” “Reptile and Amphibian Species,” “Threatened and Endangered Species,” and “Archaeological and Historical Resources.”

Section 2’s pp. 2-23 through 2-29 list and describe “[s]everal organized ordnance investigations [that] have been conducted at Castner Range during the period of 1971 through 1997,” i.e., over the 27-year time period since El Paso land activists first sought to conserve the Range (1971). Some quotes: “In September 1971 personnel from Fort Bliss conducted a surface investigation of approximately 200 acres. During the investigation[,] forty ordnance and explosive waste (OEW) items were found. ... [All] were removed from the area and destroyed ...” From April 8, 1974 to May 7, 1974, “Fort Bliss personnel conducted a surface sweep of 1,230 acres of Castner Range located east of [the U.S. 54 North South Freeway]. The surface sweep consisted of 104 individuals systematically walking the entire investigation area. A statement of clearance was issued for this tract indicating that this land had been given a careful surface/visual search and has been cleared of all explosives reasonably possible to detect ...” (pp. 2-23 and 2-29) “In January 1975, the Engineer Studies Group of the Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers Office prepared a report concerning the OEW contamination of Castner Range. Their analysis divided the range into 6 areas (A-F) based on previous use and potential for contamination. Areas A and B had been surface-swept by Fort Bliss personnel in 1974 and were being turned over to GSA for disposal to the City of El Paso. [Note: That site has long been home to the City’s Museum of Archaeology and—more recently—the privately-sponsored Border Patrol Museum.] The Engineer Studies Group concluded that there was not enough historical data on Castner Range to either qualitatively and quantitatively define the extent of contamination. The available range overlays, which dated back to 1953, did not show firing points or impact areas for the types of ordnance known to have been fired. This determination was made by Explosive Ordnance Demolition (EOD) personnel who identified certain ordnance items found during clearance which were not recorded in range records. The report also concluded that range surveys indicated that the steep easterly slopes of the Franklin Mountains were used as a backstop for large caliber weapons, but precise impact areas could not be defined. Because of the general lack of accurate information and the discovery of UXO over the entire expanse of the range, the Engineers Study Group Report concluded that the entire range must be considered impacted (ASR, 1994).” Similar findings emerged from the late 1979-early 1980 “surface sweep for ordnance along the Trans Mountain [sic, ‘Transmountain’] Highway right-of-way and along

a portion of the North-South Highway right-of-way. During the sweep[,] 49 OEW items were removed from the area. OEW items consisted of six M52 fuzes; one pop flare; fourteen 37mm shot rounds [etc.] ... The officer in charge of the investigation recommended that the area be limited to surface use only because of the large number of items found in the relatively small area searched (Archive Search Report, 1994).”

And there’s more. From p. 2-29 we learn that “[t]he next major ordnance sweep at Castner Range was conducted by Environmental Hazards Specialists International, Inc. (EHSI) from July 11, 1994 to July 22, 1994. EHSI conducted a preliminary site assessment of eight areas (A through H) to identify possible areas of OEW contamination. Approximately 6,700 total acres were investigated during the project. Seven hundred-twenty acres were covered using either standard EOD Surface Search Procedures including grids and search lanes (327 acres) or traversed on foot and visually swept (393 acres). The remaining acreage was randomly covered on foot or on all[-]terrain vehicles (ATVs). EHSI estimated that a minimum of 45 to 50 percent of the total area was covered during the investigation. The locations of each of the areas investigated are presented on Figure 2.2-1 ...” Following extensive maps and tables and charts, the Parsons Report continues thus (p. 2-38): “2.2.2.2 Based on the review of sweep reports and the type of UXO/OEW encountered, EHSI recommended that two types of clearance be completed. The areas that received impacts from light[-]cased ordnance ... were recommended for a surface clearance and subsurface clearance to a depth of 6 inches. Areas that received impacts from the heavier-cased artillery rounds were recommended for a surface and subsurface clearance to a depth of three feet.”

UXB Investigation (pp. 2-38 to 2-40). “From May 1995 through October 1995, UXB International, Inc. (UXB) conducted a surface and subsurface detection and removal project in areas where the potential for encountering OEW was suspected. UXB’s investigation consisted of clearing 569.44 acres and was conducted in areas designated as Area 1, Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, and Area D South. ... A surface clearance and 10 percent subsurface selective sampling was [sic; ‘were’] conducted in Area 1 to a depth of one foot. Surface clearances only were conducted in Area[s] A, B, C, D and D South. ... [V]isual and geophysical investigation techniques were utilized. Visual searches were conducted by using Explosive Ordnance Reconnaissance (EOR) methods. UXB personnel visually scanned the surface terrain to locate surface ordnance or evidence suggesting the presence of subsurface ordnance. Geophysical searches were conducted using Schonstedt GA-52 or GA-72 Magnetometers. The Schonstedt GA-52/72 magnetometers are passive dual flux gate instruments used for detecting ferrous metal items. The locators are portable hand[-]held units that use two flux gate magnetometers, aligned and mounted a fixed distance apart, to detect changes in the earth’s ambient magnetic field caused by ferrous metal. ...” Additional information appears in separate sections 2.2.3.1.1 (Area 1), 2.2.3.2. (Area A), 2.2.3.2. (Area B), 2.2.3.4. (Area C), 2.2.3.5. and 2.2.3.6 (Areas D/South). CMS Investigation (pp. 2-40, 2.48, 2.50-2.53). Section 2.2.4.1. (p. 2-40) reports that “[t]he most recent investigation conducted at Castner Range was performed by CMS Environmental, Inc. during the period of October 1996 through May 1997. CMS began the investigation by preparing a grid layout and surveying the site based on a control monument established near the Wilderness Park Museum on [Transmountain Road]. Location, grid layout, and surveying of the site was [sic] accomplished by CMS using a Real time Global Position System (TR/GPS). For

this investigation, CMS divided Castner Range into 11 zones based on accessibility by the public, terrain type, vegetation, soil type, and historical use while active.”

OECert Summary (pp. 2-54, 2-55 and 2-58). In paragraph 2.3.4.1 (p. 2-54), we learn that the OECert (‘Ordnance and Explosives Certification’) methodology “is designed to prioritize the removal efforts for a set of OE-contaminated sites and to determine a quantitative risk of public and individual exposure to OE at each site. An exposure ... is based on the proximity of an individual to UXO. This proximity can also be described as the ‘sahdow’ [sic, ‘shadow’] of the individual as it crosses over a UXO item. For an exposure to occur, the individual does not have to specifically touch or know the item is present ... The prioritization is based on a cost-effectiveness measure, defined as the maximum risk reduction achieved for each dollar spent on the removal effort. The public exposures to OE used in OECert result from individuals performing specific activities ... within OE[-]contaminated areas. The expected number of surface OE exposures per participant in an area is dependent on the OE density, the proportion of OE on the surface, and the activity participant’s exposure area (the area traversed by an individual while performing an activity). The expected number of subsurface OE exposures per participant in a zone is dependent on the OE density, the proportion of OE beneath the surface of the ground, the density distribution of the subsurface OE, and the area associated with an activity performed in a zone.” (p. 2-54) OECert results as presented in Section 2.3.5 (p. 2-55) reveal that “surface UXO was found in all zones except for 3 and 9. Subsurface UXO was only found in zone 4.” Additional results and conclusions appear on p. 2-58: “Because less subsurface sampling was completed than surface sampling, the 90 percent confidence interval for subsurface UXO density is higher than for surface density. This results in higher upper limits for the subsurface densities for each zone with the exception of Zone 3. Based on the nature of the soils at the site, it is considered highly unlikely that the actual subsurface UXO density is greater than the surface density. Therefore, the subsurface densities used for completion of the OECert analysis are considered to be highly conservative. Because significantly more surface sampling was completed, the data presented for surface UXO densities has a higher confidence level ... The exposure numbers do not represent accidental detonation of UXO items. ... The current risk from accidental detonation for the entire range was also calculated ... to be between 0.4547 for the lower UXO density estimate and 0.8245 for the upper UXO density estimate ... In both cases it is expected that less than one accidental detonation will occur in a 20[-]year period.”

The Parsons Report’s next sections 3, 4, 5 and 6—add considerably-detailed information plus methodological explanations that often repeat what Section 2 presented. (The final Section—“7, References”—is a single-paged ten-item unannotated bibliography.) Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6’s titles make their objectives clear; thus “Section 3: Identification of OE Clearance Scope, Goals, and Objectives,” “Section 4: Identification and Analysis of OE Clearance Alternatives,” “Section 5: Comparative Analysis of OE Clearance Alternatives,” and “Section 6: Recommendations and Conclusions.” What follows is the lengthy Appendix A, “OECert Analysis Report”), whose sections are: “Introduction,” “Application of OECert,” “UXO Characterization of Castner Range, Texas” and “Risk Assessment Process,” along with seven appendices whose titles are “Homogeneity Test Description,” “Sweep Efficiencies,” “Probabilistic Density Estimation Methodology,” “OECert Exposure Estimating Description and Example,” “Risk Estimates,” “Risk Sensitivity to Increases in Population,” and “Comparative Risk Assessment for Castner Range.” Tables, charts and graphs abound throughout. Next appearing is the equally-lengthy

Appendix B (“Institutional Analysis Report”), whose lengthy Table of Contents lists these four sections: 1 (“Purpose of Study”), 2 (“Institutional Controls” such as “Site Background, “Methodology,” “Scope of Work/Selection Criteria,” “Interview Summary”), 3 (“Institutional Control Alternatives”) and 4 (“Recommendations”). The final appendix—C (“Survey Forms”) concludes the Parsons Report’s text. The document itself concludes with a plastic envelope containing a folded-up 36-by-32-foot sheet entitled “Location of CMS Survey Grids” that was prepared by Parsons.

May 1998. *Revision: Final (of the immediately-antecedent *OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report for Fort Bliss: Castner Range, U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville, March 1998*). The following quotes from this Revision support, supplement or repeat information from the March 1998 “Parsons Report” piece that appears on the five sheets above.

Executive Summary, p. 2: “The alternative to perform removal of OE items to a depth of 4 feet was not retained in the analysis because no OE items were found at a depth from 1 to 4 feet. [So] there is no statistical basis for additional benefit gained by excavating deeper than 1 foot.”

Figure 1.0-3 Castner Range Timeline: “1994—Site visit by Fort Bliss and Corps of Engineers personnel followed by UXO field investigations of 6,700 acres to identify remaining OE.” “1995—Additional field investigations of 569 acres for UXO characterization.” “1997—Field investigations of 467 acres for UXO characterization.”

Section 1: Introduction, p. 1-5: “The Department of the Army has determined that the site is excess. Fort Bliss is required to determine the level of clearance that will be required prior to releasing the land and is also responsible for preparing an unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance plan. ... The Department of the Army provides funding to perform the clearance. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performs the UXO clearance and places any restrictions on the use of the land based upon the level of clearance.”

Section 1: Purpose, p. 1-6: “The purpose of this project is to evaluate the results of past OE investigations at the Castner Range to determine the feasibility, cost, and risk to the public from potential OE removal alternatives. The objective of this project is to implement the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) non-time critical removal action process to recommend a feasible and cost[-]effective OE removal alternative that meets acceptable levels of protection to human health with respect to the intended future land use.”

Section 2: Site Characterization, pp. 2-23, 2-29: “PREVIOUS ORDNANCE AND EXPLOSIVE INVESTIGATIONS ... Historical Investigations. 2.2.1.1: In September 1971[,] personnel from Fort Bliss conducted a surface investigation of approximately 200 acres. ... 2.2.1.2: During the period of 8 April 1974 to 7 May 1974, Fort Bliss personnel conducted a surface sweep of 1,230 acres of Castner Range located east of the North-South Highway ... The surface sweep consisted of 104 individuals systematically walking the entire investigation area. The only munitions found were 1 white phosphorous 4.2-inch mortar round and 4, 40 mm HE rounds. A statement of clearance was issued for this tract indicating that this land had been giving a careful surface/visual search and has been cleared of all explosives reasonably possible to detect ... “

Sections 2.2.1.3., 2.2.1.4. and 2.2.2.1: “In January 1975, the Engineer Studies Group of the Department of the Army, Chief of Engineers Office prepared a report concerning the OE contamination of Castner Range. ... In December 1979 and early 1980 the Army conducted a surface sweep for ordnance along the Trans Mountain [sic, ‘Transmountain’] Highway right-of-way and along a portion of the North-South Highway right-of-way. During the sweep[,] 49 OE items were removed from the area ...” “The next major ordnance sweep at Castner Range was conducted ... from July 11, 1994 to July 22, 1994[, consisting of] a preliminary site assessment of eight areas (A through H) to identify possible areas of OE contamination. Approximately 6,700 total acres were investigated during the project. ...”

Section 2.2.3, p. 2-38: “From May 1995 through October 1995, UXB international, Inc. ... conducted a surface and subsurface detection and removal project in areas where the potential for encountering OE was suspected. UXB’s investigation consisted of clearing 569.44 acres and was conducted in areas designated as Area 1, Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, and Area D South. ... Results of the investigations performed in each area are ... “

Section 2.2.4 “CMS Investigation” (p. 2-40): “The most recent investigation conducted at Castner Range was performed ... during the period of October 1996 through May 1997. ...”

Section 2.3 “Streamlined Risk Evaluation” (p. 2-54): “This streamlined risk evaluation presents a summary of the Ordnance and Explosives Cost-Effectiveness Risk tool (OECert) results. ...”

Section 4 “Identification and Analysis of Clearance Alternatives.”

Section 4.1.1, p. 4-1: “OE Detection”: “The other form of OE detection, geophysics, includes a family of detection instruments designed to locate OE. This family ... includes magnetic instruments, electromagnetic instruments, and ground[-]penetrating radar [also known as lydar].”

Section 4.1.2.3, p. 4-2: “The excavation of the OE item then takes place with either hand tools or mechanical equipment depending on the suspected depth of the object.”

Section 4.2, “Identification and Description of OE Clearance Alternatives”

p. 4-3: “For the removal action at Castner Range, five alternatives have been developed: no further action; institutional controls; removal of surface OE items; removal of OE items to a depth of one foot; and removal of OE items to a depth of four feet. No remedial measure, even using the best available technology, can completely remove all OE risk within Castner Range.”

Section 4.2.2: “The institutional controls alternative ... , if selected, would provide a means for the Army to prevent access to Castner Range or a portion of the range if it were not possible or practicable to clear OE from the site. Examples of potential institutional controls include fences, warning signs, ... For example, it may be necessary to fence off an area within a future park that has a high quantity of OE which is inaccessible to clear.”

Section 4.2.3.1, p 4-13: “In areas where the future land use is for the Franklin Mountains State Park, brush clearing would not be used because the vegetation in this environment would be slow

to re-establish. Therefore, metal detection devices would be relied upon because they would be less damaging to the natural ecosystem than brush clearance. ... In addition, UXO-qualified personnel would also use metal detection devices to ensure that any OE items that may exist on or within the top 6 inches of existing ground cover are located during the sweep.”

July 1998. **Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Volume 1.* Prepared for: U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss Directorate of the Environment, Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico 79916. Prepared by: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, 819 Taylor Street, Fort Worth, Texas 76102-0300. (Technical Assistance: Science Applications International Corporation, 3900 Paradise Road, Suite 285, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109.) This ca. 700-page report makes just three direct or tangential references to Castner Range. Table ES-1 (Public Scoping Issues by PEIS [‘Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement’] Section) lists section 4.1.2.1, 4.11.3.6 and 5.1.1.2. Here are quotes from them:

Section 4.1.2.1 (pp. 4.1-29 and 30): “Castner Range. Castner Range is a former firing range, comprised of 7,040 acres of mostly mountainous terrain. ... Currently, the range is heavily trespassed for recreational use by the public. ... Trespassing is a result of the attractiveness for hiking and exploring ... [H]owever, the entire range has since been characterized hazardous and additional money has been authorized by Congress to further the study of the amount of cleanup required. Fort Bliss is in the process of designing a clean-up plan. This study is expected to be complete by summer 1998. No money for cleanup is presently available. The degree of cleanup (and resulting cost) is based on projected land use. For example, surface cleanup is sufficient for uses requiring no earth[-]disturbing activity from construction ... However, subsurface cleanup is required when construction would result.”

Section 4.7.4 (“Fort Bliss, El Paso, and Ciudad Juarez Area”) in the following [sub-]section:

[Sub-]section 4.7.4.2, Groundwater: “Most of the fresh water in the [Hueco Bolson] aquifer lies along the eastern edge of the Franklin Mountains .. An isopach map of the major fresh-water deposit in the basin shows the thickest part of the aquifer underlying Fort Bliss and northeast El Paso (Figure 4.7-4) Eastward the fresh water thins until, east of the ‘zero’ isopach, only brackish water is present. ...”

Section 5.1.1.2 (“Fort Bliss Training Complex”).

Subsection “Castner Range,” p. 5.1-6: “A program for cleanup of the Castner Range will continue as funding is available. The Army has not made any decisions regarding future use or disposition of the Castner Range, although surface cleanup of contamination would be adequate for recreational uses provided no ground-disturbing action occurs. ... Commercial and industrial use would be suitable along U.S. Highway 54, but would require additional subsurface cleanup.”

*The following ten pages contain excerpts from the *Ordnance and Explosive Characterization and Cost Analysis Report for Fort Bliss: Castner Range, U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center Huntsville, Revision: Final, May 1998*. For easy reference, I have listed the page numbers as they are given on the 316 pages of the Adobe Reader original.

The Executive Summary reminds us that “Castner is excess property which is no longer needed to support the mission at Fort Bliss.” (page 9 of 316)

1.0.5 Castner Range is property which is no longer needed to support the mission of Fort Bliss. The Department of the Army has determined that the site is excess. Fort Bliss is required to determine the level of clearance that will be required prior to releasing the land and is also responsible for preparing an unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance plan. The Department of the Army and the Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board (DDESB) approves the UXO clearance plan. The Department of the Army provides funding to perform the clearance. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performs the UXO clearance and places any restrictions on the use of the land based upon the level of clearance. Once the property is cleared for release, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers offers the land to other Federal Agencies, i.e., DoD, DoE, Bureau of Land Management. If no Federal Agency requests the land, then the General Services Administration (GSA) oversees the distribution of the land by the following process:

- The GSA offers the land to the state and local governments.
- If the state and local governments refuse the land, the GSA makes the land available to the public for sale (commercial or residential - based on clearance restrictions).

1.0.6 Fort Bliss would receive 50 percent of the proceeds if the land is sold to a Federal Agency, or to a state or local government. Fort Bliss would not receive any financial return if the land is transferred at no cost to a Federal Agency or to a state or local government. If the land is sold on the open market, Fort Bliss would receive at least 50 percent of the proceeds. The policy of returning at least 50 percent of the sale proceeds to the installation (Fort Bliss) stipulates that the money be used strictly for facility maintenance and repair or for environmental restoration. Fort Bliss could also lease the land, and receive at least 50 percent of the proceeds. It is possible that Fort Bliss could receive 100 percent of the leasing proceeds (with Department of the Army approval). The primary reason for including residential and commercial development (of at least a portion of Castner Range) in the land use alternatives as this would provide funding for repair and maintenance or for environmental restoration over a period of many years. The State of Texas is very interested in acquiring Castner Range for an extension of the Franklin Mountains State Park. The Franklin Mountains State Park was created in 1979 by an act of the Texas Legislature. The legislation allows Franklin Mountains State Park to include any portion of Castner Range that the Army is willing to convey to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department through the excess land process (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 1993). The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department is not required to acquire this land; its acquisition and subsequent boundary changes to the Franklin

... [page 18 of 316].

Section 2 maps specific uses of various areas on Castner and indicates which ranges used what kind of ordnance starting on page 27 of 316.

2.1.13.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

2.1.13.3.1 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that the following listed threatened and endangered species may be present in the vicinity of Castner Range: Northern aplomado falcon (Falco femoralis septentrionalis), American peregrin falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum), Sneed pincushion cactus (Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii), Mexican spotted owl (Strix occidentalis lucida), Southwestern willowflycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus), Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus), and Rio Grande silvery minnow (Hybognathus amarus). Federal candidate species include: the Mountain plover (Charadrius montanus). Species of special concern include: Ferruginous hawk (Buteo regalis), White-faced ibis (Plegadis chihi), Texas horned lizard (Phrynosoma cornutum), Arizona black-tailed prairie dog (Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis), Baird's sparrow (Ammodramus bairdi), Western burrowing owl (Speotyto Cunicularia hypugaea), Conchos pupfish (Cyprinodon eximius), Blotched gambusia (Gambusia senilis), Rio Grande darter (Etheostoma grahami), Franklin Mountains talussnail (Sonerella metcalfi), Hueco rock-daisy (Perityle huecoensis), Alamo beard tongue (Penstemon alamoensis), sand sacahuista (Nolina arenicola), Sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria), Desert night-blooming cereus (Cereus greggii greggii), Nodding cliff-daisy (Perityle cernua), Smooth figwort (Scrophularia laevis), Standley's Whitlow-grass (Druba standleyi), and Goosefoot (Chenopodium cycloides).

2.1.13.3.2 The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department has identified several species of special concern known to occur in the vicinity of Fort Bliss. They include: Sneed pincushion cactus (Coryphantha sneedii var. sneedii), endangered; Texas horned lizard (Phrynosoma cornutum), threatened; Mountain short-horned lizard (Phrynosoma douglasi hernandezi), threatened; and Texas lyre snake (Trimorphodon biscutatus vilkinsoni), threatened (Martin-Bashore, 1997)..

(page 47 of 316)

2.1.13.3.5 Suitable habitat exists for the following species of special concern that are thought to inhabit Castner Range:

- Sand prickly pear (Opuntia arenaria) (special concern)
- Desert night-blooming cereus (Cereus greggii greggii) (special concern)
- Texas horned lizard (Phrynosoma cornutum) (special concern)
- Texas lyre snake (Trimorphodon biscutatus Vilkinsoni) (special concern)
- Western burrowing owl (Speotyto cunicularia hypugaea) (special concern)

(page 48 of 316)

3.3 STATUTORY LIMITS

Statutory limits exist for responding to releases under Section 104 of CERCLA. These limits set a \$2 million ceiling on Superfund-financed removal actions and a twelve-month time limit on implementing those removal actions. However, these limits

(page 88 of 316)

do not apply to removal actions authorized under CERCLA Section 104(b) that are not financed by Superfund. As a result, the Castner Range OE removal action being examined in this OE Characterization and Cost Analysis report does not have any statutory fiscal or timeframe limitations set by CERCLA. However, there are funding limitations for the project based on the budget available and on the large number of OE-contaminated sites located throughout the country that must compete for these funds based on a "worst-first" funding criteria. The DERP may provide an option for funding in the future. However, competition for funding from other sites would be high.

3.4 SCHEDULE

Figure 3.4-1 presents a planning level schedule for determining the appropriate future land use for Castner Range and for establishing a project to perform the associated clearance required. The schedule also provides a planning estimate for performing the OE clearance and turning Castner Range over to new stewards. It is estimated that Castner Range could be transferred to a new steward in the first quarter of the year 2002.

(page 89 of 316)

Appendix A (starting on page 145) is the OECert [Cost-Effectiveness Risk Tool] Analysis that was conducted by QuantiTech Inc.; it contains its own appendixes A through H. It also contains detailed analysis of risk of injury or death.

Appendix E (starting on page 187) estimates risks based on activities such as hiking, picnicking, etc.

Appendix F (starting on page 206) is an interesting analysis of # potential injuries/deaths based on increase population. This was completed BEFORE Bliss expansion plans.

Tab, Appendix B, Institutional Analysis is a separate report for US Army Engineering and Support Center at Huntsville, AL (starting on page 219). It particularly looks at local and state authorities that exert long-term control on Castner Range.

Para 2.1.2 Site History (continued on next page):

to impede access. In the early 1990's, the Army attempted to deed Castner Range to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department as part of the Franklin Mountains State Park. The original legislation creating the park in 1979 allows the park to include whatever portion of Castner Range that the Army might convey to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department without additional legislation. However, the law stipulates that the issue of unexploded ordnance must be addressed before any portion of Castner Range can be accepted by the State of Texas. To date, this issue has not been fully addressed. Therefore, the State has not been able to accept Castner Range.

(page 226 of 316)

They interviewed various agencies including Ft Bliss, City of El Paso, TX Parks and Wildlife Dept., and FMWC. Here are some excerpts:

2.4.3 U.S. Army Ft. Bliss, Properties

Interviewee: Mr. Bill Tipton, Ft. Bliss Properties
Location: Ft. Bliss Properties Office
Address: Ft. Bliss, Texas
Date: November 17, 1997

2.4.3.1 Interview Summary

The Army is considering leasing a strip of Castner Range land along Highway 54 for commercial development. The exact size of the strip is being discussed, but a strip with a depth of 600 feet was mentioned. This is the only way that Ft. Bliss can generate annual income from the reuse of Castner Range. The land would not be identified as excess and is retained by the Army and leased to a user. The revenue generated through the leasing activities would be utilized by Ft. Bliss for maintenance and environmental remediation. Although this is not standard Army procedure, the precedent was established when a tract of Ft. Bliss land was leased to the Girl Scouts of America. The government process to return excess land is as follows:

(page 230 of 316)

2.4.4 U.S. Army Ft. Bliss, Judge Advocate General

Interviewee: Mr. William Wilcox, JAG
Location: Judge Advocate Generals Office, Ft. Bliss
Address: Ft. Bliss, Texas
Date: November 17, 1997

2.4.4.1 Interview Summary

NEPA regulations will have to be satisfied before a decision on how the land is to be used in the future can be made. The Counsel of Environmental Quality (CEQ) specifies that the Army cannot limit the options for how land can be used, but the future land use scenarios should be reasonable and appropriate. The Army does not get any financial return from land that is labeled as excess and given up. Land that is leased for commercial developers is not disposed as excess land, but is retained by the Army. Historically, the Army has not been in the business to make money from land deals. Leasing out land is not standard operating practice. -

(page 231 of 316)

2.4.5 City of El Paso

Interviewee: Ms. Rosemary A. Staley, Chief Planner
Location: El Paso City Hall
Address: 2 Civic Center Plaza, 8th, El Paso, TX 79901
Date: November 18, 1997

2.4.5.1 Interview Summary

The City of El Paso Year 2010 Land Use Projections, includes the entire Castner Range area in the major parks, recreation areas and open space land use category. The plan states that part of the Castner Range military land is proposed as an addition to the Franklin Mountains State Park. The city and county have both discussed acquiring land in the eastern plain of Castner Range for public facilities such as a coliseum, arena, stadium, etc. There are no plans for this type of facility at the present time. The city has tried to focus the development of city-wide cultural activities to the downtown area. There is more than adequate land within the proximity of the existing urbanized area of El Paso to provide for growth well beyond the 2010 Comprehensive Plan envelope. The relatively small area of land included in the eastern plain within Castner Range would have minimal impact on the overall development potential of the city.

(page 232 of 316)

2.4.6 Franklin Mountains State Park

- Interviewee: Mr. Ronald W. Hillin,
Assistant Park Manager
Franklin Mountains State Park
Location: Franklin Mountains State Park El Paso Office
Address: P.O. Box 200, Canutillo, TX 79835
Date: November 19, 1997

2.4.6.1 Interview Summary

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission wants to include all of Castner Range as part of the Franklin Mountains State Park, and has included Castner range in the future plans for the park. The state legislation establishing the state park includes the addition of all of Castner Range that the Army would deed to the state subject to ordnance cleanup. Therefore, the property could be added with no additional legislative consent. The Army tried to give the state all of Castner Range in the early 1990s, but the state could not accept the land because of the ordnance problem. The state park believes that they are the only agency able to provide the stewardship that is required to maintain the integrity of the land and its archeological and ecological sites. The state parks office does not seem to know what the Army is planning for Castner Range. They believe that the Army may deed the mountain portion of the range to the state park and retain the eastern plain for development. They believe that the eastern plain should also be deeded to the park and preserved from development because it has very individual and unique environmental characteristics that should be preserved and enhanced.

(page 233 of 316)

2.4.7 Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

Interviewee: Mr. George Krenzinski, Project Manager, Infrastructure
Location: Via Telephone
Address: Austin, Texas
Date: January 8, 1998

2.4.7.1 Interview Summary

The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department wants to add all of Castner Range to the existing Franklin Mountains State Park. They are particularly concerned about the eastern plain and hope that it will be included in the area ultimately offered to the State.

(page 234 of 316)

Other excerpts:

3.1.3 Removal Responsibility

Contracted removal actions to reduce the risk of exposure to ordnance are typically coordinated through the Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville District. That agency is responsible for preparation and negotiation of scopes of services, fees, and schedules, and for retaining organizations skilled in the removal of ordnance to provide the removal services. Also, they are responsible for coordinating public information concerning to local government and the public at large as to the activities being performed. Day-to-day operations are executed and managed by the contractor in accordance with a Work Plan and Health and Safety Plans, which are approved by the ACOE, Huntsville District prior to the start of work.

(page 237 of 316)

The report analyzed many institutional control options under Access Control and Behavior Modification.

3.3.3 Notice

Appropriate notice can exert a strong influence on one's behavior. When notice of ordnance contamination is given, it can affect the expectations of potential users. Appropriate uses can be sought, and the land may still be used for economic gain. However, the contamination must be considered in the design and use of any site improvements or activities. Notices can be placed on a property in at least three ways: deed notification/restriction, notification during any property transfers, and notification during any permitting process. The property within Castner Range has never been sold and is still owned entirely by the federal government. Any future reuse of the land would be subject to the GSA excess land process. The exception to this process may be the potential leasing of portions of the land for development. In either instance, future use of the land may be restricted through the three notice methods.

(pages 239 and 240 of 316)

4.1.2 Alternatives Not Recommended

Access control via signage, fencing and land-use restrictions are not recommended. Signage exists and has proved of limited value in preventing access. Fencing the entire range is economically and physically prohibitive. Fencing only portions that are easily accessible is not considered a viable alternative because of the ease of circumventing the fences and inability to maintain fencing. Notice (via deed notification, providing notice during property transfers, and providing notice during permitting) is of no value because the land is most likely to be deeded in its entirety to a public. The establishment of a web site on the Internet provides information only to those who access the web page and is considered of limited value.

(page 251 of 316)

The report includes Meeting notes from 17 thru 19 Nov 97 and some are interesting:

Jean Offutt was briefed with respect to the OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report. Ms. Offutt realizes that it may be easiest to turn Castner Range into a park because the Army must provide the funding for clearance prior to turning the land over to outside interests. It was discussed that the Army would be responsible to provide clearance if any UXO is discovered after the land is transferred.

(page 259 of 316)

It was discussed that the PAO gets numerous calls each year from members of the public who wish to hike in Castner Range. The public is generally interested in what activities occur in Castner Range. It is believed by the PAO that developers would welcome an opportunity to develop Castner Range. However, in 10 years only one Realtor has called the PAO to inquire about developing Castner Range.

(page 230 of 316)

Bill Wilcox stated that the NEPA regulation had to be satisfied prior to a decision being made on how the land at Castner Range would be used in the future. Mr. Wilcox also indicated that the Counsel of Environmental Quality (CEQ) specifies that the Army cannot limit the options for how the land can be used, but that future land use scenarios should be reasonable and appropriate. Phil Nixon responded that the OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report would be a document that summarizes all the information that is known about the environmental setting of Castner Range; summarize the results of the UXO investigations that have been performed; and, investigate clearance alternatives. Therefore, the OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report will be a document that may satisfy the NEPA regulations (depending on the final future land use decision).

Phil Nixon asked about the difference in the Army's liability if the land went to the state instead of the public. Mr. Wilcox responded that the liability would not change much because the U.S. government would always be responsible to remove any UXO that is discovered (no matter who owns the land), and the U.S. government would be the main named party in any lawsuit since it has the "deepest pockets". Mr. Wilcox agreed that the Army has a tremendous liability under the current situation where the public uses the uncleared land. The warning signs are helpful in that they warn people of the potential dangers, but these signs do not restrict public access. Once cleared, the liability issue would still remain, but the potential for an incident would be reduced due to the clearance.

(page 260 of 316)

Mr. Wilcox closed the discussion by stating that the OE Characterization and Cost Analysis Report should be written with NEPA compliance in mind to help the Army decide how the land at Castner Range should be used.

(page 261 of 316)

The Franklin Mountain Wilderness Coalition could be an excellent source of information about Castner Range. The El Paso Archeological Society, Cactus and Rock Club, Herpetology Society, Native Plant Society, Sierra Club, Audubon Society and Wilderness Preservation Committee all have information about the area that correspond to their particular interests. With an introduction by Mr. Sproul, we could have access to these groups.

(page 268 of 316)

Ms. Staley said that residents of El Paso have been using Castner Range for recreational activities for over thirty (30) years. There would be a major outcry from the residents if the area was fenced or access otherwise impeded.

(page 270 of 316)

Appendix B is several letters from FMWC (thanks to John Sproul) including this portion of a letter to then-Congressman Ron Coleman:

While we hope it would not happen, the mechanisms summarized above carry with them the risk that the federal agencies involved might decide not to convey Castner Range to Texas Parks and Wildlife or to convey only an inadequate portion of the area. A more certain avenue would be statutory direction from Congress to convey the land for Franklin Mountains State Park.

A precedent for such direction can be found in the Act that created the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in California. It included a provision to ensure that the Presidio, the large military installation in San Francisco, would eventually become part of the recreation area. Sec. 3(f) of that Act (86 Stat. 1299) reads:

"When all or any substantial portion of the remainder of the Presidio is determined by the Department of Defense to be excess to its needs, such lands shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary [of the Interior] for purposes of this Act. The Secretary shall grant a permit for continued use and occupancy for that portion of said Fort Point Coast guard Station necessary for activities of the Coast Guard."

A similar provision might be introduced for Castner Range, either as a free-standing bill or as a rider to another piece of legislation. You, of course, are a far better judge than we of the advisability of either course of action. In any event, we believe the legislative approach deserves your consideration; it would be a way to make certain Castner Range becomes part of Franklin Mountains State Park.

(page 289 of 316)

John also included an analysis of unique floral components presented by Dr Richard Worthington in April 1983. He references the University of TX Rare Plant Study Center and lists 10 species that, in TX, only appear in the Franklin Mountains. If any of these species are endangered, might we have legal requirements to preserve Castner?

A letter from the TX State Parks and Wildlife Department dated 2 March 1998 by Robert L. Singleton, Jr., AIA, Project Planner, says: "Sneed Pincushion Cactus (Listed as Endangered, both Federal and State), which is found in the Castner Range has only been located in one other area of the park." (page 308 of 316)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. **Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared for U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss Directorate of the Environment, Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico 79916.* Vol. I (Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement). Fort Worth, TX: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, July 1998. 12, xii, 8/18/etc. pp. (ca. 400 non-continuous).

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. **Fort Bliss, Texas and New Mexico, Mission and Master Plan Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared for: Directorate of the Environment, U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss.* Vol. III: Comment Response Document. Fort Worth, TX: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, December, 2000, vi, 212, 3 pp. [Vol. II contains no information on Castner Range, so Vol. II will not be cited further here.]

TLI Solutions, Inc. **Final Site Inspection Report Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.* Golden, CO: TLI Solutions, Inc. January, 2001. Xi, ca. 400 pp.

Fort Bliss 2001. **Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.* “Prepared for the Directorate of [the] Environment Conservation Division, Fort Bliss, Texas.

Fort Bliss 2001. **Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan.* “Prepared for the Directorate of [the] Environment Conservation Division, Fort Bliss, Texas.

TLI Solutions, Inc. **Stakeholder Draft Site Inspection Report Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.* Golden, CO: TLI Solutions, Inc. January, 2001. xi, ca. 400 pp.

**Final Site Inspection Report Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.* Golden, CO: TLI Solutions, Inc. March 2001. xi, ca. 400 pp.

Anderson, Jennifer. **“Conservation Partnerships with the Military.” Land Trust Alliance, Fall 2005.* Six pages. Two inserts: “How Do Army Installations Protect Buffer Lands?” by Christina Soto, p. 16, and “Resources” (n.a.), p. 20.

**Final Site Inspection Report. Fort Bliss, Texas. [MMRP] Site Inspection Munitions Response Sites.* Jan. 2007 [initial]/April 2007 [revision]. Prepared for USACE, Omaha District. 98 pp.

**Final Site Inspection Report, Fort Bliss, Texas. [MMRP] Site Inspection Munitions Response Sites.* Jan. 2007 [initial]/April 2007 [revision]. Prepared for USACE, Omaha District. 98 pp.

**Final Site Inspection Report. Fort Bliss, Texas. [MMRP] Site Inspection Munitions Response Sites.* Jan. 2007 [initial]/April 2007 [revision]. Prepared for USACE, Omaha District. 98 pp.

N.a. **“Preserving Castner Range: Conservation Conveyance at Fort Bliss.”* Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition, November, 2007. Two unnumbered pages. Frontera Castner packet 02 Conservation Conveyance white paper.pdf

N.a. No title. Frontera Castner OEA Grant Scope of Work Mod1 101011_Dec 2011.pdf (November, 2007)

N.a. *"Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan 2008-2012. Fort Bliss." Seven scattered pages (nos. 38, 103, 108, 124, 144-146) in a printout I was given—I disremember by whom—at a RAB meeting in 2013 or thereabouts. Each page contains one or more reference(s) to Castner Range, often in the form of pre-2008 publications cited. Examples: Bilbo, Michael. *A High Elevation Archaeological Survey of Castner Range, Ft. Bliss, TX* (1976); Gerald, Rex. *Range Dam Project Castner Range-Fort Bliss Military Reservation, El Paso County, Texas: A Preliminary Evaluation of the Historic, Cultural, and Environmental Significance of the Ruins of the Prehistoric Northgate Site Community* (1972). Gerald, Rex. *Preliminary Reconnaissance to Evaluate the Cultural and Historic Resources of the Easternmost Two Sections of Castner Range, Fort Bliss, El Paso County, Texas* (1975). Perez, Elia, et al. *Archaeological Investigations of Seven Historical Sites within Fort Bliss, Texas* (2003).

2009

Military Munitions Response Program MMRP July 09.pdf (But that poorly reproduced copy is not the one to consult. See, instead, the "hand-out" copy that was distributed at the July 28, 2009 MMRP meeting.)

*Frontera Castner Reyes meetings July 25, 2009 with Reyes and staff in DC.doc

*Stakeholder Meeting Military Munitions Response Program Fort Bliss, Texas 28 July 2009. (Copy handed out at the "stakeholder kick-off meeting to introduce the Military Munitions Response Program ... at Fort Bliss ... on 28 July 2009, at Embassy Suites, in El Paso, Texas.")

*Fort Bliss Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment EIS. 2 pages. "Figure 1-1. Project Setting"—a map of the entire five-plus Castner/Bliss/McGregor Range/White Sands area—and "Figure 2-1. Fort Bliss Training Complex Divisions," a map of the eight Fort Bliss components, which are: Castner Range, Cantonment Area, South Training Areas, Doña Ana Training Areas, Tularosa Basin Portion of McGregor Range, Southeast McGregor Range, Otero Mesa South of Hwy 508, and Otero Mesa North of Hwy 508. "Current Structures on Castner Range MRS Fort Bliss, Texas [map]. MRS Location Fort Bliss, Texas [map].

*Print-out of an October 7, 2009 letter from Keith Landreth (Chief, Environmental Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss) to John Moses (Regional Director, Texas Parks and Wildlife, El Paso State Parks Complex) inviting him "to participate in a series of Technical Project Planning meetings (TPP) for stakeholders and interested parties to discuss the [WAA {Wide Area Assessment}] project ... on 16 October 2009."

*Fort Bliss Primary Stakeholder [sic] List Updated: 13 October 2009. A five-page product of TLI Solutions, Inc., "... a premier provider of environmental consulting services—with particular expertise in munitions/ordnance removal, hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste (HTRW)

remediation, federal and state regulatory compliance, and information and data management.
..."

*Print-out of four-message email correspondence—announcing an Oct. 14, 2009 RAB meeting and an Oct. 15 [sic, "16"], 2009 MMRP meeting—between Sylvia Borunda Firth, then-Director of Governmental Affairs, Chief of Staff Office of the Mayor, City of El Paso, Susie Byrd, then-City Representative for District 2, the late Judy Ackerman (Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition), and me.

Castner Range bulldozing prohibited WAA meeting 2009.msg Entitled "Castner Range Update Oct 2009," this USPS-mailed-out sheet announces two meetings: RAB (Oct. 14, 2009) and WAA (Oct. 16, 2009). (Accompanying and stapled to this one-page announcement is a half-page yellow sheet "Draft Agenda—Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board, 6:30 pm 14 October 2009—El Paso, Texas" announcement of its own.)

*Restoration Authority Board (RAB) Meeting 14 Oct 2009 Notes. These "notes," taken and then distributed by the late Judy Ackerman, summarize this RAB's two main presentational topics: the WAA and the MMRP, and how Castner Range is engaged with each.

*Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection for Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas Restoration Advisory Board [RAB] Meeting 14 October 2009. An unnumbered 27-page presentation.

*Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Site Inspection (SI) Technical Project Planning [TPP] Meeting Agenda 15 October 2009. See especially the agenda's final item, "3:45-4:30 p.m. Review and Summary of TPP Results: SI fieldwork summary, Public meetings, ROE's ['Rights of Entry'], Schedule, Action Items."

*Department of the Army / United States Army Environmental Command / United States Army Corps of Engineers / Fort Bliss. Technical Project Planning Meeting / Military Munitions Response Program / Fort Bliss, Texas. 15 October 2009.

*Print-out of an Oct. 15, 2009 email from Scott Cutler to Mike Gaglio, Judy Ackerman and Richard Teschner regarding what extent WAA actions would be invasive, i.e., plant-destructive.

*Military Munitions Response Program [MMRP] Site Inspection for Fort Bliss / El Paso, Texas / Technical Project Planning Meeting / 15 October 2009. Unnumbered p. 10 states: "As a result of the 2000 SI ['Site Inspection'] the Castner Range was recommended for RI/FS ['Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study']."

*Wide Area Assessment Technology Demonstration to Characterize Munitions Density at Closed Castner Firing Range. Technical Project Planning [TPP] Meeting 16 October 2009. Site History. Site Location. Previous Site Investigations. Ordnance Found on Castner Range. Natural and Cultural Resources. Military Munitions Response Program ("Castner Range = Munitions Response Site [MRS] within the MMRP"), CERCLA Process, Technology Demonstration Project Objectives, Characterization Challenge, Full Coverage: 'Mag and Flag', Technology

Demonstration, Project Purpose, WAA Definition, What is not included [‘Decisions about future land use ... about transferring the property ... about developing the property’], What is included [‘Collecting data about the distribution and density of munitions on Closed Castner Range. Demonstrating costs and benefits of innovative detection & discrimination technologies ...’], Project Approach, WAA Technologies & Data Derived From Each Technology, Site Coverage, Lidar [‘Light Detecting and Ranging’] & Orthophotography, Lidar & Orthophotography Study Questions, Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry, Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry Study Questions, Proposed Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry Survey Area, Towed Away, Towed Electromagnetic Induction Study Questions, Man-Portable, Man-Portable Electromagnetic Induction Study Questions, Proposed Man-Portable Survey Area, Establish Transect Spacing using Visual Sampling Plan (VSP), Optimized Transect Spacing, Determining Target Size/Shape, Target Size-Shape: Factor 1, Target Size-Shape: Factor 2, Determining Target Size/Shape, VSP Data Inputs, Target Orientation, Data Requirements to Address Study Questions [two sections], Site Preparation, Industry Standard Objects, Anomaly Identification & Reacquisition, Intrusive Investigation, Project Schedule, Future TPP Meetings.

Frontera Castner WAA TPP October 16 2009 meeting.pdf . “A stakeholder Technical Project Planning meeting to describe the Wide Area Assessment (WAA) Technology Demonstration to Characterize Munitions Density at Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, was held at 1:00 pm on 16 October 2009, at the Radisson Hotel in El Paso, Texas.” “The 2007 Site Investigation (SI) Report recommended the site to move forward to Remedial Investigation” (p. 3). “Mr. Helmlinger discussed the project purpose, defining WAA, and providing a brief description on the types of technologies planned for use on Castner Range.” (p. 3) See in particular p. 7’s third full paragraph.

“Castner Range to test new way to remove ordnance.” *El Paso Inc. News* October 19, 2009.htm

*Short eighteen-paragraph references to many of the topics brought up at the October 16, 2009 WAA TPP meetings. October 19, 2009.

*DEIS [‘Draft Environmental Impact Statement’] for Fort Bliss Army Growth and Force Realignment. October 28, 2009 mailing to subscription list. No “Castner” references. Focus: “... describes the environmental consequences of actions that need to be taken by Fort Bliss in support of the recent Grow the Army initiative.”

*TLI Solutions, Inc. *Final Historical Records Review, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas*. October __?__, 2009.

*Castner Range: WAA Site Characterization Update. Nov. 25, 2009. Email sent to subscribers. “The US Army is currently performing various activities at the Fort Bliss Castner Range ... as part of the Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration Project. The survey team is marking site boundaries, the UXO technicians are laying ground transects, and the geophysicists are installing the Instrument Verification Strip (IVS). ... this work will continue until 18 December 2009, when crews will demobilize for the holidays.” (Sent by Victoria Kantsios, URS Corporation, Arlington, VA.)

Dec. 1, 2009. Fort Bliss MMRP SI Inspection Final TPP Meeting Notes. Attachments: Final_Meeting Notes_TPP Meeting 101509.doc . “The attached file contains the Final meeting notes for the ... TPP Meeting held on October 15, 2009 to discuss the Site inspection for the Former Maneuver Area Munitions Response (MR) site at Fort Bliss. ... (Sent by Mary Franquemont, TLI Solutions, Inc.) Pages 3-6 sum up the Oct. 15 meeting, but do not mention Castner Range.

*Dec. 20, 2009. Judy Ackerman notifies recipients of a “public meeting on 14 Jan 2010,” mentioned in Victoria Kantsios’ Nov. 25, 2009 email, which Judy includes in her notification.

2010

*January 11, 2010. *Site Inspection under the Military Munitions Response Program. Stakeholder Draft Site Inspection Work Plan.* Contract No.: GS-10F-0343S, Delivery Order No W91238-08-F-0011. Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas. Appendix A: Field Sampling Plan.--Appendix B: Meeting Notes from the Technical Project Planning Meeting [of Oct 15, 2009]--Appendix C: Accident Prevention Plan. Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspections, Fort Bliss, Texas. --Appendix D: Ordnance Contact Report. --Appendix E: Electronic Files (“Military Munitions Response Program December 2009” and “Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspections: Final Site Inspection Generic Work Plan. Revised June 2006.”)

Frontera Castner Bliss EIS Castner mitigation letter from Mike Gaglio January, 2010.doc This Jan. 11, 2010 letter was sent to John F. Barrera, NEPA Program Manager, directorate of Public Works’ Environmental Division, Fort Bliss. The letter requests “that Fort Bliss actively seek permanent preservation of Castner Range as natural open space via a conservation conveyance as authorized by The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act⁴ of FY2003.”

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Stakeholder Draft Site Inspection Work Plan Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District.* Golden, CO: TLI Solutions, Inc. January 2010. iv, ca. 200 pp.

**Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies to Characterize Munitions Density. Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, TX.* Technical Project Planning Meeting, 14 January 2010. 44 pp. Many photographs, especially of Lidar and orthophotography, Lidar surface models, hole groups, a visual sampling plan, geophysical system verification, instrument verification, industry standard objects, ground-based IVS, airborne IVS, helicopter-Borne magnetometry, ground-base geophysics and the like. “Terrain is tougher than we thought (no towed-array; site survey very difficult). Lots of magnetic noise. ... Finding lots of munitions debris.” Plans to “delineate target areas and non-target areas,” “investigate the nature of MEC in target areas,” conduct “intrusive investigation,” etc. “Future TPP Meetings” are scheduled for June 2010, October 2010, February 2011 and June 2011.

*March 2010 [no “day” included in this document’s date]. *Draft. Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration Work Plan for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas. Appendix I: Explosives*

Site Plan. This 26-page variously-page-numbered piece precedes—by two years—the “March 14, 2012. Draft Final, Wide Area Assessment [WAA] Field Demonstration Report for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas ...” document, which we quote from and summarize at length (on over 3 ½ pages) as the third item in the “2012” section of the present annotated bibliography. What’s of note in the present “March 2010” Draft Final is the following: “List of [Forty] Acronyms,” a “Site” description, a brief “Anticipated Dates” section (“Start of field activities: September 2010. Project completion: September 2011”), “Site Background and Current Conditions” and the “Scope of the WAA Field Demonstration” (two pages), which cites “[s]ome of the activities [needed] for completing the field activities.” Among them are the following: “Field recon. Site delineation and marking. Site preparation (vegetation removal and transect marking). Installation of Instrument Validation Strips ... and production see items. Orthophotography/lidar field demonstration. Helicopter-borne magnetometry field demonstration. Ground-based geophysics field demonstration. Target anomaly selection. Anomaly reacquisition. Intrusive investigation. MEC disposal”. See also “7.0 Safety Criteria,” which cites “Munitions found on the Closed Castner Firing Range,” “Methods of Disposal” (“The Senior Unexploded Ordnance Supervisor (SUXOS), UXO Safety Officer (UXOSO), UXO Quality Control Specialist (UXOQCS), and the Ordnance Explosive Safety Specialist (OESS) will make the final explosive safety status determination for each MEC item discovered”); see also “p. I-5” for lengthy enumerations of who will supervise which disposal activities, etc. “Maps” and “References” (pp. I-6 and I-7) complete the section, while maps and photographs—four pages—plus three pages of “Fragmentation Data Review Form[.]s” finish up the document.

*Department of the Army. US Army Installation Management Command. Headquarters, United States Army Garrison, Fort Bliss. 1 Pershing Road. Fort Bliss, Texas 79916-3803. Letter dated May 13, 2010 from the “Office of the Garrison Command” to “Mr. Scott Cutler, President, Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition.” Key statement: “Only after the site is cleaned up, will the U.S. Army make a determination whether Castner Range is or is not excess to the Army’s needs. Also, please consider that the U.S. General Services Administration would require the Army to remove any hazards associated with unexploded ordnance on Castner Range, as required by CERCLA, before an excess status can be obtained.”

*U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Final Site Inspection Work Plan Fort Bliss Texas. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District*. Golden, CO: TLI Solutions, Inc. May, 2010. iv, ca. 200 pp.

*May 21, 2010. *Military Munitions Response Program. Final Site Inspection Work Plan. Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas*. Contract No.: GS-10F-0168J, Delivery Order No. W91238-08-F-0011 Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas. Appendix A: Field Sampling Plan.--Appendix B: Meeting Notes from the Technical Project Planning Meeting.--Appendix C: Accident Prevention Plan.--Appendix D: Ordnance Contact Form.--Appendix E: Copies of Right of Entry Permits.--Appendix F: Electronic Files: “Military Munitions Response Program. Final Site Inspection Work Plan, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas, May 2010.” Response to comments. Draft Document Review Record.

n.a. **Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration Work Plan for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District U.S. Army Environmental Command. USACE Contract Number: W912QR-08-D-0011. Arlington, VA: URS Group, Inc., June, 2010.*

June 16, 2010. *Technical Project Planning Meeting 3. Fifty-two pages (unnumbered), each containing two in-color photographs for a total of 102. Purpose: "Collecting data about the distribution and density of munitions on Closed Castner Range. Demonstrating costs and benefits of applying proven technologies in innovative ways." Main conclusion from the "Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry: Preliminary Results" photograph: "Data do not support conclusions about density and distribution of ferrous material at the site." Another conclusion: "We don't have a lot of confidence in this [helicopter-borne Mag Anomaly Density exploration]. It's more related to geology and not ordnance location." More trustworthy results from the northern portion of the Range than from the southern. "Ground-Based Geophysics: Preliminary Results" examined, leading to these conclusions: "Production rates higher than anticipated. Litter mode increases levels of uncertainty/error in DGM data. Reproducibility of transect data is surprisingly good." Overall conclusion: Hand-held megameters good, helicopters bad. (Photo-maps reveal the most highly contaminated areas.) "Incremental Sampling" is proposed.

Frontera Castner WAA TPP #3 June 16, 2010 Meeting.pdf This is a "Stakeholder Technical Project Planning Meeting [reporting on a] Wide Area Assessment Technology Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, Texas." Personnel from the URS Corporation—Victoria Kantsios, Brian Helmlinger—made presentations. Focus on "helicopter-borne magnetometry results." (See immediately-antecedent item [June 16, 2010].)

June 17, 2010. *Printout of email from John Moses to Steve Bonner and seven Castner Range campaigners (Judy Ackerman et al.). Excellent summary of the previous day's WAA TPP meeting. Main conclusion (highly pessimistic): "... risk could never be adequately reduced to make public access safe. This was not part of the study but it did show up in the opinions being offered."

August 4, 2010. **Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies to Characterize Munitions Density. Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, TX. Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, 4 August 2010. 41 pp. Agenda: Project Team. Review project objectives. Helicopter-borne Magnetometry Results. Ground-based Geophysical Results. Weight of Evidence. Intrusive Investigation. Schedule Update & Questions. Project Purpose[s]: Field test the WAA methods and conclusions included in the Wide Area Assessment Cost-Benefit Analysis: Active Army Military Munitions Response Program (USAEC 2009). College site characterization data using a variety of WAA methods in a manner to ensure usable data for subsequent MMRP investigations (i.e., RI/FS). "What is not included ... Remedial Investigation. Decision about future land use. Decisions about transferring the property. Decisions about developing the property. Decisions about mapping individual ordnance items. Decisions about cleaning-up all the munitions." "What is included ... Collecting data about the distribution and density of*

munitions on Closed Castner Range. Demonstrating costs and benefits of applying proven technologies in innovative ways.” “Ground-Based Geophysics: Preliminary Results. Able to characterize nearly all terrain up to 18% slope. Production rates higher than anticipated. Litter mode increases levels of uncertainty/error in DGM data. Reproducibility of transect data is surprisingly good.” Eleven photomaps, starting with “Historical Range Fans and LIDAR Areas of Interest” and continuing the focus on LIDAR (‘Light Detection and Ranging’). Photo-maps from 1994, 1997 and the important “2004 Surface and Subsurface Clearance and DGM Density Data.” The following six items are Aug. 4, 2010 derivatives:

August 4, 2010. *Restoration Authority Board 4 Aug 2010 Meeting notes, which sum up the presentations based on the foregoing Aug. 4 item (*Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies ...*).

August 4, 2010. *RAB 2010 Magnetometry, hand-held liters and other techno tools.doc These are the “4 Aug 2010 Meeting notes” cited just above and stored in the present document’s author’s cybernetic files.

August 4, 2010. *Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board. Agenda for the above-cited RAB meeting.

August 5, 2010. *Email exchange (anent the above-cited meeting) starting with Judy Ackerman with two informative responses from John Moses, who writes (inter alia): “.... [L]ast night’s URS presentation was a 1 hour summary of the 6 hour WAA meeting held in June at the Radisson. Also, sounded like URS was being coerced into an interim update on the intrusive investigation ... I didn’t sense that Frontera et al. were being asked to contribute their knowledge on conservations conveyances to the next agenda.”

August 6, 2010. *Teschner’s response to Mike Gaglio’s email contains a written message which Teschner suggests that Gaglio send to Sylvia Waggoner, stressing Frontera’s expertise in matters related to conservation conveyances.

August 10, 2010. *A thank-you mass emailing from Victoria Kantsios, URS Corporation (Arlington, VA), attaching the Aug. 4’s meeting’s minutes and presentations.

September 24, 2010. Summary (from <http://aec.army.mil/usaec/cleanup/mmrp00.html>) in one page of the “Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP).” Lists “MMRP Safety Education Campaign Products” and how and why they are put to use.

September 24, 2010. *A URSCorp-initiated “Meeting invitation: Technical Project Planning for Wide Area Assessment of Castner Range” from Vicki Hamilton, Chief, Environmental Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss. The TPP-for-WAA meeting “is scheduled for 9 1.m.-1 p.m. on 20 October 2010” in El Paso.

October 20, 2010, 9:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. *Agenda. Stakeholder Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting #4 Castner Range WAA Technology Demonstration 20 October 2010. Two

separate but consecutive meetings: (1) “Wide Area Assessment Technology Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, Texas” (9 a.m.), and (2) “Multi-Incremental Sampling Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, Texas” (11 a.m.), both at the Radisson Hotel. In the separate reports of each meeting, substantive amounts of highly useful information on the following topics and others: “the progress on the WAA technology demonstration project since the last Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting held June 20210, the fact that the “URS Corporation [is] the prime contractor for the project,” that while the “WAA has been applied to other DoD installations (primarily Air Force and Navy) ... those efforts did not use all the available technologies at one time, as is being done at Castner Range,” that beginning the Remedial Investigation (RI) on Castner Range “has been ‘loosely’ scheduled for 2015,” that the URS Corporation “was not involved [with the land-clearance activities that took place to construct the US Border Patrol facility in the far southeastern corner of Castner Range] and has not seen any data associated with that project,” that URS “was not aware of any research and development efforts underway to use UAVs [unmanned aerial vehicles] for munitions response applications,” that the two technologies used to differentiate metallic anomalies from geological conditions were “first, a magnetometer [which] is a passive system (e.g., a metal detector) that detects ferrous material” while the “second technology, electromagnetic induction (EMI), is different from the magnetometer in its ability to detect non-ferrous metals. Instead of a passive sensor of disturbances in the earths [sic] magnetic field, the EMI sensor transmits an electromagnetic signal that induces a field in metallic objects and then measures the induced field ... [and while URS is] often unable to differentiate geology from ferrous items using the magnetometer, [we] could differentiate between them relatively well with the EMI.” And so on and so forth. Two veritable treasures of Castner Range research!

A 56-page handout—*“Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies to Characterize Munitions Density ...”—accompanied the 9:00 a.m. presentation. Agenda: “Review project objectives. Intrusive Investigation Approach. Cultural Resources Projection. Intrusive Procedures. Demolition Operations. Materials Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard (MPPEH). Progress to Date and What We’re Finding. Schedule Update & Questions.” Page 9’s “What is included ...” lists the following: Collecting data about the distribution and density of munitions on Closed Castner Range” and “Demonstrating costs and benefits of applying proven technologies in innovative ways”; page 8’s “What is not included ...” lists this: “Remedial Investigation,” “Decisions about future land use,” “Decisions about developing the property,” “Decisions about mapping individual ordnance items,” and “Decisions about cleaning-up [sic] all the munitions.” Page 10’s “Project Scope” lists the following procedures as “Complete. Results discussed at TPP #2”: “Site Reconnaissance. Lidar & Orthophotography. Site Prep: Survey, Run VSP, Mark Transects, Install IVS.” The same “Project Scope” lists these procedures as “Complete. Results discussed at TPP #3. Helicopter-borne Magnetometry [which “worked well elsewhere but not at Castner Range because of its topography,” according to one speaker]. Ground-based Geophysics (towed array & man-portable EMI). Analog Data Collection.” The following procedure—“Intrusive Investigation” is listed as “Ongoing,” while the remaining are

listed as “Yet to do”: “Project Reports: WAA Field Demonstration Report for Castner Range. Revised WAA Cost-Benefit Analysis: Active Army MMRP. WAA Cost Estimating Equations.” Most of the above are complemented or supplemented by lengthy material appearing on the report’s remaining pages. See, in particular, “Intrusive Investigation: Purpose” (p. 12), “Target Delineation” (p. 14), the maps appearing on pp. 16-17 and 19, p. 26’s “Instrument Set: MineLab Explorer II Hand-held Sensor,” p. 32’s “Step 4: Stop Digging Decision,” p. 39’s “Overview: Demo Operations,” p. 47’s “MD [‘munitions debris’]: Why is it managed so strictly?,” p. 51’s “Progress to Date” (which states, inter alia, that areas 4 and 10 are “done,” i.e., investigated *in toto*), and unnumbered p. 53’s “Summary Data [as of Fri., Oct. 15, 2010],” which reports this: “Anomalies investigated: 216. Objects excavated 504. MEC: 0. About 50% munitions debris and 50% non-munitions scrap. Approximate weight MD: 48 lbs., Non-MD scrap: 115 lbs.”

A 27-page handout—*“Munitions Constituents Sampling ...”—accompanied the 11:00 a.m. presentation. Of special interest are the following: p. 13’s “Stratified Sampling Area[s],” which divide the Range into low-, medium- and high-density MEC and UXO concentrations; two data-related pages (23, 24) respectively entitled “Data Screening” and “Data Screening What does this mean?” (Answer: “We are going to compare our results two ways: —Against TCEQ [Texas Commission on Environmental Quality-] established levels (Protective Concentration Levels (PCLs)) including background for metals —Ecological benchmarks if we have detections[.]” See also p. 26’s “Schedule & Way Ahead,” which contains the following dates and activities: “October-November 2010: Develop Work Plan and Quality Assurance Project Plan ... February 2011: Soil Sampling [“accompanied by technicians, because the UXO has not been fully removed,” as the presenters remarked] ... March-May 2011: Analytical testing and report writing.”

RAB [Restoration Advisory Board] Minutes Nov. 10, 2010 MMRP, technology, time-line predictions etc. doc Chief presenter was Victoria Kantsios of the URS Corporation, whose report contained much of the information that had been made available at the two October 20, 2010 meetings—9 a.m. and 11 a.m.—details of which are given in the immediately-antecedent paragraphs. Highlights from Ms. Kantsios’ RAB presentation: “URS had to focus their characterization efforts on areas used for munitions-related activities and eliminate areas with no indication of munitions use.” (Unnumbered p. 1) “... the purpose of the intrusive investigation was to verify target and non-target areas and to identify areas of high and low density anomalies. [Developed was] a hypothesis using statistically based sampling [which] determined that the non-target areas were less than or equal to one item per acre. The goal [of] the study was to prioritize target areas.” “... very detailed standard operating procedures [were] followed during demolition operations. With a few exceptions ... the procedures required that the MECs be detonated in place.” “After the detonation, the team collected all munitions debris [which] were recorded on a white board and classified according to Department of Defense (DOD) management procedures.”

Franklin Castner Ackerman Judy 28-page notes on a multitude of “Franklins” topics through 2010.doc These “notes” constitute a veritable day-by-day (and sometimes hour-by-hour) narration by the always-hardworking Judy Ackerman of the great extent to which she herself was involved in the 2008, 2009 and 2010 phases of the long campaign to conserve Castner Range, especially—as was projected at the time—by means of a “conservation easement” negotiated by the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition and the Frontera Land Alliance at that time. Cited are her contacts with notables such as then-U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, U.S. Senator John Cornyn, then-Congressman Silvestre Reyes and his many staffers, then-State Senator Elliot Shapleigh, then-State Representative Pat Haggerty, then-City Representative Beto O’Rourke, then-State Rep. Paul Moreno, various U.S. Army notables, then-County Commissioner Veronica Escobar, top figures at the Marstel-Day company, then-City Attorney Sylvia Borunda Firth, then-Assistant District Attorney Joe Moody, Frontera Land Alliance leaders Mike Gaglio and Scott Cutler, then-Fort Bliss Commanding General Ed Manning, then-Fort Bliss Garrison Commander Joseph A. Simonelli Jr.—the list goes on and on.

November 22, 2010. I was appointed to the Fort Bliss RAB for an initial period of three years.

December 14, 2010. *Email from Joel Reyes, Program Manager, Installation Restoration Program (IRP), Multi Media Compliance Branch, DPW-Environmental Division, Fort Bliss announcing who was elected to three-year terms on the Fort Bliss RAB, and that “for our next RAB meeting in February 2011, personnel from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ... have accepted our invitation to present their final Site Inspection (SI) Report for a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), which cover[s] areas no longer owned by the Army located east of US 54 and parts of [the] North Hills [neighborhood] that were once part of Castner Range.

Frontera Castner Bliss Castner Range documents from 2005 through 2010.msg An email from Steve Bonner (SONRI Corp.) to all members of the “Castner Working Group” stating “Ft. Bliss has, finally, responded to our request for documents on Castner Range produced since 2005” available at <https://www.bliss.army/mil/About%20Ft%20Bliss/NEW-EIS/Documents-EIS.htm>

Rydberg, Donna R. *Analytical Report. Job Number: 280-8261-1. Job Description: Fort Bliss Texas. For: Techlaw, Inc. Golden, CO: 80401. Dec. 16, 2010. 2,347 pp. [“Reagent Traceability {and General Chemistry} Summary.”]

2011

January 14, 2011. *Site Inspection under the Military Munitions Response Program Stakeholder Draft Site Inspection Report. Contract No: GS-10F-03435, Delivery Order No. W91238-08-F-0011. Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas. Section 1: Acknowledgments.--Section 2: Introduction.--Section 3: Former Maneuver Area MR site at Fort Bliss.--Section 4: Site Inspection Areas 1-14 [all east of the Fort Bliss Cantonment Area].--Section 5: Site Inspection Findings.--Section 6: Conceptual Site Model, Former Maneuver Area MR site.--Section 7: Former Maneuver Area MR site.--Section 8: Former Maneuver Area MR site.--Appendix A: Analytical Data [“an electronic copy of {which} is provided on the CD in Appendix G”].--Appendix B: Data Validation Reports. Test

America ... Explosives by Method 8330B. Revised Date Validation Report.--Appendix C: Photographic Logs. Former Maneuver Areas 9, 10, 11, 7, 5, 6, 15, 2, 4, 13, 8—all east of the Fort Bliss Cantonment Area.--Appendix D: All areas to the east of the Fort Bliss Cantonment.--Appendix E: Former Maneuver Areas A and B, both to the east of the Cantonment.--Appendix F—from the “Technical Project Planning Meeting, Military Munitions Response Program, Fort Bliss, Texas, Oct. 15, 2009.” Areas covered are all to the east/northeast of the Cantonment. And this: “Technical Project Planning Meeting,” July 29, 2009. Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection Fort Bliss, Texas. Tribal Meeting—Ysleta de Sur, Mescalero Apache, Comanche Nation, Kiowa Tribe of OK. Discussed: Land in New Mexico; land east/northeast of Cantonment. July 28, 2009. Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection for the Maneuver Areas No. 1 and No. 2 Munitions Response Site Fort Bliss, Texas. Castner Range solely mentioned thus: “The fifth site, Castner Range, was recommended for a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.”--Appendix G: Electronic Files: “Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection Report, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas. January 2011.”

January 26, 2011 meeting—*“Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection for Fort Bliss El Paso, Texas Technical Project Planning Meeting January 26, 2011,” which the title page also names “Fort Bliss Military Munitions Response Program Site Inspection **Final Technical Project Planning Meeting** [my emphasis].” P. 3’s “Meeting Goals” use the word “Review” three times: “Review the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP),” “Review the MMRP Site Inspection (SI) goals and objectives,” and “Review Technical Project Planning **Process** [my emphasis],” i.e., not the progress achieved so far, but the general process by which TPP progress can be made. Reviews of on-Fort Bliss MMRP activity fill pp. 4, 5, 6 and part of 7. P. 7’s “Review of TPP Process” links MMRP activity to TPP (“The MMRP SI will be conducted in accordance with the USACE TPP Process” and repeats information given out at previous meetings, thus: “The USACE TPP describes the process for identifying project objectives and designing data collections programs to ensure that the type, quality, and quantity of data are obtained to satisfy project objectives that lead to informed decisions and site closeout.” P. 8 repeats TPP information conveyed at previous meetings. The rest of this 33-page document largely deal with Fort Bliss property other than Castner Range, or with procedural matters (thus “MRSPP Stakeholder Notification”—p. 29—and “MRP SI Project Schedule” (p. 31), almost entirely a flashback to events held and reports completed from 2008 through 2010.

January 26, 2011. *Notification—from “Patricia A. Rice, President, Scientific Research & Technology, Inc., ... El Paso, Texas 79913-3208”—of the next RAB meeting, scheduled for Feb. 9, 2011 [but postponed until Feb. 10, 2011 because of snow], and of its “Old Business” (including “Munitions Constituents Sampling at Castner Range”) and “New Business”: “Fort Bliss Former [sic] Used Defense Sites—Final Site Inspection Report.”

February 10, 2011. *Judy Ackerman’s “Brief Notes from 10 Feb 2011 WAA TPP on Castner Range.” Some quotes: “Brian Helmlinger [URS Corporation] gave the main presentation. Brian said that the data [from Castner Range] will be used in the Remedial Investigation (RI) that will begin sometime in the future. ... I spoke with Ms. Bradshaw (Bliss JAG [Judge Advocate] office).

She said that Castner is dangerous and should just be left alone. She also said that TCEQ [Texas Commission on Environmental Quality] will not approve any transfer to the State Park. If any lead is found on Castner, TCEQ will require a full (destructive) clean-up.—I spoke with Scott Reed (USAEC). Scott works with funding for MMRP and says, ‘We have the funding for the RIFS (Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study).’ He says the money is fenced and will not go away. He blames the WAA for delaying the MMRP but will use the data in the RI. Castner is high on the MRSPP (Site Prioritization Process) because it is in a big city. The IRP (Installation [sic, ‘Installation’] Restoration Program) expires in 2014. BTW, FUDS is out of money.—Munitions Constituents Sampling: Victoria Kantsios [URS Corporation] gave this presentation on testing for explosives and metals including mercury. Pay attention to this part. TCEQ could require invasive clean-up, deny transfer or other road blocks. URS works closely with TCEQ to ensure their data is acceptable. EPA has delegated their authority to TCEQ. Andrea Silva represented TCEQ at this meeting.—BTW, Brian carefully did not use the word ‘Castner’, but Veronica [sic ‘Victoria’] did.”

February 10, 2011. Frontera Castner WAA TPP February 10 2011 meeting notes.pdf

“Stakeholder Technical Project Planning Meeting #4 [the first—i.e., the 9 o’clock—part of two meetings held that morning]. Wide Area Assessment Technology Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range Fort Bliss, Texas. 10 February 2011.” Some quotes: “Mr. Brian Helmlinger of URS Corporation (URS), under contract to the US Army Environmental Command, presented an overview of: -the progress on the WAA technology demonstration project since the last Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting held October 2010, -results/findings to date, and – remaining work to be completed. ... [Some quotes or synopses from p. 3 of the report:] Mr. Helmlinger discussed the intrusive investigation approach. He reminded everyone that the project team had applied a ‘weight of evidence’ approach using all available data to delineate target and non-target areas. In the target areas, URS performed intrusive investigations (i.e., digging) of a statistically valid number of anomalies to determine the proportion of anomalies attributable to munitions and non-munitions sources. In the non-target areas, URS tested a hypothesis that MEC densities are less than or equal to 0.5 MEC items per acre (at a 90% confidence level). The data collected in both areas provide information about the nature of the objects causing the anomalies (i.e., size, depth, orientation, and nomenclature). ... Mr. Helmlinger continued to discuss the target area delineation parameters: Density of anomalies; Lidar munitions features of interest; Handheld reconnaissance data; and, Presence of surface debris. ... [He] discussed the approach the URS UXO Technicians used for every dig. A question was raised regarding the materials of the anomalies investigated. Mr. Helmlinger responded [that] we found both ferrous and non-ferrous metals, but most are ferrous because most military munitions are ferrous. ... NTA [‘Non-Target Area’] Lot 2: 24% of the investigated anomalies were munitions debris. NTA 2 contained large amounts of non-military debris, which was not removed from Castner Range. –NTA Lot 3: 48% of the investigated anomalies were munitions debris. ... How many people worked for how long with each technology? [Response:] –Lidar and Orthophotography: 2 individuals for 2 days. –Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry: 4 individuals for 1 week. –Man-Portable Geophysics: 8 people (4 terms of 2 individuals) for 4

weeks (plus 6 UXO Technicians). –Intrusive Investigation: 13 people for 4 months. –NTA Lot 4: 61% of the investigated anomalies were munitions debris. This is an unusually high proportion of munitions debris for a ‘non-target area.’ ... The rest of p. 4, all of p. 5 and the beginning of p. 6 present ‘percentage’ statistics similar to NTA Lot 4. They range from a low of 13% (TA 14) to a high of 97% (TA 9). A comment of interest regarding TA 9: “The terrain in this area is very steep and we found lots of HE [‘high explosive’] frag. We believe this is actually a continuation of TA 1 with our findings of artillery and mortar MD and armor piercing tracer (APT) projectiles. Questions followed, including this one of interest: “Mr. [John] Moses asked about the upper elevation of Castner Range being left to their own (no investigation). Mr. Helmlinger responded that conducting geophysical and intrusive investigations in the higher elevations were [sic] deemed too risky using existing technologies and methods.” (p. 6)—The second—i.e. the 11 a.m.—part of the Feb. 10, 2011 meeting involved the same participants and contained the following items of greater interest: “Ms. Kantsios ... started the discussion defining the problem facing the Army: -Castner Range has an unknown future land use[; et seq.] –Large ... MMRP sites; -Varying types of firing ranges and munitions; -Heterogeneous distribution of munitions constituents (MC); -How to determine the presence or absence of MC? –If discovering presence of MC, how to determine the nature and extent of contamination; Characterizing a site with discrete samples would require over 50,000 samples (7,000 acres x 8 samples/acre) ... A question was asked which lab URS plans to use to conduct the analytical analysis. Ms. Kantsios replied Agriculture & Priority Pollutants Laboratories, Inc. ...” Ms. Kantsios also said: “URS has designed the sampling approach to test the hypothesis (at 95% confidence level) that there are no 1-acre parcels within each area with a mean concentration above regulatory threshold. To test this hypothesis, URS will collect incremental samples from 60 randomly selected 1-acre sampling units ... If there are no results that exceed regulatory thresholds, then we can conclude, with 95% confidence, that there will be no mean MC concentrations above regulatory thresholds in at least 95% of the remaining unsampled 1-acre parcels in that area. ...” (p. 4) And this (pp. 4-5): “Another question was about what TCEQ will do with the data. Ms. Kantsios responded that the Army would like to incorporate the analytical data into the upcoming Remedial Investigation (RI).” —A 31-pp. handout was distributed to participants. The 9 a.m. “TPP Meeting #3” handout included photos and information on sampling areas, sampling tools, sampling processes and decontamination, laboratory processes, munitions constituents, heterogeneity of explosives in soils, data screening, slope analysis, soils and high MD densities. The “TPP Meeting #5” handout (i.e., that of the 11 a.m. meeting) ran to 50 pp. and contained what Mr. Helmlinger referred to as “results,” i.e., not “plans.” See especially unnumbered pages 8-19 for “Results by TA [‘Target Area’] & NTA [‘Non-Target Area’] Lot,” “NTA Lot 1 [and, separately, Lots 2, 3 and 4],” TA’s nos. 1-18 (separately) and—on unnumbered page 24—the “Project Schedule,” which lists—inter alia—“February-May 2011: WAA Report writing” and “May 2011: Final TPP Meeting to Discuss Conclusions/Recommendations.”

I recall that the following two-page item was distributed at the Feb. 11, 2011 meetings: * “Draft Munitions and Explosives of concern (MEC) Data Quality Objectives (DQOs)[,] Closed Castner

Firing Range Remedial Investigation, Fort Bliss, Texas.” This item, an anomaly, consists of two 17-by-11-inch sheets. Both sheets contain eight vertical columns presenting the following information: DQO, Problem Statement, Project Goals, Required Information Inputs, Input Boundaries, Analytical Approach, Performance Criteria, and Plan for Obtaining Data. The most information-packed columns are those of “Input Boundaries”—eight bullets on Sheet One, and seven bullets on Sheet Two. A veritable wealth of information that—alas—is not available online in any format.

March 29, 2011. Frontera Castner Closed U.S. Army Ranges meeting Chapin High Tues. March 29, 2011.msg This is a report that was written by me—and sent out to the Castner Conservation core—on the Tuesday, March 29, 2011 evening meeting held at Chapin High School. Four “closed ranges no longer owned by the U.S. government” were the topics of presentation by employees of the Parsons Infrastructure & Technology Group, Inc. along with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). All are former—or very proximate—components of Castner Range during the years that it was actively used for fire-arms training. These areas are now considered FUDS (“formerly-used defense sites”); the FUDS program itself was not established until 1986; it is managed for the Department of Defense by the USACE. The presenters emphasized that Munitions Response Site (MRS) activities “focus on ‘historic use’ and ‘qualitative reconnaissance’ and are not as intensive as the tasks that have been and continue to be undertaken on Castner Range itself over the last 16 months.” Among other findings and recommendations: “[W]here UXO is present, most of it ‘is located within the first two feet beneath the surface, but may be found at depths of up to 20 feet.’ ‘All UXO, whether intact or in parts, presents a potential hazard to those who find it.’ ‘Never transmit radio frequencies within 50 feet of a UXO location.’”

Before the actual presentations began, attendees were invited to view the dozen triptychs at the front of the auditorium. One of them stated that “in 1971, ‘a fatality’ had occurred ‘on the closed U.S. Army range.’ During question time at meeting’s end, I inquired about that fatality. “The presenters said that they were ‘unaware’ of any fatality or its location or the exact date it occurred. After the question time was over, I sought information about the procedures to be followed by people who’d sustained UXO-caused injuries ... Only one of the presenters claimed knowledge of such procedures, but her answer was very general: ‘They’d have to contact someone at the [Department of Defense], and that’s all I know about it,’ she said.”

A 37-page document—*“Closed Ranges No Longer Owned by the U.S. Government: Formerly Used Defense Site: El Paso, Texas: FUDS Project No. K06TX005401: Public Meeting March 29, 2011”—was made available to the meeting’s participants.

March 31, 2011. **Site Inspection under the Military Munitions Response Program final site Inspection Report. GS’10F’03435, Delivery Order No. W91238’08’F’0011, Fort Bliss, Texas. Transmittal of Final Site Inspection (SI) Report for Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas dated March 31, 2011. ... The six-page “Public meeting, December 2, 2009” section, which constitutes the final or “end” part of Appendix H, contains two references to Castner Range, both on p. 2. Here are the*

two pertinent quotes, both from six-section “MMRP Site Name / Acreage / Current Status” table: ‘Closed Castner Firing Range, 7,007.34 [acres]. Site Inspection has been completed under the MMRP; recommended for immediate response (fencing and signage) and further characterization.’ And “Castner Range-XD. 1,338.9 [acres]. Being addressed by the Formerly Used Defense Sites [FUDS] program.” Neither “Castner” reference is “being addressed during the current Site Inspection (SI), which is the second step in the CERCLA process. The rest of this six-page section deals exclusively with the “Former Maneuver Area” MMRP Site ... located entirely to the east of the Cantonment.—Appendix I: Summary of Rights of Entry Contacts. Final Site Inspection Report, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas. This is a “Summary of Fort Bliss ROE [‘Rights of Entry’] contacts,” which include nothing anent Castner Range. Appendix J: “Electronic Files. Final Site Inspection Report, Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas.” (File dated “March 2011.”)—The “Response to comments” contains no Castner references.

RAB April 6 2011 Minutes.doc Some quotes and summations: Victoria Kantsios (URS Corporation) spoke on “Munitions Constituents Sampling at Castner Range” (unnumbered p. 2), and reported that “[t]asks in progress include report writing on WAA field demonstration report for Castner Range, cost-benefit analysis: Active Army Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) and the cost[-]estimating equations.” (p. 2) She also reported that she and her assistants “decided on two approaches on how many anomalies would be excavated at each location. They decided on an area[-]based calculation using proportions of anomalies to munitions.” (p. 2) She noted that “[t]he WAA report writing is scheduled to be performed between February and May 2011. The final TPP meeting to discuss conclusions and recommendation is scheduled for June 2011.” (p. 2) In response to a question (p. 4) Ms. Kantsios “explained that the schedule for the incremental sampling project involved collecting the samples in February 2011. Analytical testing was conducted between March and April of 2011. Depending on the analytical testing, additional sampling may be required and will be conducted in May 2011. The report writing will be concluded between June and September 2011, and the results and conclusions are scheduled for presentation in October 2011.” In p. 5’s section “3. New Business,” Karen Holmes (Section Chief of Munitions, USACE) summed up material that had already been presented at the Feb. 10, 2011 WAA TPP-on-Castner-Range meeting. Summed up was work done on FUDS sites following the CERCLA process. She repeated that the USACE had “identified four ranges or munitions response sites” that ceased to form part of Castner Range in 1971 as is well known.

The following 38-page document—*“Munitions and Munitions Constituents Characterization, Closed Castner Range Firing Range, Fort Bliss, TX, Restoration Advisory Board Meeting, 6 April 2011”—was made available to attendees and RAB subscribers. The document—a recap of information presented before—contains numerous photographs, graphs and charts, especially anent the MEC/USO WAA Project showing “Progress to Date” (p. 6; “Yet to do” includes completing these three Project Reports: “WAA Field Demonstration Report for Castner Range,” “Revised WAA Cost-Benefit Analysis: Active Army MMRP [‘Military Munitions Response Program’]” and “WAA Cost[-]Estimating Equations.” The MEC/UXO WAA Project’s photo maps

appear on pp. 7-10 (“... Project Target Delineation”—a map of all anomalies on the site—, “... Project Selected Anomalies,” “... Project Intrusive Procedures” and “Dig Results.” “... Preliminary (Draft) Conclusions” appear on p. 12; among them: “The data indicate that the non-target areas (all 4 “lots”) contain no greater than .5 MEC items/acre (less than or equal to 1 MEC item/2 acres). “The data indicate that several of the ‘target areas’ are not actually munitions target areas (e.g., 5, 14). “Additional analysis may identify portions of TAs that can be ‘carved out’ (e.g., 13, 17).” Reference is again made—p. 13—to “June 2011: Final TPP meeting to discuss conclusions and recommendations.” See also p. 15 (“MC [‘Munitions Constituents’] Incremental Sampling[.] Defining the Problem”), which gives rise to doubts about previous conclusions (thus “Don’t know if munitions constituents (MC) are present/absent. If present, don’t know the nature and extent of contamination (large area, varied uses) ... characterizing with discrete samples could take over 50,000 samples (7,000 acres x 8 samples/acre)”). P. 19’s “Project Goals” repeats much concerning implementation, collection, determining, accepting, etc. “Sampling” and “Samples” are discussed at length in the rest of these Minutes. See especially p. 33’s “Incremental Sampling Project Schedule.” Its highlight: “October 2011: present results and conclusions.”

RAB April 6 2011 meeting.doc This is my two-page summary—“Restoration Advisory Board (‘RAB’) meeting, April 6, 2011, Northeast Command Center, El Paso, TX”—of the April 6 RAB meeting. Some quotes: “An impressive amount of work has already been completed as of date, to wit: site reconnaissance; Lidar and orthophotography; site prep[arations]: survey, run VSP (“Vertical Seismic Profile”), mark transects, install IVS (“Interactive Visualization Systems”); helicopter-borne magnetometry; ground-based geophysics (involving both a towed array and a [hu]man-portable EMI [“electromagnetic interference”]); analog data collection, and intrusive investigation.” And this: “As we had learned—albeit tentatively—at previous RAB’s and kindred meetings, MEC’s tended to be concentrated in the southeast and northeast parts of the Range, especially alongside the US 54 freeway. (From the maps presented, it is clear that most of the MEC’s can be found in the eastern third of the Range, i.e., in the flattest part of it, the part that has been of sporadic interest to commercial developers.)”

*Texas State Senate Resolution S.R. No. 506, May 5, 2011, by State Senator José Rodríguez (El Paso). A quote: “Whereas, since 1995, the army has been clearing old artillery rounds from the surface of the land; surface clearance, as opposed to subsurface clearance, was found to offer the best risk-reduction-to-cost ratio and is most compatible with a minimal-disturbance future land use, such as passive recreation on protected parkland.”

Frontera Castner FMWC newsletter piece by Teschner on House, Senate resolutions.docs 5/6/2011 The title of this one-page piece is “Texas House, Senate Pass FMWC/Frontera ‘4-C’s’-Sponsored Resolution Supporting Conservation of Castner Range.” It reports on the unanimous passage—by both houses—of the two-page resolution written and promoted by members of the joint Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition/Frontera Land Alliance “Castner Conservation Conveyance Committee” (aka “the 4 C’s”) consisting of members Judy Ackerman,

Steve Bonner (SONRI Corporation), Scott Cutler, Doug Echlin, Mike Gaglio, John Moses, Richard Teschner, Kevin Von Finger and Pat White. Ongoing efforts towards Castner conservation have been aided by a \$300,000 Office of Economic Adjustment/Department of Defense grant to collect data anent the application of a conservation conveyance to Castner Range. The grant was obtained for the 4-C's in 2009 by then-U.S. Congressman Silvestre Reyes (D-El Paso). The joint resolution makes these points: That under the stewardship of the Army, Castner has rested in its natural state since 1971, when all munitions operations ceased (as almost all of them had done in 1966); that since 1995—and in particular recently—the Army has been clearing old artillery rounds from Castner's surface; that the Range contains "some of the most geologically complex and visually striking parts of the Franklins and is prized for its Mexican gold poppies; that the El Paso City Council and the El Paso County Commissioners Court have unanimously passed resolutions in recent years advocating that Castner be left undeveloped and conserved for recreational use," and so forth. The joint resolution stipulated that the chief clerk of the House and the chief clerk of the Senate forward official copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Commanding General of Fort Bliss, to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Defense, and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Castner Range National Monument 2015 Status of Castner Range From excess to excess cancelled in 1983.msg June [12?], 2011. This is the "Frontera Castner Bonner Report," submitted to the Frontera Land Alliance in June 2011 by Steve Bonner, Executive Director, SONRI Corp. as per the terms of the Frontera/SONRI contract. The Report runs to five pages of text plus six pages of appendices (of which there are two) plus a one-page twelve-item "References" addendum. The Report itself contains an Introduction plus the following sections: "Status Research" (pp. 3-4), "Status of the Castner Range" (p. 4), and "Conclusion" (pp. 4-5). Appendix I is a "Report on personal contacts and follow-up concerning status of the Castner Range"; Appendix II is an August 16, 1983 letter from Charles D. Thomas, Director, Disposal Division [location suppressed], to Chief [name suppressed], Real Estate Division, Albuquerque District, Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 1580, Albuquerque, NM 87103.

*Frontera Castner El Paso El Paso Times From bombing range to boom town City leaders work to keep development off Castner—El Paso Times.mht 6/13/2011 This three-page article quotes city officials—starting with then-Mayor John Cook—and including then-U.S. Congressman Silvestre Reyes, César Méndez (Superintendent, the Franklin Mountains State Park), Bill Medrano (former director of the Los Angeles Parks and Recreation Department and a resident of El Paso's Northeast district), and Richard Teschner (for the Castner Conservation Conveyance Committee [CCCC]). Article author Aaron Bracamontes writes that "[u]nexploded ordnance, artillery and munitions are the only things keeping Castner Range untouched. ... It has been classified as 'closed' to the public ever since [1983]" because of the ordnance etc. atop and beneath the land. Mention is made of REDCO ('El Paso Regional Economic Development Corp.') and its late-2005-early 2006 "proposal to create a science and technology park to support defense research and development," vigorously and successfully opposed by

the newly formed CCCC. Teschner expressed optimism that Castner Range would be permanently conserved by the end of the present decade (2010s). Mayor Cook, a long-time resident of the Northeast, stated that he could remember a time “when no one thought the eastern portion [of the Range] would be developed. I can remember when that portion of the range ran all the way down to Dyer ... So to say it will never be developed is unrealistic. It can happen. We are saying it has to stop once you reach a certain point. I believe that point should be the Patriot Freeway (U.S. 54).”

Frontera Castner DC August 1 and 2, 2011, summary of meetings on Hill, at Pentagon.doc

This is a one-page report on the two days spent lobbying in DC by Richard Teschner (representing Castner Conservation) and Steve Bonner, Executive Director, SONRI (q.v. supra). The most profitable meeting took place on Tuesday, August 2 in the Pentagon office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations; also in attendance were several Army specialists, one of whom—in what can be considered the meeting’s highlight—said he would oppose any attempt to impose an EUL (‘Extended Use Lease’) on any part of Castner Range. Meetings were also held in the offices of Senator John Cornyn and Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison. Also held on Tuesday was a thirty-minute meeting with four House Armed Services Committee staffers included Dave Sienicki, with whom Steve and Richard had talked the previous summer. This meeting’s message—especially from Mr. Sienicki—was that “there is, these days, absolutely no money whatsoever for range clean-up, ordnance/munition removal, restoration, or anything else that has to do with rehabilitating closed Army properties such as Castner.” Steve and Richard responded that one of the “Castner” components—the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition—has been pressing for Castner conservation since the Franklin Mountains State Park was created in 1979-1984, so range clean-up (etc.) is not a new request.

*“The RAB and the Castner Range Report (Wed., Oct. 12, 2011). (Not available online.) From Mike Gaglio, President, The Frontera Land Alliance: “I received an update from Steve Bonner about the Castner Range Conservation Conveyance report. It is still undergoing final review. Almost all of our suggestions and edits were incorporated into the report. ... The report will *not* be available before the RAB meeting on October 19. My suggestion is to provide an update ... that simply states: 1) that the report is near completion; 2) it effectively maps options for conservation of land at Castner; 3) that the next step is to develop a conceptual land use plan; and 4) that work has already begun on the conceptual land use plan.”

RAB Oct. 19, 2011 Minutes Army cannot transfer a contaminated site to anyone.docx

11/28/2011 Pages 3-6 relate to Castner Range. (Pp. 2-3 deal with “Maneuver Area A,” far to the east of Castner.) Introduced was Robert Rowden, successor to the now-retiring Scott Read. Mr. Rowden “is an environmental engineer with many years of experience with RCRA (Resource Conservation Recovery Act). He has worked at the installation level at Fort Sill with had multiple DERA (Defense Environmental Restoration Act) and MMRP (Military Munitions Response Program) sites.” (p. 3) Additional statements: Castner Range “has not been declared excess to Army needs and remains as such. The Army is still obligated to clean it up. ... [T]he MMRP was

the first funding mechanism to access hazards from munitions and performing remediation on Army sites. The IRP (Installation Restoration Program) funded hazardous waste cleanup, not munitions cleanup.” (p. 3) “With respect to Castner Range, the Army selected it to test detection technologies. As a result, the site inspection has been completed. The data indicates that it required further investigation. The Phase 1 of the WAA (Wide Area Assessment) gave rise to [P]hase 2 for which multi-incremental sampling was performed. Pursuant to this, thousands of MEC were recovered. The reports will be published in December of 2011-January 2012.— Although several actions associated with this project have been completed, Mr. Reed informed the group that there is an additional opportunity use Castner Range to conduct testing of robotics that have detection and retrieval capabilities. ... the robots have been designed to detect munitions, retrieve them and transport them to a safe site for disposal. Castner’s terrain makes it an optimal site to test the capabilities of this technology.” Mr. Reed indicated “that this testing is not to be perceived as a removal action and that to date we do not have the technology to conduct a 100% removal.” ... Reed said “that if the robotic phase were to be conducted that it could potentially advance the technology to effect safe UXO removal. He did not know for a fact if the Castner terrain would prove supportive of the technology.” (p. 4)

Mr. Reed further told the group “that he believes the public is under the impression that a decision will be made by the Army regarding Castner within two years. ... [I]f robotics are tested[,] that would suspend the MMRP action for about 18 months. ... [T]he Army is currently not in the position to make intelligent decisions as to where areas of concern are located, what is present in those areas and how to address them.” (p. 5) [Reed also] indicated that the bottom line was that robotic testing would delay the MMRP process. The range status will remain unchanged until the entire MMRP/CERCLA process is complete.

Mr. [Rip] Langford [a member of the RAB Board] asked when Castner would be cleaned up to allow it to be used to hiking, public use or development. Ms. [Sylvia] Waggoner [Military Co-Chair and Fort Bliss staffer] indicated that there is no way to determine if cleanup is even feasible until the RI/FS are completed. Army needs to conduct a risk assessment and a range of alternatives. Right now we just do not know. Ms. [Patricia] Rice [a member of the public] stated that at least the public could be assured that no development would take place during the process. (p. 5) Mr. Raul Amaya [also a member of the public] stated that he has heard developers state that if Army sold them the property that they would clean it up. Mr. Rowden responded by stating that Army cannot transfer a contaminated site to anyone. Dr. [Richard] Teschner asked if the Army could transfer a part of the site. Mr. Reed responded by stating no. The parcel would have to be declared excess in accordance with Army regulations. Until then the land is still in Army ownership. Mr. Reed indicated that Castner Range was not going anywhere anytime soon. It is now a project requiring full compliance with the CERCLA process. Once that is complete[,] Army will determine whether the property can be declared excess or not. We will not have any part of piece-mealing Castner out.

The 22-page October 19, 2011 RAB's handout is entitled *"Former Maneuver Areas 1 & 2: Remedial Investigation of Maneuver Area A." It deals entirely with those areas, located far to the east of Castner Range and unrelated to it. Next meeting is scheduled for ... January 18, 2012 [in] Chaparral, NM. (p. 6)

Frontera Castner Calibre report Teschner summary The Castner Range Conservation Conveyance Report.docx 12/11/2011 The Calibre report itself was finalized and distributed on Nov. 11, 2011. This 104-page study was prepared for the Castner Conservation Conveyance Committee ("4-C's") by SONRI Inc., of Boerne, TX and CALIBRE Systems, Inc., of Alexandria, VA with funding from a \$300,000 grant obtained with the assistance of El Paso's then-Congressman Silvestre Reyes and his staff, and administered through the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) of the DOD. The 4-C's, an ongoing entity consisting of several members of the boards of directors of the Frontera Land Alliance and the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition, were led in their work by Project Manager Steve Bonner of SONRI Inc. The 4C's work on this project began in the fall of 2010. The project is a major component in the ongoing effort to deploy a conservation conveyance on Castner Range. Governmental bodies at all levels—the El Paso City Council, the El Paso County Commissioners' Court, the Texas House of Representatives and the Texas Senate—are on record in favor of applying an easement to Castner as an intermediate stage in its transfer from DOD ownership to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department so it would become a part of the FMSP (as envisioned at the time). The report itself consists of a one-page Executive Summary plus four chapters: Background (including Castner Range's Demographics, Environmental Conditions, Ecological Information, Cultural Resources, Future Land Use, Munitions and Explosives of Concern, and Unexploded Ordnance), Real Estate Options, Liability Concerns, and Recommendations. Among the topics dealt with in the Appendices are the previous deployments of conservation conveyances at two other military properties (one in Lassen County, CA, and one in Clark County, WA), the various ways to perform unexploded ordnance remediation, our contacts with local, state and national officials, an expanded discussion of liability issues, Texas and federal laws applying to properties such as Castner Range, Army contingent funding, Army-retained conditions, and the specifics of a hoped-for draft Conservation Conveyance Cooperative Agreement with the Department of the Army including a likely timeline. Also dealt with is the exact legal status of Castner Range, a question that has long gone without a confident answer. We know this: In 1971 the Department of the Army reported Castner Range as excess to its needs. Due to the contaminated state of the property, the General Services Administration conditionally accepted the "excess" status but determined in 1983 that until such time as Castner "can be disposed of without the contamination restrictions, a new Report of Excess should be submitted. (So as of 2011, Castner remained Fort Bliss property and as the "closed" range referred to above.)

The Sun Valley Retention Dam (SVRD). June 21 through September 22, 2011.

*From the third week of June through the third week of September (2011), the question of whether a "retention dam" proposed by the El Paso Water [Utility] (a City-of-El-Paso affiliate) in

coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque District) would be built in the northeast quadrant of Castner Range was discussed at length, and ultimately dealt with by the El Paso City Council. (No dam was ever built. The El Paso City Council voted in favor of reducing the size of the dam. Ultimately that did not satisfy its proponents.) Relevant to the present document is the discussion of the SVRD at the July 13, 2011 meeting of the Fort Bliss RAB (held in Las Cruces, NM). Comments regarding the “Sun Valley Flood Risk Reduction Project” and appearing on a “Comment Form” submitted in advance of the Las Cruces meeting were the following, submitted by Richard Teschner as a member of the Fort Bliss RAB and summed up here: “Castner Range’s terrain, fauna and flora will be damaged to a greater or lesser degree by the building of roadways leading to the [dam’s] construction site, by the establishment of equipment storage sites alongside the proposed project, and by the construction of the large-scale berm/dam on the retention dam and basin site itself. How will the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) identify that potential damage, what sort of damage are we talking about, what plans is ACE making to reduce the amount of it, and how and when will ACE repair the damages once ... incurred? Who exactly will **OWN** the ... dam/berms and retention basin (henceforth SUVDAM)? What sort of permission/permitted from Fort Bliss and/or the Department of the Army is needed in order for ACE to construct the SUVDAM? Has that permission been applied for and has it been granted? Are the pertinent documents classified or can the public access them and if so how? And who will be responsible for the SUVDAM’s upkeep and maintenance? If the responsible party is the El Paso Water Utility, then what percentage of the cost of upkeep/maintenance will it be expected to pay? What percentage of the construction costs will the EPWU be expected to pay? ... Will all MEC and UXO be removed from the construction areas—roadways, equipment storage sites, berm/dam, retention basin—before construction of any sort commences? How will the design and construction of the SUVDAM compare to that of the Northgate (Hondo Pass/US 54) dam/berm? What lessons have been learned from the Northgate project, completed roughly thirty years ago?”

2012

Frontera Castner TPP February 10 2012 Incremental Sampling Meeting Minutes.pdf The “Stakeholder Technical Project Planning Meeting #4: Incremental Sampling Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, Texas” was held at 11 a.m. on Feb. 10 at the Radisson Hotel in El Paso. Once again, Victoria Kantsios of the URS Corporation led the meeting. She stated “the problem[s] facing the Army.” Among them are these: Castner has an unknown future land use. Its MMRP (Military Munitions Response Program) sites are large, and contain “varying types of firing ranges and munitions” along with a “heterogeneous distribution of munitions constituent (MC)”. Still unknown is “[h]ow to determine the presence or absence of MC,” despite many attempts referred to and described on the preceding two dozen pages of the present document. Still putatively unknown is “how to determine the nature and extent of contamination” when discovering the presence of MC. And “characterizing a site with discrete samples would require over 50,000 samples (7,000 acres x 8 samples/acre).” (p. 2) The solution:

“Using incremental sampling” which “maximizes the effectiveness and efficiency of the sampling effort.” (p. 3) “Originally, URS planned to stratify the site[s] into low, medium, and high anomaly density areas. This approach was revised [by] looking at areas meeting the following parameters: -Areas with <10% slope (safely accessible to sampling teams and likely to ‘hold’ MC given effects of weathering) -Areas with soil available to sample (using Natural Resources Conservation Service [soil maps].” (p. 3) Castner Range would be stratified into “Area 1: Areas of high munitions debris density (>500 MD/acre) and areas where propellant was found on the surface. Area 2: The rest of the site.” URS decided on 1-acre sampling units for these reasons: Doing so “provides a large enough population of parcels within each area to allow for a statistically significant sample size [and] ease of sample collection [since] one[-]acre parcels are typical of many different reuse scenarios” and are an area about which “understanding MC concentration would be desirable.” (Why this is so was not explained.) She also asserted (p. 3) that “confidence of representativeness increases as sampling unit size decreases.” More explanations of this sort complete p. 3’s final paragraph into p. 4. Also discussed—p. 4—were the “sampling tool, sampling process, sampling too decontamination, and sample packing” along with “the laboratory analytical methods” for explosives, for metals and for mercury. Ms. Kantsios actually spoke of “the Franklin Mountain [sic] State Park” as “representing the southern portion of the site” and of “the El Paso Water Utilities property” as “representing the northern portion of the site” in the following terms: “These areas presumably have not been impacted by munitions-related activities and would be used for comparison of sample results within the Castner Range.” Such statements make one wonder whether Ms. Kantsios ever set foot on Castner Range.

*Emails (February 5, 2012 through March 14, 2012) between Richard Teschner (as member of the RAB) and Joel Reyes (Restoration Program Manager, Multi Media Compliance Branch, DPW-Environmental Division, Fort Bliss) regarding the WAA Wide Area Assessment Report and the proximate meeting of the RAB. On Feb. 5, 2012 Teschner writes that the WAA Report “was due to appear eleven months ago in March of 2011.” Reyes responds the next day that “[t]he WAA is still being reviewed” and “we are hoping that by mid-March we will be having our first 2012 RAB meeting.” Five weeks later (March 14, 2012) Teschner asks if there’s been “any further word on the WAA Report?” as he has yet to receive a copy of it. Reyes responds on March 14 that “[t]he WAA was reviewed by our folks here at Fort Bliss, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Army Environmental Command,” that “a final Castner Range WAA TPP meeting will take place on Wednesday, 25 April 2012,” and that a RAB “will take place 25th of April.”

March 14, 2012. Draft Final, * “Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration Report for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District [and the] U.S. Army Environmental Command [by the] URS Group, Inc., 2450 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202.” I have in my possession the Report’s *Executive Summary (pp. iii-v) along with the Table of Contents (pp. vii-viii), the “List of Figures” (pp. ix-x), the “List of Tables (p. xi) and a list of “Acronyms and Abbreviations” (pp. xiii-xiv). Some quotes—at length—from this important Executive Summary:

“The U.S. Army manages millions of acres of closed ranges, areas formerly used for military training or testing purposes, that may be contaminated by munitions or munitions-related items. ... Conducting detailed investigations of very large sites ... using current geophysical technologies and practices is costly and time[-]consuming. Large areas of land within the Army’s Munitions Response Site (MRS) inventory may not contain munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), so the benefits associate with conducting detailed site characterization on all of this land are unlikely to justify the costs.—The U.S. Army Environmental Command (USAEC) has actively sought to identify, develop, and demonstrate technological approaches that would enable cost-effective and rapid classification of range lands into those with munitions-related impacts and those ... with no indication of munitions use. ... Wide[-]area assessment (WAA) is the specialized application of site characterization technologies to gather large amounts of data rapidly, thereby improving the understanding of a site and supporting site management decisions. WAA is not a single technology, but rather a set of methods for applying technologies that increases their coverage and data collection rates. WAA methods have been used extensively within the U.S. Air Force Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) and the Formerly Used Defense Site [FUDS] program. These methods have been demonstrated to support decisions at various stages of the munitions response process, such as identifying MRSs during the Site Inspection [SI] phase, and characterizing the nature and extent of MEC contamination during the Remedial Investigation (RI) phase. In 2009, USAEC conducted a ‘desktop’ study of the costs and benefits of applying WAA technologies under conditions common to MRSs within the Active Army MMRP ... Because of the uncertainties inherent in a desktop study, this current field demonstration was initiated to test and refine conclusions from the 2009 study. The Closed Castner Range MRS ... was one of the four sites used as a reference location in the desktop study and was selected as the demonstration site because of its extensive prior use as a training range, [its] large size (over 7,007 acres), and field conditions, including large areas of flat terrain and relatively sparse and low vegetation. The selected approach was to use WAA technologies—light detection and ranging (lidar), orthophotography, helicopter-borne magnetometry, man-portable electromagnetic induction (EMI)[,] digital geophysical mapping (DGM), analog range reconnaissance [(ARR)], and intrusive investigation—in a layered approach. The objective was to demonstrate the ability to use multiple layers of data in identifying areas of concentrated munitions use, confirming areas with no munitions use, and improving the understanding of the density and distribution of MEC across the MRS. Although this project is not part of an MMRP RI, data collection methods, stakeholder involvement, and application of quality control measures produced a data set that meets the stringent requirements of an RI.

“Lidar and orthophotography data were collected at the same time from the same platform, with lidar data density at 22 points per m² and orthophotographs at a pixel size of 10 cm. Bare earth models were analyzed in conjunction with corresponding photos to identify features indicative of munitions-related activities. Lidar and orthophotography can delineate craters above 1 m diameter, as well as target features, berms/trenches, and demolition pits. They can

be used to identify areas used for certain munitions-related activities (e.g., demolition); however, the absence of surface features cannot, by itself, be used to draw confident conclusions about the absence of munitions. Features discovered by lidar/orthophotography were used in conjunction with other data layers to refine maps of areas of interest, and topographical data were vital in planning helicopter-borne magnetometry and man-portable EMI DGM.

“Helicopter-borne magnetometry data were collected over those parts of the Closed Castner Range MRS with an average slope of less than 5%, or about 1,742 acres, representing 25% of the total range area. Areas of greater slope make flying at the required 1-3 m altitude unsafe. The airborne platform covered a large area quickly but site conditions resulted in a less than optimum data set. Under optimal conditions, helicopter-borne magnetometry reliably detects metallic items as small as 60mm, but because of vegetation, a significant portion of the Closed Castner Range MRS data was collected above the optimum altitude, resulting in a weaker target signal. The Closed Castner Range MRS also contains large amounts of 37mm, 40mm, and 57mm projectiles and 2.36-in. rockets. Additionally, ferrous geology contributed significant background noise, and the resulting data were not used to identify areas of munitions use, identify areas without munitions use, or improve the understanding of MEC densities and distribution.

“Man-portable EMI DGM was employed in a transect approach, where the transect spacing was calculated using Visual Sampling Plan software to achieve a 95% probability of traversal and detection of conservatively[-]defined preliminary target areas. Two contractors each surveyed approximately half of the safely[-]accessible acreage, areas with an average slope of less than 18%, which totaled approximately 3,521 acres, or 50% of the MRS. Man-portable DGM successfully located metallic anomalies representative of the types and sizes of munitions expected, which were later confirmed by intrusive investigation. The combination of digital geophysical data with precise locational data enabled the creation of anomaly density maps showing possible areas of concentrated munitions use (i.e., anomaly densities from 300 to 1700 per acre) and areas with little indication of concentrated munitions use (i.e., anomaly densities less than 300 per acre).

“Stakeholders were engaged early and often through the Technical Project Planning process, and were briefed on the technologies, their limitations, and their accomplishments. Stakeholders at Fort Bliss included project and technical personnel from the Army, Fort Bliss personnel, Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board members, representatives from the state regulatory community, Native American tribal representatives, preservation and conservation organization personnel, and local citizens and community leaders. Stakeholder concurrence was obtained at every phase of the project. Because of their intimate local knowledge, stakeholders identified concerns about potential MEC along unofficial hiking trails and steep arroyos or eroded water channels, which were inaccessible to other methods of assessment. Consequently, an analog range reconnaissance approach was implemented, where unexploded

ordnance (UXO) technicians wielding handheld metal detectors and global positioning system units investigated about 22 miles of these features of concern, mapping metallic anomalies and classifying surface debris. These data, while less formal than EMI DGM, nevertheless provided a key understanding of the types and quantities of munitions-related items in these areas.

“The layers of data from these assessment technologies were compiled and compared to identify 18 preliminary target areas, or areas of possible concentrated munitions use. The remaining acreage was hypothesized to be no-target area based, in part, on a low probability of encountering MEC. A sample size calculation was performed to determine how many anomalies identified by man-portable DGM required investigation to estimate the proportion of anomalies within each preliminary target area that were munitions-related items. A separate sample size calculation, based on UXO Estimator, was performed to test a hypothesis about the relatively low MEC density (i.e., less than 0.5 per acre) in the non-target areas. UXO dig teams then returned to the field and excavated the randomly selected anomalies and classified each find as to type and source. Nearly 3,000 anomalies were reacquired and excavated. Using this approach, approximately half of the assessed acreage was confirmed as non-target area at the 90% confidence level.

“This project successfully demonstrated the WAA technologies on an Active Army MMRP site and supported the conclusions of the cost-benefit analysis. Transect-based, man-portable EMI DGM proved to be highly effective to determine the relative density and distribution of anomalies in all but the steepest terrain. Lidar data effectively identified range and munitions-related surface features that were not visible at ground level or in orthophotographs. Lidar was also very useful for planning other site characterization methods. While helicopter-borne magnetometry proved less effective under these specific site conditions, it nevertheless remains an important tool for WAA, in general. Analog reconnaissance proved effective in investigating areas otherwise inaccessible to WAA technologies. Intrusive investigation was used for anomaly classification by confirming the source of individual anomalies; however, it remains the most labor intensive (i.e., costly) phase of the investigation process.

“All the WAA methodologies require careful planning, with rigorous adherence to accepted statistical approaches, in order to obtain the desired confidence in conclusions about the relative densities and distribution of munitions-related items. Because no change from current land use has been proposed for this MRS, this report does not draw conclusions about MEC hazards on the site, nor does it make recommendations for response actions. The methods and data within this report should be re-examined for applicability when land use is selected and during the formal MMRP RI. This project does not complete the investigation at the Closed Castner Range MRS, but the data reported here will be of significant benefit to the subsequent RI.”

*April 9, 2012 print-out letter from Vicki Hamilton, R.A. Chief, Environmental Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss, notifying recipients that a Military Munitions Response Program Remedial Investigation is being undertaken. “A Site Inspection (SI) was conducted

between 2008 and 2011 and resulted in the decision to divide the area [far to the east of Castner Range and unconnected to it] into two Munitions Response Sites (MRS), Former Maneuver Area A and Former Maneuver Area B. Since ... Area A obtained a No Further Action (NFA) status during the SI, the MMRP RI will focus on the Former Maneuver Area A MRS. The RI will identify the nature and extent of munitions potentially present at the Former Maneuver Area A MRS and any associated munitions-related constituents in soils.—A Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting is being held to present the project approach to the Project Stakeholders. The objective of the meeting is to solicit input from [them] and attain consensus on the technical approach, including the geophysics investigation plan, sample types and locations, analytical methods as well as formulate project data quality objectives (DQOs).” The invitation to an April 25, 2012 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. meeting at El Paso’s Marriott Hotel ensues.

*April 12, 2012 e-mailed announcement of the proximate (April 25, 2012, 6:30 p.m.) meeting of the Fort Bliss RAB. Two Castner items are included in the short Agenda: “State of the Castner Range area,” and “Draft of [the] Final Project Report ‘Wide Area Assessment’ in Castner Range” featuring Victoria Kantsios of the URS Corporation.

*April 25, 2012, 9 a.m. Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies to Characterize Munitions Density [at] Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, Texas. Technical Project Planning Meeting #6, 25 April 2012. Agenda: -Project Objectives. -Layered Data Collection and Conclusions. -Intrusive Investigation and Results. -Lessons Learned. -Project Report. Among the “Overview of Project Activities” (p. 8): “-Site Reconnaissance. -Historical Records. -Lidar & Orthophotography. -Site Prep: Survey, Run Visual Sampling Plan (VSP), Mark Transects, Install Instrument Verification Strip (IVS). -Helicopter-borne Magnetometry. -Ground-based Geophysics. -Analog Data Collection. -Intrusive Investigation. -Project Report.” Unnumbered p. 9: “Site overview: -Size (7,000 acres [sic, ‘7,081 acres’]. -Location. -Vegetation/Terrain. -Geology. -Historical Uses. -Munitions Types. -Stakeholders. -Undefined land use. (p. 9) — Historical Data (p. 10): Data Types -Range Maps/Fans[,] -Previous Studies/Clearances. -Results: -Changing and overlapping range fans throughout site history -Previous studies are based on surface walks/sweeps. —Lesson Learned: -Historical data are ‘rough’ predictors of areas with high anomaly densities. -Not sufficient for footprint reduction or management decisions: - Presence of historical data is a good indicator of where anomalies ARE. -Absence of historical data is not a good indicator of where anomalies ARE NOT. -Use in concern with other data layers to build “weight of evidence.” P. 11 features a “Historical Uses” map whose “Legend” separates out “Features” by decade—1930s, 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. Ca. three dozen Features are named, and their exact locations are pointed out on an excellent map of Castner Range. —P 12 examines “Lidar & Orthophotography,” featuring “Lidar at 20 points/m2,” “Analyzing two data sets -20 points/m2[,] 5 points/m2,” “Orthophotography at 10cm pixels” and “Performer: Terrapoint,” each illustrated by its separate photograph. P. 13 (“Lidar Data”) contains three photographs with no explanations. P. 14 features one large photograph of an aerial map of Castner Range which “captured the outline of those features in GIS” by drawn-in red lines that point to the features’ locations, according to the oral presentation at the Technical Project

Planning event. P. 15 presents “Updates to Historical Range Layers” with three maps, namely: “Map 1: Original Historical Range Locations Provided by Site Inspection Report,” “Map 2: LIDAR Image with Described Areas of Interest, and “Map 3: Augmented Historical Range Locations Created as a Result of Close Proximity to Related Areas of Interest.” Featured are “berms associated with these ranges,” as per the TPP’s event’s oral presentation. “Conclusions: Lidar & Orthophotography” (p. 16) states the following: “-Can detect surface features indicative of munitions-related activities -Can reliably identify some areas of concentrated munitions use - Assists with project planning -Provides greatest insight when paired with other data layers - Cost: \$12.04 per surveyed & characterized acre,” which the presenters described as “very cost-effective and reasonable.” “Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry” (p. 17) includes a map (“Area Characterized through Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry”) which divides the Range into two zones—“5% or less slope” and “greater than 5% slope”—and reports on the procedures that contributed to those conclusions: Flying took place “1-3m above ground surface,” there was “100% coverage of survey area (approx. 1,577 acres; < 5% slope),” an “[e]stimated approx. 300-500 acres/day” were covered by “Performer: Sky Research.” P. 18 presents “Conclusions [from the] Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry,” which are: “Site conditions at Fort Bliss limited utility of data [as] Ferrous geology more extensive than expected [and] Vegetation more problematic than expected (high altitude = low pd). Data do not support conclusions about density and distribution of ferrous material at the MRS.” The cost of these operation? “\$126.56 per surveyed & characterized acre.” P. 19’s “Ground-Based Geophysics” present these operations and conclusions: “Man-portable (little) EM61 with transect-based coverage,” “Estimated characterized acreage is 4,020” on an “Area ≤18% slope” by “Performers: NAEVA Geophysics and Sky Research.” P. 20’s “Summary Statistics” “[c]ollected data over >1 million linear feet (>200 miles) of transects” of “[t]ransect spacing approximately 57m apart” and thus “[i]dentified and georeferenced approximately 21,000 anomalies.” P. 21’s “Instrument Response and Anomalies” presents data that is not explained. P. 22’s “Anomaly Densities” state that the on-the-ground researchers were “[a]ble to use ‘kriging’ to interpolate anomaly densities between transects”, thereby producing “[r]esults in statistically valid characterization of anomaly densities for over 4,000 acres.” On p. 23 we learn the “Conclusions” from “Ground-Based Geophysics,” i.e., “Able to characterize nearly all terrain up to 18% slope, “Litter mode increases levels of uncertainty/error in DGM data,” “Instrumentation can reliably detect expected munitions items on the MRS,” and “Transect-based date collection provides strong anomaly density estimates” at a “Cost [of] \$4,270 per surveyed acre [i.e.,] \$91.49 per characterized acre.” Set forth on p. 24 is the “Analog MEC Reconnaissance” that is “Based on USACE, Huntsville Center, Programmatic Work Plan for MEC Reconnaissance Surveys,” used “hand-held EMI sensors (MineLab2) and GeoXH to map anomalies,” acquired “data in areas inaccessible by DGM teams due to terrain: In the gullies/arroyos[,] Along unofficial hiking trails in mountainous terrain (stakeholder request) [involving] Approx. 22 miles of data collection.” More “Conclusions: Analog Reconnaissance,” i.e., that it “Can be used anywhere the operate can reach; up to 25% slope,” that it will “Assist with understanding types and quantities of MEC across the arroyos and ‘unofficial hiking trails’,” and that it “Addressed stakeholder concerns.”

A very data-rich map (“Weight of Evidence: Target Delineation”) covers much of p. 26 and shows the location of demolition pits (“2 sites”), MECs (“13 pieces”), munitions (156 pieces), range residue and debris (15 pieces), concrete features (24 pieces), dikes, surface metal, and wire fencing. More of the same appears in the “Intrusive Investigation” section (pp. 27-35). Some titles and their contents: “Intrusive Investigation: Purpose” (p. 28), which has been to verify target and non-target areas and set forth these goals: “Target areas: Determine the proportion of the anomalies that are attributable to munitions,” “perform statistically valid sampling through intrusive investigation of detected anomalies to characterize the source of each anomaly and confirm areas as target areas,” and “Non-target areas: Test hypotheses that MEC densities are less than or equal to 0.5 MEC items per acre (i.e., 1 MEC item per 2 acres)” and also “Perform statistically valid sampling (at 90% confidence level) through intrusive investigation of detected anomalies to ‘resolve’ and confirm the source of each anomaly” so as to “[c]haracterize each excavated object [as to] size, depth, orientation, nomenclature ...” The map on p. 29 green-dots “Selected Anomalies.” P. 30’s “Intrusive Procedures: Overview” states that the field workers were instructed to “Navigate to anomaly location using handheld GPS unit (Trimble GeoXH), Pinpoint anomaly using handheld EMI (MineLab), Use hand-tools to excavate all anomalies in sampling area, Classify items [as] MEC, Munitions debris, Range[-] related debris [or] Non-military debris [and then] Record data about each item.” P. 31 presents “Dig Results: Non-target Areas” pinpointing MECs (though none are shown on the map), Range[-]Related Debris, Non-Military Debris, Munition Debris, Hot Rock[s], Propellant[s], etc. “Dig Results: Target Areas” (p. 32) pinpoints p. 31’s target objects on another map that shows the location of all but MECs. P. 33’s “Dig Results by TA & NTA Lot (Man-portable Geophysics)” — continued on p. 34—features “frag[ments]” (which the TPP’s presenter said have “come from an exploding ordnance item”) including frag characterized thus (in the “Primary MD Descriptions” column of the table: “small arms bullets, few frag [or] some frag, frag, fuze components and small arms bullets, small arms bullets, frag, and a few projos [unknown term not defined]” and so forth. P. 35’s “Intrusive Investigation: Conclusions” are these: “In all non-target area lots, intrusive investigation support[s] the hypothesis that the density of MEC items is lower than 0.5 MEC item/acre. Lots 3 and 4 (southern NTAs) contain a higher proportion of munitions-related anomalies than in Lots 1 and 2 (northern NTAs). Two TAs (5 and 17) show little evidence of concentrated munitions use (low munitions-related anomaly densities). Four TAs (1, 2, 3, and 9) have mean munitions-related anomalies exceeding 300/acre (high confidence of munitions target area). Remaining TAs have mean munitions-related anomaly densities from 87 to 300/acre (4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 13). TAs 11, 14, 15, 16, and 18 (see Table 3-12) are not directly comparable to the others (analog range reconnaissance). Much of the site (almost 4,000 acres) remains inaccessible to most site[-]characterization methods.” Pp. 37 presents “Lessons Learned,” which are: “Historical Data: Don’t assume historical range boundaries are accurate. Lidar/Orthophotography: -Relatively cheap (even for very high density/quality)[.] -Serves/supports multiple purposes (MMRP planning, natural/cultural resource management, real property management, etc.)[.] Minimum of 5pts/mete2 lidar density (higher if in dense vegetation)[.] Helicopter-borne Magnetometry: Please IVS seeds at

least 20m apart from one another[.] Terrain slope critical to identifying accessible survey areas [.] Vegetation height above 6 ft (even sparse) may prevent safe useful data collection[.] Perform basic magnetometer sweeps to ID magnetic geology[.]—Man-portable Geophysics: A statistical-based transect design is highly effective at establishing anomaly densities.—Analog Geophysics: Very difficult to estimate anomaly densities and compare to digital geophysics.—Intrusive investigation production rates [are] lower when digging randomly[-]selected anomalies on transects.—Have open, honest, & frequent discussions with stake holders.—And, finally, p. 39 gives a six-item report on the TPP’s “Status,” namely: “About 120 pages [plus ca.] 300 pages of appendices.” “Content is VERY similar to this and previous TPP presentations (should be no surprises).” “DRAFT underwent internal Army review in November 2011 (modest changes).” “Distributed to TPP participants in March 2012.” “Would like to discuss any comments /concerns today.” “Plan to finalize in late May 2012 (please send us any input by 15 May.”

Frontera Castner TPP April 25, 2012 Incremental Sampling Meeting Minutes.pdf These Minutes sum up the “Stakeholder Technical Project Planning Meeting #6: Wide Area Assessment Technology Demonstration at Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, Texas, 25 April 2012.” See the immediately-foregoing three pages for a close report on it. The entire initial presentation at this meeting was made by Brian Helmlinger (URS Corporation). He has figured prominently in previous presentational events; the Minutes refer to URSs as “under contract to the US Army Environmental Command.” Also present was URS’s by-now well-known Victoria Kantsios. Five Fort Bliss personnel were on hand, along with three individuals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Helmlinger “discussed the layered data collected and used during this project [and then] provided an overview of the activities URS conducted” on the Range. He reminded participants that “this site has an undefined land use, which is where this project deviates from a RI. He then described URS’[s] use of previous studies/reports to establish the site[‘s] ‘history’ [which] is a rough predictor of areas with high anomaly densities, but it is not sufficient data to support management decisions. ... Mr. Helmlinger described the Lidar and Orthophotography data collected in October 2009. ... URS collected a lidar point density of 20 points per square meter. URS analyzed two lidar data sets, the full 20-point per square meter data set and a set that parsed out 5 points per square meter. Orthophotos with a 10 square centimeter pixel size were collected concurrently with lidar. Data were collected densely enough to find munitions[-]related surface features. He explained “that with orthophotography you get pictures of the vegetation [and with] Lidar, points do penetrate through the canopy to hit the ground and there is an ability to filter vegetation from the final Lidar image. ... [He] mentioned his concerns about using Lidar on Castner Range. Previous Department of Defense Lidar studies were conducted on air-to-ground bombing ranges, which typically contain [large] cratering and ground scarring. [Such] is not typical on Army ranges, so the features left [there] may be too small to detect using Lidar. The presence of highly erodible soils ... increases the potential that surface features become unrecognizable over time. We were skeptical that Lidar and Orthophotography would be of much value at Castner Range. [He] showed large Lidar maps of

Castner Range that clearly show surface features related to munitions-related activities. ... URS has drawn the conclusion that the use of Lidar and Orthophotography provides an improved understanding of historic range use, assists with project planning, provides insight into areas of concentrated munitions use when coupled with other data, and it has high value with relatively low cost ... just over \$12/acre [at Castner Range].

Mr. Helmlinger next discussed the conclusion derived from using helicopter-borne magnetometry to determine the density and distribution of ferrous metals. The results of this technology were of limited value due to the presence [of] magnetic geology and vegetation, forcing the copter to fly higher than planned. Helmlinger said that in theory helicopters could detect subsurface larger than 60mm in geologically “quiet” areas if they could fly 1-3 meters above the ground. “The vast majority of munitions are found in the top eighteen inches of soil.” Next discussed the “conclusions associated with the use of ground-based geophysics, “the tried and true method to characterize munitions sites. URS employed an electromagnetic induction (EMI) system ... that sends out a magnetic field to induce a secondary field in subsurface metal objects and measures the decay of the secondary field in millivolts (mV).” In response to a question about looking for surface munitions, he responded that “a certified UXO technician escorted each team, so if surface munitions were found[,] the UXO technician would capture [their location] for later disposition and escort the geophysicists to a safe location.”

A series of questions ensued. One asked if we can draw conclusions in only those areas that were walked. Helmlinger stated “yes.” Another question asked if both companies used the same instruments. The answer was “yes,” with another “yes” to the question “do the QC checks and overlap areas indicate that the geophysical data were similarly collected and processed. A fourth ask was would the data have differed if it had been collected east to west in lieu of north to south. Helmlinger’s response: “Probably not. The historic firing ranges were sited east/west and collecting data north/south was the most conservative approach to ensure we detected all target areas on the range.”

Mr. Helmlinger summarized the discussion thus: -URS believes [that] our hypothesis regarding MEC density in the non-target area is valid. -Two target areas (5 and 17) show little evidence of concentrated munitions use. -Four target areas (1, 2, 3, and 9) have mean munitions-related anomalies exceeding 300/acre. -Remaining target areas have mean munitions-related anomaly densities from 87 to 300/acre. -Much of the site (almost 3,000 acres) remains inaccessible to most site[-]characterization methods.

URS plans to finalize the report in late June/early July 2012.

Among the multiple questions and answers that followed: (1) With gravity, material moves from high terrain to low, but it cannot be predicted to what degree and how long it will take to move. (2) Where is the break point of the EM technology? A 25%-plus slope? Responses: break points are subject to discussion. Helmlinger: “[I]t was not safe to deploy the EM61 sensors at greater than 18% slope and the limit of the hand-held instrument characterization was about

25-30% slope.” (3) “The original date for the draft report release was May 2011. Why the delay? Mr. Helmlinger responded that we had underestimated the amount of time it would take to analyze the data and to draw conclusions associated with the data.” (4) Fort Bliss and the Army would look at parceling out areas to make the RI more manageable. Cost will be a driver ... [T]o investigate the entire site could be cost[-]prohibitive.” (5) “Not all munitions have an explosive safety risk. ... [T]he type and size of rounds drive risk. Some munitions, like small arms projectiles, contain no explosive risk. They are solid pieces of metal. However, even some medium and large caliber munitions items that look like a solid piece of metal ... have the potential to contain a spotting charge; therefore, an explosive hazard may exist. (6) Historical records “are notoriously inaccurate and they do not indicate where on Castner Range the rounds were fired.” (7) What actions did TxDOT and others do to clear the footprint during the 1968 construction of Transmountain Road? “Meeting participants responded that ordnance was found during construction.”

Final questions and answers: “What is the plan going forward for the Remedial Investigation?” Answer: “[T]he Army is still awaiting the munitions constituent data, which will need to be incorporated into the plan.” — “[T]he data collected during this project allows the Army to evaluate the scope for the RI. Future land use is a big decision as this site moves forward in the cleanup process.” — “[T]here is significant data on the easy[-]to[-]access areas of Castner Range, but the Army is continuing to evaluate how to proceed in the steep and high elevation areas. ... Once this site moves forward to the RI, the Army will hold a scoping meeting with regulatory agencies.” — “[The range scrap] was managed in accordance with DOD processes and procedures. The material was considered MPPEH (Material Potentially Presenting an Explosives Hazard) until it underwent two 100% visual inspections and was documented as safe.” “Many things [have not been] decided for the RI, such as timing, scoping, and data. Who decided on [the] way ahead and where is public input? Mr. Rowden responded that the Army (Fort Bliss and HQ Department of Army) decides.”

*April 25, 2012. 6:30 p.m., Chaparral [NM] Community Center. [Editor’s note: Only Castner Range-related material will be cited/summed up in what follows.] All prior studies performed on Castner Range were surface studies. This RAB reports on airborne examinations. Lidar and orthophotography were flown using a fixed wing aircraft over the site. It was determined that lidar data was much better than orthophotography data. “We analyzed the Lidar data, and we found man-made features of interest. Map 3 shows historical ranges that are likely [to show] where you should focus your clean[-]up effort.” “Helicopter-borne Magnetometry: ... This study proved problematic due to the ferrous nature of the geology and the dense and high vegetation [and so] most of the data was undecipherable. ... [W]e can’t use this data. We couldn’t discriminate the items from the geology.” “Kriging” is a “statistical method [that] can be used to characterize the anomaly density of the terrain. It is a tried and true method [though] expensive ...; it costs \$2=4200/acre to walk each acre. But due to statistical data interpolation [it] only costs \$91.49/acre. This is not a bad a cost [sic]. This method was also employed at higher elevations. ... [R]esearchers used a hand[-]held EMI called the MineLab2 [and] 22 miles

of data at 25% slope was collected. This was the safety threshold [as] we couldn't get any steeper than that. ... Dig results in target areas showed mostly military debris, where as [sic] dig results in non[-]target areas found mostly non[-]military debris and some munitions but no USO. Overall no explosives were found[,] only frag and other munition debris."

"Lessons Learned: ... [H]istoric data is good, but don't expect the mapped range boundaries to be exact. Lidar/Orthophotography is relatively cheap and a good indicator. Only collect at 5 points per meter. 20 points per meter doesn't produce much more information. Helicopter Magnetometry [sic] was not useful. Man-Portable Geophysics works, but is expensive. Intrusive investigation is extremely time[-]consuming and expensive.

The final report should come out in May 2012.

Miscellaneous questions from RAB members and the general audience plus answers from staffers: "The cost of this study is a little higher because of the evaluation of the technology. This was not a Castner Range study. This is a technology-based investigation. We can use this information for Castner ... [b]ut this was a technology investigation which will be used to evaluate other DOD sites." "What happens to Castner Range cannot be determined until after the CERCLA investigation. We have to complete this process before the Army can determine end use." [From Sylvia Waggoner, Fort Bliss Environmental staffer and co-chair, the Fort Bliss RAB:] "If there are no other questions, we will move on to the next agenda item, the proposed adjournment of the [Fort Bliss] RAB. This is proposed because we don't have the results of the RIFS and this RAB is only one of several forums through which the public can get involved. The Army is considering a temporary adjournment of this RAB and we are expected to advertise this in the [news]paper for a 30 day period of public comment. ... We want to publish something by the 29th of April."

*Photocopy, Friday, April 27, 2012 e-mail ("Castner Range: My trip to DC, and our trip to Chaparral") from Richard Teschner to the seven other members of the Castner Conservation Committee. A page-and-a-half email consisting of three long paragraphs and two very short ones. With cautious optimism, the first long paragraph narrates the author's visits with various federal executives. Chief point of discussion: The "Castner" language in the FY 2013 NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) which—given the since-January-2011 Republican majority on the HASC (House Armed Services Committee)—could no longer contain earmarks, given that majority's opposition to them. Therefore, "the Castner language in the FY2013 NDAA reads thus: 'LOG ID 12115 Land Conveyance, Castner Range ... (a) Conveyance Authorized. (1) Conveyance authority.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to the Parks and Wildlife Department of the State of Texas ... all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 7,081 acres ... for the purpose of permitting the Department to establish and operate a park as an element of the Franklin Mountains State Park.'" Also included is the following statement, in Paragraph (2) of Section (a): "Piecemeal Conveyances.—In anticipation of the conveyance of the entire parcel of real property described in paragraph (1), the Secretary

may subdivide the parcel and convey to the Department portions of the real property as the Secretary determines that [its condition] is compatible with the Department's intended use ..."

The email's second long paragraph repeats some of the information appearing in the present document's item just above ("TPP Incremental Planning Sampling Meeting Minutes"). The paragraph stresses the following quote therefrom: "The layers of data from these assessment technologies were compiled and compared to identify 18 preliminary target areas, or areas of possible concentrated munitions use. The remaining acreage was hypothesized to be non-target area[,] based, in part, on a low probability of encountering MEC ... Using this approach, approximately half the assessed acreage was confirmed as non-target area at the 90% confidence level." ... "I should add that [URS presenter Brian Helmlinger] noted that in the CERCLA Process, Castner is now between the WAA phase and the RI/FS ('Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study') phase on the road to remediation and eventual transfer, and that whether Castner will even enter RI/FS 'hasn't been determined yet; the matter is still being evaluated.'" It's the third long paragraph's news that is bad. To quote: "[W]e knew from earlier e-mails (sent out by Fort Bliss's Environmental Command office) that the 'other' purpose of the meeting was the e-announcement that this would be the last Fort Bliss RAB 'for at least the next two years.' (The e-announcement spoke of the RAB as being 'adjourned,' aka 'suspended'.) I myself [Richard Teschner] have been a RAB delegate since last spring and I came to this meeting prepared to advocate a plan whereby the RAB would meet once a year as opposed to twice or thrice (most recently it hadn't met since October 2011) and would therefore not be considered 'adjourned.' I was given no opportunity to do so. The meeting's two chairs ... allowed or encouraged the 'adjournment' discussion to stray widely afield, with members of the public adducing topics that though Castner-related were nonetheless quite ungermane to the matter of adjournment. Two hours into the meeting, the staff chair simply announced that this RAB was adjourned for at least two years and until further notice. ... I later asked Judy [Ackerman] whether this 'adjournment' (and the way it came about) was legal. Alas it is, she said, for RABs are entirely the creatures of any given base's garrison commander, who can do with them as (s)he wishes."

Frontera Castner 4C's Meeting notes 2012 05 12.docx May 15, 2012. These notes—taken by Judy Ackerman—are from the May 15, 2012 4C's meeting with Park Superintendent Cesar Mendez at his Franklin Mountains State Park headquarters office. Some quotes: "The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA, conduit for the \$300,000 grant in 2010 to study a conservation conveyance) says it is OK to use money left from the grant for a Land Use Study (LUS). ... Ideally, the LUS will be in a format and cover the topics needed [to] meet the needs of [the Texas Parks and Wildlife Division] AND possibly also meet the needs of the Army. ... If Castner is designated as a Closed Natural Area (CNA) or a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) the management is different than if Castner is part of [the Franklin Mountains State Park]. Considerations for Land Use include: Park Headquarters, conservation, water recharge, camping, trailheads, RV camping, horses. ... Cesar has a contact on Bliss ... Cesar will contact [him] and propose a meeting with [his] boss (probably the new Fort Bliss Garrison Commander ... along with Cesar's

boss, Deirdre Hisler). In light of the press conference by Congress Reyes, 12 May 2012, on transferring Castner to the FMSP, Texas Parks and Wildlife is thinking about doing a LUS.

[May 15, 2012 4:25 p.m. printout of an email entitled:] *"The 30-day comment period on what to do with the Fort Bliss RAB." Eight separate emails between Richard Teschner (RAB member), Joel Reyes (Restoration Program Manager, Multi-Media Compliance Branch, DPW-Environmental Division, Fort Bliss) and Judy Ackerman (member, the Castner Conservation Committee) with send-outs to Sylvia Waggoner, Ronald Baca, Carlos Peña (Environmental Division, Fort Bliss) and others. Mr. Reyes' initial email (April 23, 2012) stated that "[a]t this moment, Fort Bliss does not have any restoration projects to justify the need of the RAB, and we will be inviting the public to comment on the proposal to adjourn the Fort Bliss RAB, which would be for a minimum of 2 years. It is important to clarify that this does not mean the RAB will be permanently dissolved." Judy Ackerman responded in part as follows: "My biggest concern with the 'adjourning' of the RAB is the decision-making method. Since I've been attending RAB meetings ([beginning March] 2008), there has been a wide variety of public attendees. Questions and comments from the public, as well as discussions among RAB members [influence] the opinions of those present and [add] to their common knowledge. This sharing of information simply cannot take place [by] e-mail." Richard Teschner responded thus in part: "As a member of the RAB ... I strongly support Judy's request. May I end this e-mail with a quote from this past Wednesday evening's Castner presentation by URS's Victoria Kantsios: 'It's important to have open, honest and frequent dialogue with stakeholders.' No such dialogue can occur in the absence of public forums such as those the RAB provides." Joel Reyes responded as follows (May 1, 2012): "I will ... forward the emails below to our Garrison Commander so he can consider them prior to the final decision of adjourning the RAB or not. Also, I will let you know the dates for the 30-day comment period where members of the public will be able to submit their comments." Richard Teschner responded in part as follows (May 15, 2012): "In your initial e-mail (April 23 ...) you write that "[t]he 30-day public comment period will begin April 29, 2012 and ends May 28, 2012." But in your more recent e-mail (May 01, 2012 ...) you write: "I will let you know the dates for the 30-day comment period where members of the public will be able to submit their comments." Two and a half weeks have now passed since April 29, and just thirteen days remain until May 28. What is the status of the 30-day comment period? Has it already begun? Have the dates been changed (and, if so, what are they)? As a member of the RAB, I assumed I'd be informed ... " Joel Reyes responded thus (May 15, 2012, 4:22 p.m.): "I'm still working on this. No worries, the public comment period has not yet begun, but rest assured that I will make notify [sic] everyone when this will begin." Teschner's response (same day, 4:25 p.m.): "Thanks for your very quick response. We will look forward to your next e-mail, informing us as to the start of the public comment period." A month later—June 10, 2012—Joe Reyes emailed me and other members of the RAB to the following effect: "Good morning. I just wanted to let you know the 30-day comment period for the recommendation to adjourn the RAB begins today. I will call Mr. Aldaz, Mr. Mazzochi, and Ms. Wonciar [additional members of the RAB] to let them know as well. Please send your letters to

Zia Engineering & Environmental Consultants LLC. 755 S. Telshor Blvd., Suite F-201. Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001. Thank you.”

*[June 10, 2012 7:15 p.m. Print-out of most of an email that Richard Teschner sent to Judy Ackerman and Scott Cutler, long-time member of the Castner Conservation Committee and founder and frequent President of the Frontera Land Alliance, the El Paso area’s only 501(c)3 nationally-accredited land-trust organization:] “I’d say this [in response to Joel Reyes’ e-mails]: ‘At the very least, we want one RAB per year to be held. If Fort Bliss adheres to such a schedule, the next RAB would take place in April 2013. We understand that in addition to an annual RAB, TPP meetings will also be held when appropriate.’—I have no additional info from Joel or other official[s] ... To the very best of my knowledge, Joel et al. did not make any public announcement.”

RAB adjournment informational e-mail on the proposal adjournment of the Fort Bliss RAB.msg
June 11, 2012 E-mail sent by Richard Teschner in his capacity as Member (since January 2011) of the Fort Bliss RAB to the 25 individuals directly or indirectly associated with Castner Range conservation efforts. Some quotes from Teschner’s letter:

“This is a strictly information-only mailing. No organizational action or even consideration of the fate of the Fort Bliss RAB ... is being solicited here. Instead, I am simply letting you know what’s now going on anent the Fort Bliss RAB, whose main concern is Castner Range. ... [T]he Fort Bliss Environmental Division and the Fort Bliss Garrison Commander are recommending that the RAB be ‘adjourned’ for at least the next two years, i.e., no more RAB meetings until [Fort Bliss] decides to start them up again. I oppose this. See my letter attached.—Justification of the ‘adjournment’ recommendation appears in an April 23, 2012 e-mail from Joel Reyes [q.v. supra] ... : the Garrison Commander will ‘consult the Environmental Protection Agency, state, tribes, Fort Bliss RAB members and the local community to recommend the adjournment of the Fort Bliss RAB. At this moment, Fort Bliss does not have any restoration projects to justify the need of the RAB ... [T]his does not mean the RAB will be permanently dissolved. ... As required, Fort Bliss will continue to move forward with the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) ... [including Castner Range], as required under ... CERCLA, and support the Technical Project Planning and public meetings that are an important component of this process.’ And indeed, a few TPP meetings have been held since 2008. All public meetings however have been held under the aegis of the RAB. No other venues have been realized or proposed. ... If you personally support my opposition to the adjournment of the RAB, please write Zia Engineering ... as I myself have done. ...”

RAB Teschner letter to Zia Engineering re adjournment of Fort Bliss RAB.docx “Monday, June 11, 2012. ... Dear Zia Engineering: This letter is in response to the request, by Joel Reyes, Restoration Program Manager, Multi-Media Compliance Branch, DPW-Environmental Division, Fort Bliss, TX, for comments anent the Environmental Division’s recommendation that the Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) be adjourned ‘for a minimum of 2 years. ... (Joel Reyes, e-mail April 23, 2012, 3:32 p.m.) — As a member of the RAB ... I oppose its adjournment. My

biggest concern is the long hiatus adjournment will produce in the decision-making process. Since I've been attending RAB meetings (from 2008 onward) I've been aware of both the quantity and the quality of the input there ... Questions and comments from the public, as well as discussions among RAB members themselves, have clearly influenced the opinions of those present and have added to our common knowledge. Such sharing of information cannot take place in e-mails. From the first page of the website www.epa.gov/fedfac/documents/rab.htm, I learn that DoD policy calls for RABs 'to be formed at all closing installations and at all non-closing installations where the local community expresses interest. RABs are an expansion of DoD's Technical Review Committee (TRC) concept. The boards are a forum for exchange of information and partnership among citizens, the installation, the EPA and the state. Most importantly, they offer an opportunity for communities to provide input to the cleanup process. It is our view that RABs will improve DoD's cleanup program by increasing community understanding and support for cleanup efforts, improving the soundness of government decision, and ensuring cleanups are responsive to community needs.' While Technical Project Planning (TPP) meetings concerning Castner Range will—by law—continue to be held, they have not proven as thorough or as enlightening as the RAB events have done. I'm not requesting that Fort Bliss RABs be held on a quarterly basis; ... that is just too much to ask. Instead, I strongly recommend that Fort Bliss RABs be held just twice a year and at the very minimum at least once. What underlies my recommendation is that through their elected officials and in unanimously-supported resolutions (by City Council, the County Commissioners' Court, the Texas House of Representatives and [the Texas] Senate), El Paso's citizens strongly support cleaning up Castner Range ... Without regular RABs, our citizenry cannot keep up to date on what's happening in our 'home on the Range,' and cannot continue to move forward in our drive to conserve the Range in its entirety."

RAB adjournment comments from Democratic Nominee for U.S. Congress Beto O'Rourke.docx Dated "Friday, June 15, 2012," two weeks after Mr. O'Rourke won the Democratic Primary Election, it read, in part: "There have been some serious concerns brought to my attention about this adjournment and the impact that it could have on our community, specifically as it relates to the clean-up and conservation of Castner Range ... It is clear to me that the community has expressed interest in keeping [the] RAB active, so that they may increase their public input in the current processes and clean-up taking place, as well as staying informed and having the opportunity to discuss these issues with other members. If the existing RAB were to be adjourned ... it would greatly limit this participation. ..."

*Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration Report for the Closed Castner Range[,] Fort Bliss, Texas. Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District / U.S. Army Environmental Command. July 2012. [No "day" date given.] This five-page-long three-page presentation was USPS-mailed to an undisclosed list of recipients. Prepared by the URS Group (Arlington, VA), it succinctly repeats information appearing earlier. (See, in particular, two documents—WAA and TPP— both dated April 25, 2012 and both quoted from and summed up extensively above.) Cited and discussed here—as in the two April 25, 2012 documents—are WAA technologies,

lidar and orthophotographic techniques and data, helicopter-borne magnetometry techniques and data, man-portable EMI DGM transect approaches and so forth. “Stakeholder concurrence was obtained at every phase of the project” (p. iv). “The layers of data from these assessment technologies were compiled and compared to identify 18 preliminary target area, or areas of possible concentrated munitions use. ... A separate sample size calculation, based on UXO Estimator, was performed to test a hypothesis about the relatively low MEC density (i.e., less than 0.5 per acre) in the non-target areas. UXO dig teams then returned to the field and excavated the randomly selected anomalies and classified each find as to type and source. Nearly 3,000 anomalies were reacquired and excavated.” (p. v) “This project does not complete the investigation at the Closed Castner Range MRS, but the data reported here will be of significant benefit to the subsequent RI.” (p. v)

*TPP [Technical Project Planning] Meeting No. 2, September 12, 2012. This 13-page handout supported the TPP meeting, whose orally- and visually-presented data it supplemented. The sole location discussed was “Former Maneuver Area A,” located many miles to the east of Castner Range; Castner itself was not under discussion, nor did any information specifically related to Castner appear in the handout. TPP meetings’ objectives are “[t]o solicit Project Stakeholder input and obtain concurrence on the RI Work Plan including assignment of sampling location logic and investigation approach,” to quote from the slide reproduction that appears on p. 2 of the document.

2013

Frontera Castner Núñez John History of the FM State Park and Castner Range.docx Entitled “Castner Range: 1977-2012,” this seven-page narrative by lifelong El Pasoan John Núñez (henceforth “JN”) is a treasure trove of rich historical information. JN grew up near the corner of Magnetic Street and Sands Avenue, just two blocks south of Hondo Pass Drive, the southern boundary of Castner Range. He writes of sites and structures now long gone such as the Castner Recreational Park (“[v]ideo footage of a windmill and some of the {area’s} rock structures can be seen on the Texas Film Archive website under Hunt Family Vacation Films #1”—p. 1). He refers to “an old structure made of rock and cement that may be related to the former Threadgill Ranch [on most of what is now Castner Range]. There is another structure similar to this located south of [Transmountain] Road. Both rock structures resemble the ones visible in the Hunt Family film.” (p. 2) Pp. 2 and 3 speak at considerable length of “the historically rich area known as Indian Springs Canyon,” mentioning bee-hive structures, trails, archaeological sites “where Jornada Mogollon natives would scrape the deep red rock and use the scrapings for pigment for their pottery. This site is mentioned in the Wilderness Park Master Plan that the

City of El Paso wrote in 1972.” (p. 2) “I saw a report that was written about culturally and archaeological[ly-]sensitive areas of Castner Range that [was written in 2005 by] former Park Superintendent Ron Hillin. I have not seen this report ... as it may have been buried in confidential files.” JN refers to “jeep trails [that] had to have been built during the 1960’s or early 1970’s” (p. 3), i.e., after Castner ceased to be an active artillery Range. “Further west on [Transmountain Road, and] directly across [from] the TxDOT shade/picnic shelters, there is another archaeological[ly-]sensitive area known as White Rock Canyon and White Rock Shelter ... Sadly this area has been plagued with heavy graffiti and lit[t]er, thus the recent construction of a chain-link fence along the roadway.” (p. 3) “At the top of the canyon, just south of [developer Dick] Knapp’s Road (now the [Franklin Mountains State Park] North Franklin Trail) lies the banged-up remains of a three-sided navigation light structure. ... When [Mr. Knapp] constructed a jeep trail to the top of North Franklin Peak in 1979, [he] leveled the top of North Franklin Peak. As a result, ... the navigation light structure was bulldozed and pushed off the top of [the peak, and] it eventually landed on top of Oak Tree Canyon.” (p. 4)

On pp. 5 and 6, JN makes “a few suggestions” that stem from his childhood, adolescent and young-adulthood years of “hik[ing] on Castner Range prior to the recent (1999) enforcement of ‘No Trespassing’.” Those suggestions include: “(1) Create a trail-head on the south end of Castner near the intersection of Galena Dr. and Hondo Pass Road. This would provide access to some of the most exciting and scenic trails in this section of [Castner Range]. (2) Establish a trailhead at Fusselman Canyon leading up and over the saddle and down into Hondo Pass Canyon ... (6) [Establish] a trailhead at Oak Tree Canyon similar to the proposed trailhead at Whispering Springs Canyon. (7) Establish a designated trail leading from Whispering Springs to North Franklin Peak.” Six more suggestions complete JN’s recommendations.

JN’s history concludes with the Range’s being closed to public access in 1999. “I frequently hiked on Castner Range up until 1999 when I was approached by Range Patrol, specifically Range Rider Dean Wood. Prior to this encounter ..., I and many other people hiked freely on Castner Range [despite the] No-Trespassing signs [that] were always there [and] it was common to have as many as 10 cars parked at any given trailhead off of [Transmountain] Road. [H]ikes were sponsored by local organization such as the Boy Scouts ... I believe what forced the DOD to enforce ‘No Trespassing’ were a slew of disasters within the range. Most notably, the wildfire of May 1993, which destroyed vegetation over approximately 60,000 acres of land, including a large portion of Castner Range.” (p. 7) “If there is anything else I can do to assist with the land use plan, such as provide maps, photographs, film/video footage or references, please let me know.” (p. 7)

Frontera Castner 4C’s Fort Bliss meeting January 11 2013 Candid comments (Teschner’s).msg
In her capacity as Executive Director of the Frontera Land Alliance, Janaé Reneaud Field attended a Jan. 3, 2013 meeting with personnel from Fort Bliss including Col Brant Dayley (Garrison Commander), Mark Cauthers (Deputy to the GC), Al Riera (Director, DPW), Vicki Hamilton (Director, DPW-Environmental), Sylvia Waggoner and Eric Wolters (both DPW-

Environmental), Marianne Bradshaw (OSJA, Fort Bliss), Cynthia Cano (Office of Congressman Beto O'Rourke), César Méndez (Superintendent, Franklin Mountains State Park), Michael Gaglio (President, the Frontera Land Alliance) and John Moses (Board of Directors, Frontera Land Alliance). Some quotes: "Col. Dayley opened the meeting and asked each attendee to provide a brief intro. A flow chart of the Castner 'process' prepared by Ft. Bliss was passed around and showed that the project was somewhere in the middle of the diagram's tasks. Janae' offered paper and CD copies of the Calibre conservation conveyance report. Col. Dayley asked if Bliss had input. Vicki said that she had contacted Calibre and was told that her request for a cost estimate on a conservation conveyance was outside of the scope of the study. Vicki said that she had spoken to the funding agency (OEA) and was told it could be within the scope of the project. Mike offered CD containing draft land use plan and asked for comments.

Status of Castner: Col. Dayley said [it] "may not be excess today." Army needs to decide if they might still need the acreage. **Declaration of "excess" and reversion to GSA [General Services Administration] would come after cleanup.** [Richard Teschner's emphasis.] GSA would then look at use options. If Army evaluates possible options, [this] may trigger NEPA [National Environmental Policy Act]. Statements made: (1) Castner Range is having an environmental assessment conducted and the Corps of Engineers will be speaking [with] Commander Dayley. (2) Fort Bliss must go through the entire MMRP process, **which includes the clean[-]up** [my emphasis]. (3) If Castner is cleaned up then it goes to GSA for review and others have the option to provide input on what happens to the land. (5) Who has legal jurisdiction? How would this be handled? What is the cost of cleanup? (d [?]) Incremental transfer (most costly) option for all. (6) Army legally is responsible for clean-up and liability ... (7) Funds for clean-up, at this time, come from Congress and are distributed based on the public risk/harm that they might encounter. (9) Rain seems to move UXO's which is a danger since not sure when and what will be moved in the coming years. (10) The type of clean-up will disturb the existing land.

Status of RAB—Vicki says RAB was mothballed due to lack of interest by NM reps.

Status of MMRP—Sylvia noted role of Congress in appropriating cleanup funds Al Riera said that DOD does the "racking & stacking" by risk. Col. Dayley wants to host meeting involving DOD personnel involved in ranking/prioritization of sites and doesn't want to wait until May WAA meeting. Wants to see meeting in February. May not use RAB as vehicle for meeting but needs to be open to public. May use "novel" meeting approach.

Richard Teschner's emailed comments (1/14/2013) followed. Among them: Castner is not "excess today." Steve Bonner thoroughly researched that issue and came up with the facts, which his Report reports in detail. It also addresses the issue of "[w]ho has legal jurisdiction." Statement #10 ("The type of clean-up will disturb the existing land") is the original Catch-22. ANY type of clean-up that digs down six inches or more will disturb the existing land. Cop-out. Regarding the status of the RAB and the decision to "adjourn" its meetings, the New Mexico representatives do not constitute a RAB majority, nor have I ever heard them indicate any "lack of interest." "I [greatly] like Col. Dayley's desire to host whatever sort of meeting in February."

Frontera Castner 4C's Fort Bliss Meeting__132013 report thereon.msg This is a January 19, 2013 continuation of the immediately-antecedent item. Judy Ackerman wrote thus: "Is anyone following up to ensure we are informed of date/time/location of WAA and any other meetings Dayley might host?" Richard Teschner responded as follows: "My suggestion is that Janaé be the one to follow up [on that]. ... I myself would be more than happy ... to beat the drums again for a RAB, but Mike strongly recommends that I hold off, since Col. Dayley seems to have made some sort of don't-call-us-we'll-call-you statement about the RAB at the 1/3/2013 meeting.

*Photocopy of a Feb. 13, 2013 letter—from Kevin W. Davee, Chief, Environmental Design Branch and presumably sent by USPS—to the office of the District 4's El Paso City Council Representative, who passed it on to Richard Teschner. Some highlights: "The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Fort Worth District is continuing the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at [Castner Range]. In support of this RI/FS, USACE will hold its second Technical Project Planning (TPP) Workshop beginning at 10:00 AM on February 27, 2013 [in El Paso] to discuss the RI approach as well as the FS process to be implemented following the RI. USACE is requesting the participation from [sic] project stakeholders, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Region 6), [the] Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, local government agencies and officials, and other affected property owners to participate in the TPP process. [Editor's note: No mention of long-active land-conservation organizations such as the Frontera Land Alliance.] The TPP Workshop will review the RI approach, which is detailed in the Draft Final Work Plan. [It] has undergone an internal Army review and is presently under review by stakeholders. The TPP Workshop has been scheduled approximately half-way through the Work Plan review cycle, providing stakeholders a working knowledge of the RI approach ... and allowing for in-depth discussions regarding the RI data collection process outlined in the Work Plan.—A single munitions response site (MRS), the Artillery and Anti-Tank Ranges MRS will be investigated during the RI. Activities in the MRS will include a geophysical survey to detect metal objects below the ground surface and the manual/mechanical excavation of buried metal debris. ... USACE will implement the RI/FS following the ... (CERCLA) process. ... A Site Inspection (SI) was completed at the Castner Range FUDS property [i.e., the land to the east of and across the freeway from Castner Range itself and, therefore, not the present-day Castner Range proper] in 2010 and a public meeting was held in March 2011 to present the SI results. The SI recommended the site for an RI/FS, which is the next step in the ERCLA process, and included implementing a series of TPP Workshops. [Editor's comment: Mr. Davee is confused. The Castner Range FUDS property is not the subject of such continuing attention.] ... —Sincerely, Kevin W. Davee, PG, PMP, Chief, Environmental Design Branch.

*Feb. 19, 2013 announcement of Feb. 27, 2013 RAB plus draft agenda.—This item's main importance is its revelation that Fort Bliss has not "adjourned" the RAB for at least two years as it announced that it would do. The key quote: "We would like to announce that we will be having a RAB meeting February 27th, 2013, at 6:30 PM in the Northeast Regional Command Office located at 9600 Dyer Street in El Paso, Texas."

Frontera Castner TPP February 27 2013 Technical Project Planning Meeting Memorandum.pdf

“The purpose of the TPP Meeting was to introduce project stakeholders to the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) being conducted at the Former Castner Range, Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) and to obtain stakeholder input on the upcoming investigation. This document is intended to record the project stakeholder discussions conducted and action items identified as a result of the meeting.” (p. 1) There follows a “Project Description” which parameterizes the project as follows: “Following the Army’s 1974 surface clearance of approximately 1,230 acres on the far eastern side of the range [editor’s emphasis], this portion of the land was sold to non-Department of Defense (DOD) entities including the city of El Paso, and is therefore now part of the Former Castner Range FUDS. ... There is a large portion of the original ‘Castner Range’ which is still owned by the U.S. Government; however, this area is not part of the FUDS property and therefore not part of this investigation.”

RAB Kirgan Robert WAA Munitions Feb 27 2013 Meeting Presentation.pdf The title of this 48-page document is “Demonstration of Wide Area Assessment Technologies to Characterize Munitions Density[,] Closed Castner Firing Range[,] Fort Bliss, TX”. Much of the present document’s information was presented in various forms by Army representatives or affiliates on several occasions throughout 2012. It is useful to find that information repeated or expanded upon in the present document. Here are its highlights: AGENDA: “Project Objectives. Layered Data Collection and Conclusions. Intrusive Investigation and Results. Lessons Learned. Incremental Sampling Methodology. Project Reports.” (p. 2) “Project Objections: Characterization Challenge. Millions of acres of closed ranges in MMRP site inventory. Many acres do not contain UO. Needs methods to cost[-]effectively: -Focus characterization efforts on areas used for munitions[-]related activities. -Eliminate areas with no indication of munitions use.” (p. 4) “Project Purpose[:]-Field test the WAA methods and conclusions included in the *Wide Area Assessment Cost-Benefit Analysis: Active Army Military Munitions Response Program* (USAEC 2009). -Collect site characterization data using a variety of WAA methods in a manner to ensure usable data for subsequent MMRP investigations (i.e., RI/FS). (p. 5) “Objective[:]-Demonstrate non-traditional technology applications for detecting munitions on Army property. -Determine areas with evidence of concentrated military munitions use. -Determine relative density of anomalies across these areas. -Determine areas with minimal evidence of past military munitions use.” (p. 6) “Layered Data Collection” (p. 7) [:]-“Overview of Project Activities[:]-Site Reconnaissance -Historical Records -Lidar & Orthophotography -Site Prep[:]-Survey -Run Visual Sampling Plan (VSP) -Mark Transects -Install Instrument Verification Strip[:]-Helicopter-borne Magnetometry. -Ground-based Geophysics. -Analog Data Collection. -Intrusive Investigation. -Project Report. [p. 8] There follows (p. 9) a “Site Overview [of Castner Range] enumerating “-Size (7,000 acres) -Location -Vegetation/Terrain -Geology -Historical Use -Munitions Types -Stakeholders -Undefined land use” and so on and so forth. Maps (p. 11), photos of “Lidar & Orthophotography” (p. 12), “Lidar Data” (p. 13), “Lidar/Ortho Features of Interest” (p. 14), “Updates to Historical Range Layers” (p. 15) and “Conclusions: Lidar & Orthophotography” (p. 16) complete the section. Remaining section titles will be familiar to

persons who are familiar with presentations made the previous year (2012): Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry [presentation and “conclusions”], Ground-Based Geophysics, Instrument Response and Anomalies, Anomaly Densities, “Conclusions” anent Ground-Based Geophysics,” “Analog MEC Reconnaissance” and its “Conclusions,” Target Delineation (“Weight of Evidence”), a lengthy section on Intrusive Investigation (“Purpose,” “Selected Anomalies,” “Procedures: Overview,” “Dig Results: Non-Target Areas [and] Target Areas,” the inevitable “Conclusions,” “Project lessons Learned,” “Incremental Sampling Methodology” and its consubstantial “Defining the Problem,” “Project Goals,” “Phase 1 Sampling Design,” “Incremental Sampling [itself],” the usual “Summary” (pp. 42-43), “Phase 2 Sampling Goals” and then “Sampling” (activities and findings), “Notional Arroyo Transect Design[s]” and, finally, “Project Reports: Status,” which reports the following: “The Wide Area Assessment Report is complete. The Incremental Sampling Methodology Report is being finalized and will be complete by March [2013]. The final TPP meeting [on the topics presented above] will occur in early April to discuss sampling results.”

*Agenda. Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board [RAB]. 27 February 2013 at 6:30 pm. Northeast Regional Command Center, El Paso, Texas. Of the Agenda’s six highlighted items—three “Old Business,” three “New Business”—two (i.e., one from each category) refer to Castner Range: “Status of Castner Range RI [‘Remedial Investigation’] Scoping,” and “Castner Range Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS).” As FUDS-ocentric, the second item focusses on the section of Castner that lies to the east of the US 54 North-South Freeway and is thus no longer part of “Castner Range” as parameterized since the early 1970s. (In actual point of fact, the overwhelming majority of the fifty-some pages—most numbered, some not—deal with the east-of-the-freeway aka “FUDS” section of what used to be Castner Range.) Onward, then, to the present-day Castner’s “RI Scoping” as Old Business. See, in particular, unnumbered pages 2 and 3 of “2. Old Business” at the beginning of the printout. P. 2’s first complete section (“c. Wide Area Assessment (WAA) Update: presented by Dr. Robert Kirgan (U.S. Army Envr. Command”) describes “the demonstration project which has been on-going at Castner Range for the past year or two. Updates on this project have been provided at many previous RAB meetings. The purpose of the study is to test the effectiveness of various techniques for detecting the presence of UXO on formerly used firing ranges. He emphasized that the study is not part of the CERCLA process although it is similar to a Remedial Investigation in some ways. The techniques being tested are LIDAR (aerial imagery using a laser), ortho-photography, helicopter-borne magnetic survey, ground-based geophysics, intrusive investigation and soil sampling. The results indicate that LIDAR is both effective at finding topographic features related to the firing range and it’s economical. LIDAR was more useful than the aerial ortho-photography. The helimagnetometry was not successful or economic[al] at Castner because of the topography, the iron-rich rocks and the tall vegetation. The ground-based geophysics technique produced good results at a reasonable cost but its use was limited to areas with slope <18%. That excludes 4000 of the 7,081 acres in Castner Range. The intrusive investigation of the anomalies detected by the geophysical instruments found

mostly cultural debris (hiker trash). Soil sampling has found very low levels of explosive components but some exceedences [sic] for metals like beryllium. The final TPP meeting for this project in April 2013 will present the soil sampling results. — d. Q&A: ... J. Ackerman asked if any MEC was found. R. Kirgan said a practice round was found. Rick Provencio asked if [today's presentation] was the same presentation given at the April 2012 Chaparral meeting. R. Kirgan said that only the sampling data was new. [Sue DiCara] asked if the live munitions were destroyed. R. Kirgan explained that some munitions can be removed but most are destroyed in place. — e. Status of Castner Range RI Scoping: presentation by Bob Rowden (U.S. Army Environmental Command). The next step in the CERCLA process for this site is a Remedial Investigation (RI). The scope of work (SOW) is being written and should be contracted out around August or September of 2013. The purpose of this RI is to determine the extent of the UXO on this former firing range. The contractor will develop a work plan for how to accomplish this goal and then proceed to survey the acreage. The results of the [WAA] will be incorporated into this effort. One of the challenges will be how to survey the steeper portions of the range on the cliffs of the Franklin Mountains. There will be public meetings throughout the life of the project. — f. Q&A: R. Provencio asked about the cost of the cleanup of Castner. B. Rowden said he had no idea. First the RI must be done to survey the extent of the UXO. Col.[.] Dayley asked if it's a realistic goal to have the SO ready in 6 months and would it include the steeper part of the range. B. Rowden replied that the entire 7000 acres needs to be investigated and September is their goal for advertising the contract. Col. Dayley asked if the large area and the complexity of the logistics would increase the cost. Can we afford it? B. Rowden said we don't know what the RI will cost until we have the SOW. R. Teschner asked which contractor would perform the RI. B. Rowden said he didn't know because it will be advertised and open to any firm who [sic] does this type of work. R. Teschner asked if there are similar Army sites that have had an RI done. B. Rowden stated that there are Army sites in California and Nevada ...R. Teschner asked how the contracting mechanism works and Col. Dayley asked "what is the performance period of the contract". R. Smith said it will be awarded this year with options which can be exercised as funds become available over the next few years; could be as late as Sept[.] 2017. The federal government's current economic woes could slow down the process. J. Ackerman ... wanted to know when a land use plan would be developed. B. Rowden replied that development of a land use plan is premature and must await the results of the RI. R. Provencio [sic] asked if TCEQ had cleanup criteria which must be satisfied. B. Rowden replied that under the CERCLA process, DOD is in charge of the site and TCEQ is a partner in that effort. Col. Dayley asked when the net update would be for the public on the Castner RI. B. Rowden replied it would be 3-6 months after the contract award; spring 2014."

RAB March 2 2013 emails.msg E-mail from long-time Castner Conservation Committee (CCC) member Judy Ackerman to all CCC's anent the February 27, 2013 RAB (which see, s. "Agenda ..." just above). Some quotes and summaries, in part to supplement the "Agenda" résumé: Robert Rowden (USAEC etc.) stated that the Army Environmental Command "may have a contract for a company to do the RI by Aug 2013. "A lot of us would like to do [i.e., clean up]

certain areas ...” Vickie Hamilton (Chief, DPW-Environmental Division) mentioned the idea (attributed to Sylvia Waggoner ...) that the RI could be done piecemeal from the top elevations down. ... Advantages: Cleaning from the top down ensures no future rains will bring contaminants onto the parts already cleaned. Funding is a big problem, especially multiple[-]year projects, so doing only a portion of the RI at a time might be [feasible]. ... — Richard Teschner asked Robert Rowden about getting a copy of the Statement of Work (SOW) for the RI but Rowden said NO since that could give illegal advantages to potential bidding contractors. If we could be involved in the definition of ‘exercise options’ it could be beneficial to moving the MMRP process forward. We are familiar with the terrain. It would be wonderful to finally have a working relationship with the Army.” To the RAB summation above, Judy appended the following extras: “2013 02 28 phone conversation with Steve Bonner: Yes, there is a legal prohibition with outsiders being involved with the SOW, but members of the RAB could sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement and then participate in [a] Draft SOW. ... Other RABs have done it. ... FMWC [Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition] could write a white paper suggesting an approach on how to piece-up Castner—where to draw the lines for iterations of the RI, starting at the highest elevations. FMWC [and] NOT Frontera so that Frontera can be at arm’s length and not influence a decision that might benefit Frontera. We could send the white paper to Rowden since USAEC is the lead on the RI. We could [cc. Col. Dayley], [Congressman Beto] O’Rourke, and even Lieutenant General Michael Ferriter (commander, U.S. Army Installation management Command IMCOM and Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management. — Other: Funding any RI is a problem. However, near the end of every fiscal year (30 Sept) there is a push to spend. It would be good to have a project ready. Rowden is aiming for letting a contract in Aug 2013. Castner is very low priority for the Army. — A short course on ... MMRP is available at: <http://aec.army.mil/usaec/cleanup/mmrp00.html> The long course is in http://aec.army.mil/usaec/cleanup/mmrp_rifs_guidancefinal.pdf Scoping the RI/FS is discussed in Section 4 with [a] nice flow chart on p. 4-1 (page 45 of 299).

*March 15, 2013 USPS-sent letter from Vicki G. Hamilton, R.A., Chief, Environmental Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss Dear Mr. Teschner: The U.S. Army has completed a demonstration of incremental sampling methodology (ISM) to identify the presence or absence of munitions constituents on Castner Range ... ISM is a structured sampling and processing protocol with specific elements designed to reduce data variability and increase sample representatives for a specified volume of soil under investigation. The project field-tested the draft Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Guidance Document for Soil Sampling of Energetics and Metals and collected soil samples in a manner to allow the analytical results to be used in future remedial actions. —The Army invites you to participate in the final Technical Project Planning meeting (TPP) for stakeholders and interested parties to discuss the draft final project report. The meeting is scheduled from 9 a.m.-noon, on 3 April 2013 [and] will be held at the Marriott Hotel, 1600 Airway Blvd., El Paso TX 79925. — We hope that you can attend and participate in the execution of this important project. If you have questions about this project or the MMRP, please contact Mr. Joel Reyes, Restoration Program Manager, Environment

Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss, at (915) 568-6993, or Dr. Robert Kirgan, U.S. Army Environmental Command, at (210) 424-8337. Sincerely, Vicki G. Hamilton [etc.]

Frontera Castner Bliss meeting March 2013 comments by Mike, Judy, Richard.msg This document begins with Frontera Land Alliance's Executive Director Janae' Reneaud Field's "March 18, 2013 Land Use Plan meeting with Sylvia Waggoner and Vicky Hamilton at Fort Bliss[.] Mike Gaglio [Frontera President] and Janae' Reneaud Field ... were in attendance. — It was asked that we make this land[-]use plan useful to Fort Bliss. Below are a few of the items we touched on[;] the others will be coming via email. 1. Have quantifiable data, they need data to analyze. For example[,] specification for the type of road, erosion control, storm water treatment, etc. ... specs for trails, specs for RV campsite, etc. ... 3. Who will have jurisdiction? Who will enforce trespassers? Who will fight the fires? 4. If the land is to be cleaned up for industrial use, with today's technology, they are required to scrape the surface 3 feet deep. Is this what we really want? 5. Prepare an alternative with status-quo being an option; keep range closed, but public can enjoy the view. Still costs associated here with signs, fencing, monitoring, etc. 6. After the remedial investigation and feasibility study are completed[,] the land use plan will be helpful for DOD to review as an option for use of the land, to occur in 2017. 7. Can be hard to clean up arroyos, watch where our trails are located. 8. Don't say 'excess'[;] instead use the word[s] 'closed range'. 9. Remove [the] word 'unique' [as something is not] unique if the same habitat exists elsewhere. 10. Add to plan that fire management plans, trail management plans, etc. ... will be needed prior to [any transfer]. 11. State that the long[-]term goal for the preservation of this land is because the west side of [the state park] is now being zoned for development. Castner Range will be the last undisturbed area to see natural habitat. — **Action:** 1. Research if legislation can [be] place[d] on federal land restriction for no development in perpetuity if the land stays with DOD as it. 2. Janae' is working with Sylvia and Vicky to prepare a draft status quo statement for the land use plan and will get [it] to the committee when completed. — Brief comments from John Moses, member, Castner Conservation Committee, March 19, 2013 12:29 p.m.: "Item #4 removing 3' of cover for industrial use doesn't make sense, as we're not proposing any industrial uses. We need them to tell us how [the] Border Patrol worked this issue [after acquiring Castner Range land in 2007 for the proximate construction of a Border Patrol Station just north of the TxDOT maintenance facility in the extreme southeastern corner of Castner Range/northwest corner of the US 54 Freeway and Hondo Pass Drive]. ..." —Lengthy eight-paragraph emailed response from Mike Gaglio (March 19, 2013, 9:25 p.m.). Highlights: "[T]his meeting was ... very productive in terms of getting past the outright stonewalling attitude that we seemed to encounter in the past. Some of their comments were very pointed and direct while being positive and aimed at drafting a truly useful land use plan document [which] needs to be something that technical military UXO people can evaluate to have an understanding of the costs needed to 'clean up' UXO. It is understood that the draft that they read did not include some of the data that we now have (specifically the maps) that will help us come up with 'analyzable' and 'quantifiable' data. — All that said, make no mistake that they are still masters of talking a lot and saying nothing ... —

The notion of 'cleaning to a depth of 3 feet' for industrial purposes is[,] as I see it[,] a two pronged tactic In the one sense, CERCLA and TCEQ regulations require contamination to be removed to a certain depth for a given default use (classified generically as industrial use). Vicky made the point that under these current regulations, in order to transfer the land, it would have to be cleaned to these standards. I see this as a blanket 'safe' approach to take, without acknowledging that there are likely a number of scenarios and caveats that circumvent this level of clean[-]up. This is one of those areas where we ... frankly don't know enough about the regulations to intelligently argue [or] this is just another stonewalling tactic. Vicky seemed to say that 'surface clearance' (i.e., not excavating) is indeed an option, but that it is not adequate enough to allow public access to a site. She also stated that there are situations where there are livestock grazing leases on UXO-contaminated areas on DOD land, and a condition of the lease agreement is that the livestock owners accept the possibility that their livestock is at risk ... Vicky did state that [the Border Patrol] got their land because of the knowledge they had about the UXO on that site...that the cost for the level of contamination clearance that had to be completed was justifiably insignificant relative to the cost of acquisition of new real estate. — I will also note that there is still of great deal of work to be done on this land use plan. ... Vicky did state that because Castner Range is in MMRP, this document can/should/will become a tool that is used in the MMRP evaluation process. It is my opinion[,] then, that we have our work cut out for us. We (i.e., Janae') need to more fully understand the MMRP process to know how this document should fit in as a piece of the puzzle. ... Finally, while we only glanced [at] the topic, [we] should remember that just about anything is possible with legislation. The folks at Ft. Bliss are not going to admit that DOD land with UXO can be transferred or preserved in perpetuity by another organization. But that does not mean that they are opposed to the idea of perpetual conservation. They default back to the notion of what is best for the mission of the [Fort Bliss] base. But with legislation, can't it be decided that the land will be forever preserved as open space, weather [sic] the public has access or not? — Ultimately, I get the impression that they are more willing to work with us than they have ever been. My recommendation is that Janae and Cesar (and I when available) continue having a few more 'working meetings' with Vicky and Sylvia where they focus on actual facts and components of the land use plan. I think we can get a lot done this way. — Michael D. Gaglio. Biologist/Managing Member. High Desert Native Plants, LLC. El Paso, TX 79932. — Responding the following day to Mike's email were Judy Ackerman ("My opinion: Legislation can do anything, including specifying public access or not"), Richard Teschner ("In light of the need to gain more knowledge of the MMRP— and the fact there '[t]here is an entire manual on just the RI phase' ... —I suggest [we] consider re-engaging Steve Bonner, hiring him (if he is willing) for an hour or so of phone or e-mail conversation about the MMRP, which he's likely to know quite a lot about." —Mike's response: "... I would recommend [that] we (Janae') learn this on our own, and consult with Steve sparingly. Steve is busy, and cannot give us the attention we need. ..." Richard's answer to Mike: "As a first step, yes: learn as much as we can on our own, then contact Steve to see if he'd like to do a quick job for us. If we are well-prepared, an hour by phone should quite suffice."

*Fort Bliss TPP Meeting scheduled for April 3, 2013. Some quotes from the email announcement sent the morning of March 28, 2013 by Joel Reyes (Restoration Program, Manager, Compliance, Environmental Division, Fort Bliss Directorate of Public Works) to some two-dozen individuals: “The U.S. Army has completed a demonstration of incremental sampling methodology (ISM) to identify the presence or absence of munitions constituents on Castner Range ... ISM is a structured sampling and processing protocol with specific elements designed to reduce data variability and increase sample representativeness for a specified volume of soil under investigation. The project field-tested the draft MMRP Guidance Document for Soil Sampling of Energetics and Metals and collected soil samples in a manner to allow the analytical results to be used in future remedial actions. — The Army invites you to participate in the final Technical Project Planning meeting (TPP) for stakeholders and interested parties to discuss the draft final project report. ...

Frontera Castner WAA TPP April 3 2013 Meeting on Incremental Sampling Methodology.msg
In her role as (long-time) Secretary of the FMWC (Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition), Judy Ackerman sent out the following announcement by email: “In Oct 2009 the Army started its ‘wide area assessment’ (WAA) technologies to characterize the presence of munitions on Castner Range. Later they added incremental sampling methodology (ISM) to the project. The completion of the ISM should allow publication of the Final WAA. Then the Army will be able to resume work on the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) which addresses the potential explosives safety, health, and environmental issues caused by past Department of Defense (DOD) munitions[-]related activities. ...”

Frontera Castner WAA TPP April 3 2013 final Incremental Sampling Demonstration.msg
An impressively thorough seven-page “Minutes” of the 9:00-11:00 a.m. meeting, held at the Marriott Hotel and attended by 18 individuals representing entities governmental (USAEC, Fort Bliss, TXDOT, El Paso City Council, El Paso Water Utilities, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Texas Council on Environmental Quality, Fort Bliss RAB) and private activist (Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition). Some quotes and summaries: “Victoria Kantsios of [the] URS Corporation ... under contract to the US Army Environmental Command, presented an overview of: -Castner Range; -defining the problem requiring incremental sampling; -project objectives; -study design; -sampling and analysis methods; -Phase 1 of sampling and results; -Phase 2 of sampling and results; -conclusions and recommendations. ... Ms. Kantsios explained that URS intended to provide the draft report to the Army for review prior to today’s TPP meeting, but that the report had been slightly delayed and would be released after the meeting. [See the next item just below.] ... A question was asked whether Fort Bliss or the ... USAEC would release the report to the public. Ms. Kantsios stated that this point was currently under discussion between Fort Bliss and USAEC. ... [She] began by describing the physical features of Castner Range and explained the problem[s] facing the Army: -Large Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) sites; -Varying types of firing ranges and munitions; -Heterogeneous distribution of munitions constituents (MC); -How to determine the presence or absence of MD; -If discovering presence of MC, how to determine the nature and extent of contamination; and -Castner

Range has an unknown future land use. She then explained the statistical principles and methods behind incremental sampling and how it is used to overcome the heterogeneous distribution of MC in soils. (p. 2) Pages 3-7 present information that's "some old, some new, some borrowed, some blue." P. 3's topics: The steps through which the sampling design was developed. The results of the first round of sampling. Further evaluation of "the standard deviations of MC concentrations and [subsequent comparison of] concentrations to PLs ['Protective Concentration Levels'] to identify areas of the site" ranging from clean, clean unresolved, contaminated (high confidence) contaminated unresolved (low confidence that concentrations exceeded PCLs) and data gaps ("insufficient data points to classify the area"). Pp. 3-4 explain the Intermediate Analysis that "URS performed on the initial sampling data" as follows: "Do analyte ['a substance whose chemical constituents are being identified and measured'] concentrations differ significantly by soil type? Do analyte concentrations differ significantly within and outside target areas? Was sufficient geospatial coverage attained to draw confident conclusions through kriging about nature and extent of contamination? Were sufficient background samples taken to establish site-specific background levels? Then "[b]ased on the results of the intermediate analysis, URS, in coordination with the US Army[,] decided to perform a second round of sampling (Phase 2) to: -Fill data gaps and 'resole' areas within the target areas and adjacent to current development as either 'contaminated' or 'clean' (30 additional samples" and so forth (bottom, p. 4). Continued onto p. 5 is an explanation of "the method URS used to establish 1-acre sampling units and collect incremental samples within the arroyos. ... The Phase 2 samples resulted in no explosives exceedances and several metals exceedances (antimony, beryllium, and lead)." Lead is clearly in the lead, as the following quote makes clear: "Lead appears to be ubiquitous, appearing in many samples throughout the site, and even in the background samples, above the PCL ['Protective Concentration Levels']." — As reported on p. 5, "[t]he following questions were asked by the stakeholders: What would cause such a broad distribution of elevated lead levels? [Ms. Kantsios's response: "It is difficult to say and we did not attempt to identify a potential source. ... Several participants pointed out that the ASARCO smelting plant operated for years in the area and may have been a source." (p. 5) "Is this pattern similar to areas around other military installations? [Ms. Kantsios's response: "We have no information about the presence of lead around other installations."] She "also described the results of additional sampling to identify trends in an area with elevated beryllium concentrations in the northwestern portion of the site. No concentration trends (i.e., gradients) were identified although there are a series of beryllium exceedance along the drainage in the northwestern portion of the site and along Transmountain Road." — Ms. Kantsios described the results of the site-specific background study and compared the results of the TX-Specific Background values and the TRRP [Texas Risk Reduction Program] PCLs. URS and the Army concluded that the use of TRRP PCLs was the most conservative approach and decided to use those numbers as preliminary screening values. [She] then reviewed the conclusions associated with each of the study questions [pp. 5-6]." She "concluded that through the [WAA] demonstration project and [the present] incremental sampling project, the Army had: -Demonstrated WAA methods can successfully characterize [the] nature and extent of

MEC on Castner Range[;] -Demonstrated incremental sampling and characterize [the] nature and extent of MC ... -Developed a robust high[-]quality data set that can support future investigations and decisions. —More questions from participants followed. Among them: -‘Did the project identify any MC that presented a risk?’ “URS did not perform a risk assessment; we only screened the values against TRRP PCLs. -How do PCLs vary with land use? “The military has not determined future land use but the PCLs used in this project are based on residential land use because those are the most conservative.” -Is the Army responsible for making a land[-]use decision? “Yes.” (pp. 6, 7)

*Demonstration of Incremental Sampling Methodology [ISM] to Characterize Munitions Constituents. Closed Castner Firing Range, Fort Bliss, TX. TPP Meeting #4, 3 April 2013.” This noteworthy 56-page full-colored document was delivered to all April 3, 2013 WAA TPP-meeting participants—see the immediately-antecedent document—and constitutes an impressive summation of the content of similar documents previously compiled and distributed. Material found mainly in the second half of the present document is largely new to it. Some titles: “Intermediate Analysis: Data vs. Target Area” (p. 24, and continued on pp. 25 and 26); “Intermediate Analysis: Data vs. Defined Areas” (pp. 27, 28 and 29); “Intermediate Analysis: Preliminary Results – As [sic? “Area A” perhaps?], “Intermediate Analysis: Preliminary Results—Be [same question]”, then “Cd” and finally “Pb” (pp 30-33). See also “Intermediate Analysis: Site-Specific Background” (p. 34; a quote: “ITRC [‘Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council’? No spell-out is provided] guidance & discussion with USACE EM-CS personnel did not provide alternative with fewer samples”), “Phase 2” Sampling Goals (p. 35), followed by that Phase’s “Sampling” (p. 36), “Arroyo Transect Design” (p. 37), “Sampling Locations,” “Sampling Background Locations,” “Sampling Preliminary Summary,” “Sampling Results” (pp. 41-44 and so forth), “Potential MC transport pathways” (p. 45) and so forth. “Study Questions” (among them ‘What modifications to the Army incremental sampling guidance would make the implementation more effective and efficient in the context of an MMRP RI?’ [p. 50]) and “Conclusions and Recommendation” (pp. 51-55; a sample from p. 52: “2. Is MC present on the Closed Castner Firing Range? If so, are the levels above regulatory concentrations? What is the nature and extent of contamination?”) complete the document, along with its final page’s “Final Thoughts: -WAA technologies can characterize nature and extent of MEC on Castner Range -ISM can characterize nature and extent of MC on Castner Range -Provide robust high[-]quality data sets which can support future investigations and decisions.” (p. 56)

Frontera Castner 4C’s Los Alamos option—Just post signs.msg Judy Ackerman discovered—and then circulated—an article (“Lab Posts Danger Signs”) appearing in the *Los Alamos Monitor*, a news publication of the Los Alamos National Laboratory (northern New Mexico). Here are some quotes: “Last November[,] two old mortar shells were found by a hiker near the boundary of TA-33 and TA-70 in Ancho Canyon [on the LANL property] ... As it turned out, no high explosives were involved, but it was a reminder that people are still coming across old ordnance related to the laboratory. The lab is letting people know that ‘Danger’ signs have recently been posted at trailheads to remind hikers of the potential for finding old unexploded ordnance in

the area. The signs include photographs of the various types of ordnance that might be encountered. Trail users on LANL land between State Road 4 and the Rio Grande are reminded to use caution, be aware of natural hazards and the potential for finding unexploded ordnance. ...” Judy’s comment read as follows: “Here is another option for the Land Use Plan. Just post signs that there may be hazards.” Richard Teschner’s response read thus: “Who needs \$65 million and a big-time disruption of the largely pristine [Castner Range] terrain when \$6,500 for about a hundred signs would more than do the trick?”

*Frotnera [sic]: Thank you and summary of meeting regarding Castner Range [.]. An e-attachment to “Frontera Castner 4C’s Land Use Plan Bob Rowden’s response ...” 7/2/2014]. This e-mail was first sent to Vicki Hamilton, Sylvia Waggoner and Joel Reyes, all of Fort Bliss Environmental. It reports on Janae’ Reneaud Field’s Dec. 3, 2013 meeting with those three individuals. It reads as follows: “Is the following a correct summary of our discussion yesterday? (I need to send a quick summary to the [3C’s] group and want to make sure we all heard the same thing[.]) — The summary reads as follows: Janae’ Reneaud Field with the Frontera Land Alliance, representing the [3C’s], handed over the Castner Range Land Use Plan to Vicki Hamilton, Sylvia Waggoner and Joel Reyes on December 3, 2013. We asked that all feedback be sent to Janae’ by February 28, 2014. Janae’ shared that the OEA grant expires September of 2014 and Bob Rowden [and Robert] Kirgan also will be sent a copy of the Land Use Plan with the opportunity to provide feedback. It was also shared that [the 3C’s] will be hiring a person to produce a video, or short videos, about Castner Range for educational purposes. Such topics may include biology, plants, geology, culture, etc. If we do a flyover of Castner Range we need to make sure than we can [indeed] fly over and how close we may get.—Vicki shared an update on the status of Castner Range. The Site Investigation has been completed by DOD. They are now in the process of conducting a Remedial Investigation (RI). The RI was originally to be completed in 2017, but has recently been moved [forward] to 2019. The RI report, when completed, will inform DOD of the level of contamination at Castner Range. After the RI [the] DOD will conduct a feasibility study to determine what the cost would be in relation to the possible different uses of Castner Range. Vicki shared that the Land Use Plan will be helpful to show that this is a valid option for consideration for Castner Range. We were reminded that if, or when, ... Castner Range is offered to the Federal government first, then [the] State of Texas, then [El Paso] County and finally the City. Again since the UXO’s are there (DOD keep finding them and recording them with photos and [have] recently discovered that neighbors of Castner are collection UXO’s as souvenirs) the land will be kept as is for at least another 10 years as DOD conduct the necessary investigation and complete their reports. — I was asked how Frontera would be in charge of the clean-up as Honey Lake [was]? I explained that Frontera [itself] could not [do so]. We would have to hire another person to oversee, manage and be the contact to Fort Bliss for the consultant that we would also have to hire for the clean-up of UXO’s. ... Janae’ said that Frontera could accept grant and manage them if they were acquired to help with the clean-up. Also it was shared that in the Land Use Plan there are several options for the conservation of Castner Range such as leaving [it] with Fort Bliss, but with conservation

restrictions placed on the land ... again off limits to the public. — Finally, on December 8, 2013 the EECA [Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis] is a document we should review. You can find this document on the Fort Bliss website. Go to the left column[, access] “Environmental” and see the EECA document.

Frontera Castner 4C’s Fort Bliss meeting and comments late 2013.msg This document contains six separate items that were combined into a single email the chronologically last five of which were sent to me separately. The chronologically first in this series is an edited version of what was sent as an email to the other members of the 3C’s [Castner Conservation Committee] by Frontera’s Executive Director Janae’ Reneaud Field on Dec. 4, 2013 at 11:07 a.m. “The meeting was surprisingly pleasant with Vicki Hamilton, Sylvia Waggoner and Joel Reyes. It was to last about 20 minutes and we all talked [for] over an hour. ... I think [this] is a huge step for the [3C’s]. [Bliss Environmental] will get us feedback on the Land Use Plan, but will only be able to edit facts in [it and] will not be able to endorse the report. It still looks like DOD has Castner Range tied up in reviews and investigations before anything will even be considered to happen to the land for some time. On the bright side the land will remain undeveloped during this time. Note: [A]ttending public meetings, being polite [and] respect [with] the military and continuously sharing the great need to preserve Castner Range sounds like it will be beneficial in the long run. ...” —The second item in the series was sent out by Judy Ackerman on Dec.6, 2013 at 5:55 p.m. Excerpts: “... [D]id any other of the 3C’s attend?—It is sad that the RI is delayed another 2 years. Any suggestions how to speed up the process? Any talk of doing the piecemeal, top[-]down RI process that could turn over upper elevation ... sooner? The LUP and the Castner [Report] were aimed to speed up the process.—The land disposal process Vicki talked about (Federal agencies get first refusal, then state, etc[.]) is the standard disposal of Army land. NOTE it [is] outside the MMRP or RI processes. When any federal land is declared ‘surplus’, then it is up for grabs by various agencies as described. ... Judy”. —The third item in the series was sent to Judy Ackerman by Janae’ Reneaud Field Dec. 9, 2013 at 7:49 a.m. “No other [3C’s] were able to attend the meeting, it was short notice and I did not debate the day/time ... I believe they were told the RI is delayed due to budget issues. Vicky actually did not know of the new end date ... Joel ... updated her on the new deadline at that time. We did discuss the idea of doing [tracts] of land at a time[. T]hey did not get excited or say no, [so that is] another option to consider. It seems that staff are hung up on procedure, as they have been trained [throughout[their entire government careers. I personally think [that] when the staff are directed to look at Castner Range differently we will have better conversations on the best method for Fort Bliss to move the land ...” — [EECA] stands for The FINAL ENGINEERING EVALUATION/COST ANALYSIS ... (EE/CA) LAND USE CONTROLS. [The site was not available until yesterday. See:] <https://www.bliss.army.mil/DFW/Environmental/ocuments/EE-A%20-%20MMRP%20LUC%20-%20Fort%Bliss%20Final.pdf> [And yes,] Vicki liked removing Frontera since it would be simpler for them, less paperwork and save money. Also, Frontera[’s having] to do any clean-ups, deal with trespassing (even for a day)[,] the liability[,] etc., was a major concern since they question [our] capacity (staff/funding) to accept the land as [a] pass-

through. I was very clear [that] as long as the land is conserved, Frontera did not have to be the 'middle man' [T]he main objective is to conserve Castner. — Mike Gaglio responded to Janae's email thus (Dec. 9, 2013, 9:06 a.m.): "All this seems to just reiterate the fact that we are here for the long haul. We continue to do our part as concerned stakeholders. But meaningful results will likely come from top down, which means that we should not let our presence be forgotten by the folks in DC and upper[-level] DOD." — Janae' emailed me [Richard Teschner] separately twelve minutes later (Dec. 9, 2013, 9:18 a.m.) and apologized for not having included me in the chain. I, in turn, emailed her and all the other 3C's Dec. 9, 2013 at 10:20 a.m., in part as follows: "Mike is right: 'meaningful results will likely come from top down ...' So here's the wildest of cards, and one that I've been saving up: Remember [the young world-famous cybernetic guru] Edward Snowden, and how—half a year ago or so—his flight to Shanghai and eventual defection to Russia made big-time headlines for many weeks? At a critical stage in this crisis, Barack Obama called to the White House my senior-year roommate, whom I've always stayed in touch with ... [He] has since become very famous and has risen to the heights of the international cybernetic industry. President Obama spoke with him alone for over two hours. Perhaps ... [we] can make hay from this sunshine before early January 2017? ..."

*Print-out, Frontera Castner CLUP December 6, 2013. What follows are excerpts from a seven-paragraph form letter that Janae' Reneaud Field wrote with the intention of send it to selected persons at Fort Bliss and at the DOD in various locations. "Dear _____: As you've long been aware, El Pasoans are grateful to the Department of the Army for its decades-long stewardship of Castner Range which since 1968 has been a 'closed' military range and has thus been conserved by default. ... Castner Range is owned by the Army, but is geographically separated from Fort Bliss and is surrounded by private and public lands. El Pasoans at all levels have long made it clear that the best use for Castner Range is for TPWD [the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department] to take ownership of the Range, thus expanding the [Franklin Mountains State Park]. [Editor's note: See the immediately-following item in this series, which addresses the issue of TPWD ownership of the Range.] ... As part of the 2013 Defense Appropriations Act, Congress indicated that Castner Range may be transferred to TPWD. The transfer of Castner Range, with a conservation conveyance, could be undertaken by several of the ways that are outlined below. The 'Conservation Conveyance' process, authorized in 2003 by Congress, created a new means for enhancing natural resource stewardship on military lands. The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act of FY2003 authorized conveyance of surplus military real property to nonprofit organizations that exist for the primary purpose of conservation of natural resources (Section 2694a, Title 10, US Code). ... This procedure is known as a conservation conveyance. [It] allows several options for conservation of the Range: (a) Castner Range could be managed as a State Natural Area (SNA) and/or Wildlife Management Area (WMA). ... (b) Castner Range could be developed for passive recreation such as camping, hiking, biking and sightseeing. (c) Sections of Castner Range could be cleaned up and transferred when ready to FMSP. In the meantime Fort Bliss could place the land under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance to ensure that all 7,081 acres of Castner Range are protected in perpetuity. ... (d)

Castner Range could remain part of Fort Bliss which would continue to monitor trespassers, maintain fences, replace signage as needed and so forth. The public would directly benefit by enjoying the views of Castner Range, and no disturbance would come to the existing wildlife corridors, the natural springs or wildlife habitat.—The [3C's] were instructed by Dr. Craig College (during the time he served as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Department of the Army, headquartered in the Pentagon) to prepare a Land Use Plan (LUP) for Castner Range. The following Castner Range LUP [separately attached to the present letter] lays out the summarized alternatives listed above. ... This, then, is the LUP that we've produced. We now invite you yourselves to provide feedback on the [LUP] by February 28, 2014. ... Sincerely, Janae' Reneaud Field, Executive Director, The Frontera Land Alliance[.]

Print-out, Fort Bliss RAB Update, Dec. 9, 2013. Joel Reyes (Restoration Program Manager, Compliance, Environmental Division, Fort Bliss Directorate of Public Works) sent the following email message to members of the Fort Bliss RAB. The message's text reads as follows: "The Legal Notice of Availability commencing the 30-day public comment period for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) recommendations for Land Use Controls (LUCs) at Closed Castner Range was published on December 8, 2013. LUCs are interim or non-time critical removal actions (NTCRA) implemented at MMRP sites until such time as the site has been fully investigated and remediated, if required. This document is available at the Fort Bliss Mickelsen Library or at the Environmental division's online website[and at the following https address:] <https://www.bliss.army/mil/dps/Environmental/documents/EE-CA%20-%20MMRP%20LUCs%20-%20Fort%Bliss%20-%20Final.pdf> The document, Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) Land Use Controls Fort Bliss, TX Military Munitions Response Program, was issued January 2013. It was prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and prepared by "URS Group, Inc. [Germantown, MD] and Arcadis Malcolm Pirnie [Baltimore, MD]. A five-paragraph "Executive Summary" (including "Agencies Involved" and "Description of MRS") complete the document. Key information: "The EE/CA has a focused purpose and is not intended to result in a final remedy at Fort Bliss. Fort Bliss is at the Remedial Investigation (RI)/Feasibility Study (FS) stage, which is pending completion of a Wide Area Assessment being conducted by URS. A final remedy selection is anticipated during the fiscal year 2017, and therefore will be planning for a five[-]year interim NTCRA.—Following the preparation of this EE/CA, the Army will prepare an AM and finalize a Land Use Control Plan (LUCP) to guide the implementation of LUCs as a[n] NTCRA."

***Correspondence with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Division (TPWD) from 2013 and 2017 regarding the possible annexation of Castner Range to the Franklin Mountains State Park (FMSP).**

[Archived as:] Castner Texas Parks and Wildlife Brent Leisure ordinance must be removed from site.msg Excerpts: Nov. 27, 2013, Frontera Land Alliance Executive Director Janae' Reneaud Field emailed TPWD with the following request: "Richard Teschner and I just met with Congressman [Beto] O'Rourke's staff here in El Paso. We gave them an update of where we are with the Castner Range project and [we] asked them to help move the project along. They asked for a letter from TPWD stating that the transfer of Castner Range to [the]

FMSP would be a good addition and would be wanted by the TPWD. Would you be able to email a simple statement stating that TPWD would be happy to accept Castner Range into its State Park system when the opportunity arose? ...” Thirteen days later (Dec. 10, 2013) Ms. Field received the following e-mailed reply from Brent Leisure, State Parks Division Director, TPWD: “... You are also aware that the Range was used by the U.S. Army as an artillery range from the 1920’s to the 1960’s and that there are concerns regarding the possibility of unexploded and potentially dangerous ordnance on the site. We think that some or all of this land would be an appropriate addition to the state park if and when this ordnance and any other hazards have been completely cleared and removed from the site. We remain hopeful that this will be the case at some point in the future. Sincerely, Brent Leisure, State Parks Division Director ...” But members of the Castner Conservation Committee remained hopeful that TPWD would change its mind. So three and a half years later—on April 24, 2017—Richard Teschner again emailed Brent Leisure with the following renewed request: “No doubt you know that President Obama did not declare Castner Range a national monument and that all of us are extremely disappointed. All we got ... was a 1½-page letter cosigned Jan. 19 [2017] by the outgoing Director of the Bureau of Land Management and a senior official in the Department of Defense, which I’ll be happy to e-send if you’d like. Our ‘core’ Castner committee continues to hope for a Monument in four (or eight) years, but in the meantime we have once again revisited the possibility that the Range might be annexed to the Franklin Mountains State Park. Hence the present e-mail, and to get right to the point: Can you yourself revisit what you wrote in the e-mail below (Dec. 10, 2013), expanding on these comments: ‘... if and when this ordnance and any other hazards have been completely cleared and removed from the site’? To be specific, would TPWD insist on a Sam’s Club-style clearing* of all 7,081 acres of Castner Range? We would very much appreciate a response.” [* footnote: “In the first several months of 2013 the ca. 14-acre commercially-zoned property on the southeast corner of El Paso’s US 54 North-South Freeway and Diana Drive was prepped by Wal-Mart Stores for the construction of a Sam’s Club. This land formed part of the 1,230 acres of Castner Range that were transferred to the City of El Paso in 1971, five years after Castner Range was closed. First step in the clean-up: Remove and discard all vegetation. Second step: Dig ca. foot-deep holes at ca foot-wide intervals throughout the whole property, searching for MECs and UXOs. The property having been cleared, the ‘Club’ was constructed along with its gas station, its parking lots and a loading dock. The Sam’s Club opened its doors within twelve months.”] — Mr. Leisure not having responded, Prof. Teschner emailed him again on May 16, 2017 as follows: “Brent: I can only imagine how busy you’ve been. Nonetheless it’s now been three-plus weeks. If you can’t respond ... please let me know if you’ll need three more weeks (i.e., once the [State of Texas Legislative session] is finally over ...)” Mr. Leisure responded the same day and at length. Major excerpts: “ ... we believe the Castner Range adds tremendous value to El Paso and as an adjacent natural area to [the] Franklin Mountains State Park. My point about the ordnance however is simply to say that the state of Texas cannot assume liability for unexploded ordnance that we know exists on the land. ... The DOD process to survey and remove ordnance is obviously a long and tedious one. Technology advances all the time. I hope that someday

ordnance might be detected and mitigated in a way that is not damaging to the land and the habitat it provides. Perhaps there is a possibility to clear corridors or areas for potential and future access but until that time, I'm afraid TPWD and the state of Texas just cannot assume responsibility for the risks that the ordnance poses to the public ..." — A year and a half later, on Dec. 17, 2018, Texas Parks and Wildlife issued the following News Release: "Rodney Franklin Named Texas State Parks Division Director." An excerpt: "Franklin, previously the Deputy Director of Texas State Parks, succeeds Brent Leisure who recently assumed the role as Interim Chief Operating Officer for TPWD after 8 years in the state parks director role." On December 16, 2020, Richard Teschner emailed Mr. Franklin, asking him the same questions that his predecessor had been asked and then had answered. Mr. Franklin responded just as Mr. Leisure had done, to the effect that TPWD would only accept Castner Range if and when the Castner Range ordnance (etc.) had been completely cleared and removed from the site. Here are the pertinent quotes from Mr. Franklin's Jan. 21, 2021 letter to Richard Teschner: "The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department would consider the addition of the property to [the] Franklin Mountains State Park, but only upon completion of all necessary actions by the Department of Defense to clear the area of any unexploded ordnance and other hazards that could impact public health and safety or limit public access to the site. Until these assurances can be provided to TPWD, the agency cannot commit to inclusion of the tract into the park." See also the Jan. 4, 2021 email from Allison Winney (Intergovernmental Affairs, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department) to Amy Hernandez (District Director, Office of [Texas] State Representative [Joe] Moody) in which Ms. Winney responded to the Dec. 28, 2020 email sent to her by Ms. Hernandez. Ms. Hernandez's Dec. 28, 2020 email was prompted by an email sent to Representative Moody by long-time Castner Conservation Committee (CCC) activist Judy Ackerman on Dec. 17, 2020 in which Ms. Ackerman wrote the following in part: "... As you know, the Army has been going through the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) on Castner Range for many years. ... Currently [the MMRP is] in the Feasibility Study phase. ... An effective Feasibility Study should analyze possible future uses of the land. Since the creation of the Franklin Mountains State Park (FMSP), we have hoped for inclusion of Castner in [the] FMSP. We would like to get a statement in writing that TPWD would still consider this possibility. I attach previous statements from TPWD on this topic dated 1994, 2007 and 2010. Please let me know what to do next to achieve a statement from TPWD about accepting Castner into FMSP." —Ms. Ackerman (along with all the other members of the CCC) had known since late 2013 that Brent Leisure, then Director of TPWD, had responded—on Dec. 10, 2013—to my (Richard Teschner's) e-request that he update the TPWD's three earlier statements that supported annexing Castner Range to the FMSP. (See just above—pp. 56-57 of the present document—for quotes from Mr. Leisure's response.) Ms. Ackerman and other members of the CCC were also aware that my second emailed request to Mr. Leisure—on April 24, 2017—had produced the exact same response from him; again, see p. 57 of the present document. So what prompted Ms. Ackerman to revisit the annexing-Castner-Range-to-the-FMSP issue? It was the comments made at the Dec. 9, 2019 RAB by Mike Bowlby (Environmental Service Support Manager, US Army Environmental Command – Midwest and Central America [sic] Division, San

Antonio), a frequent presenter at Castner Range RAB, WAA, MMRP, RI meetings. Ms. Ackerman emailed Mr. Bowlby in part as follows: “Since at least the previous RAB meeting [in El Paso] on 10 Dec 2019, you briefed us that you have updated the Risk Management Methodology. Have you had a chance to explain that new Risk Management Methodology to TPWD personnel? Would you like assistance in finding the opportunity to explain the new Risk Management Methodology to TPWD personnel? Let’s have a phone conversation to discuss options on this topic.” Mr. Bowlby e-answered in part as follows (Jan. 26, 2021): “The Risk Matrices were presented to TCEQ [Texas Commission on Environmental Quality] ... back in 2019. They subsequently approved this approach in order to determine MEC risk at the site.” And this: “I am working with our HQ staff in order to determine the best approach to how the US Army deals with matters involving US and State-level Representatives, NDAA language, TPWD Officials, Real Estate, etc. It is a bit more complicated than you and I just getting together [which is what Ms. Ackerman had proposed].” In subsequent RAB etc. meetings, it was reluctantly stated that “the new Risk Management Methodology” was exactly that—a methodology, not a mechanism—and that it did not constitute a tool surpassing all preceding tools to more quickly and efficiently remove all MECs and UXOs from Castner Range. Meanwhile, TPWD’s position has remained precisely the same, and nothing further has been heard about Risk Management Methodology.

2014

*Two-page printout of the Frontera Land Alliance Executive Director Janaé Reneaud Field’s oral presentation about Castner Range to ca. fifty people at then-District 4 City Representative Carl Robinson’s weekly Friday morning breakfast meeting on Jan. 10, 2014 at the Denny’s on East Transmountain Road. Janae’ covered a variety of land-conservation topics, beginning with the history of Frontera, continuing with a presentation on the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition (which, founded in 1978, played a central role in the establishment of the Franklin Mountains State Park the following year). She mentioned—among many things—the \$300,000 grant that the Castner Conservation Committee received from the DOD’s Office of Economic Development in 2009 “which would set forth a variety of ways by which Fort Bliss/DOD could conserve Castner Range,” the fact that “Fort Bliss is undergoing a process of determining the best use of [Castner Range] and that the CCC’s goal is “to preserve, in perpetuity, the natural areas, wildlife corridors and natural springs that are present on Castner Range,” and how, “after considerable study and work, the CC has drafted and published a Land Use Plan that is being turned over to Fort Bliss so it can aid the Department of Defense in determining the future use of the Range.” Ms. Field cited results from a survey that Frontera sent out to its supporters. Some preferred “no development whatsoever” of the Range, while other wanted it “open for hiking, mountain [and] horses, but no motorized vehicles.”

Frontera Castner Remedial Investigation When It Will Begin Vicki Hamilton October 2014.msg is a four-paragraph letter dated Feb. 13, 2014 that invites its recipients to attend “a Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Remedial Investigation (RI)” meeting “from 9 a.m-1 p.m. on 27 February 2014” at the Radisson Hotel. “The purpose of the RI is to analyze the data needed to complete a site characterization and to develop a baseline risk assessment for the Castner Range Munitions Response Site (MRS). The RI will evaluate explosive hazards posed by munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), and any human health and ecological risks posed by munitions constituents (MC) ... The RI provides a means to obtain sufficient information to document these site hazards and, in the future, develop and evaluate alternatives for response actions to reduce these risks. Data previously generated from field demonstrations will be considered, and relevant data incorporated, into the RI.” But what’s equally interesting about this invitation is the in-depth information this bibliography presents—a dozen entries below—in the “Frontera Castner URS History of Company.mht” document (dated Oct. 26, 2014). Its essence: That URS—so longer under land-study contract to Fort Bliss—has merged with and/or been purchased by a firm known in 2014 as “PIKA ARCADIS” (as appearing at the top of the Feb. 27, 2014’s Agenda) and at the time of this writing—July 2023—as simply “Arcadis.”

Frontera Castner 4C’s land Use Plan Bob Rowden’s response et al. Feb. 14.msg A ten-email collection beginning with Janae’ Reneaud Field’s ten-paragraph-long Dec. 2, 2013 email to Robert Rowden (US Army Environmental Command, Fort Sam Houston, TX and a long-time participant in Army-sponsored Castner Range-related public meetings) and ending with Richard Teschner’s Feb. 13, 2014 mail to Castner activists et al. As is shown by the immediately-antecedent item “Correspondence with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Division ...” (the last in the “2013” section), on Dec. 10, 2013 the TPWD’s State Parks Division Director Brent Leisure wrote Ms. Field that “only if and when this ordnance and any other hazards have been completely cleared and removed from the [Castner Range] site” would TPWD accept the Range as an addition to the Franklin Mountains State Park. So the TPWD’s at-that-time-new position was not known to Ms. Field when she wrote Bob Rowden. Hence her several references to that long-hoped-for addition. (I.e., “El Pasoans at all levels have long made it clear that the best solution for Castner Range is for TPWD to take ownership of the Range, thus expanding the FMSP [p. 4 of the present document].” She also discusses—in paragraph 3—the in-those-days well-publicized possibility that by means of a Conservation Conveyance (“authorized in 2003 by Congress [and which] created a new means for enhancing natural resource stewardship on military lands”), Castner could be conserved. A Conveyance—she writes—would allow “several options for conservation of the Range” such as it “could be managed as a State Natural Area [or] a Wildlife Management Area.” And see the following: “Sections of Castner Range could be cleaned up and transferred when ready to [the] FMSP. In the meantime Fort Bliss could place the land under a Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance to ensure that all 7,081 acres of Castner Range are protected in perpetuity.” She closes by offering to send—by USPS mail (as it was too big for the cybernetics of the day)—the lengthy “Land Use Plan for Castner Range” to Bob Rowden. — Mr. Rowden’s Dec. 2, 2013 response was the briefest: “My address is as follows.”

On Feb. 11, 2014 Ms. Field wrote Mr. Rowden thusly: “Just a friendly reminder if you have any comments on the Castner Range Land Use plan please send them to me by February 28, 2014.” Here is Mr. Rowden’s response: “I thank you for a copy of the report. At this time I cannot and it is not my place to comment on any future land use at the Former Castner Range. Presently this is designated as a closed range by Army. The Army is moving through the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information [sic] Act process which is currently performing the Remedial Investigation at the site. The completion of this investigation will be used by the Fort Bliss Garrison and HQ Army for future determination.” The morning of Feb. 12, 2014, Ms. Field forwarded Mr. Rowden’s response to the Castner Conservation Committee activists. Richard Teschner wrote them that day as follows: “My only suggestion to Janae’ is that she respond to Rowden thus: ‘... In your response below you state that the CERCLA process ‘is currently performing the Remedial Investigation at the [Castner Range] site. What is the scheduled completion date for that Investigation?’ No doubt Judy will have something to add to this suggestion as she’s more knowledgeable about CERCLAs and RIs than I am.” Judy Ackerman quickly emailed thus: “Richard, you were reading my mind. Additionally, I’d like to know exactly what is ‘currently’ happening. To my knowledge, NOTHING has been done on MMRP, RI ... or CERCLA for at least 3 years since all such activities were halted due to the WAA. However, I just learned from Mark-Thomas Bray (VP of [the] Castner Heights Neighborhood Association, CHNA) that ... he thinks the activity that we have seen for months in the SE corner of Castner (civilian trucks, people, port-a-potties) has to do with possible USO exposed by rains last September.—If CERCLA is in progress, I’d sure like to know about it. It has to be public info and Bliss would have to know. Anyone ... want to give them a call?”—Richard’s same-day response was this: “Judy: You have taken the knife from my stab in the dark and nicely honed and sharpened it. About 2 ½ months ago ... I and others [as RAB delegates] received an e-blast announcing that a RAB would be held in March of 2014 and asking us to say which Wednesday we preferred—the 12th or the 19th. I picked the 12th as the 19th is ‘third Wednesday’ and thus [a meeting of the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition]. I never heard back from Bliss As the 12th is just a month away I’ll now write RAB Central and ask what gives. ...” Janae’ Reneaud Field’s next-morning response is as follows: “The last meeting I had with Vicky and the others[,] they stated the [completion date of the] current remedial investigation was moved ... again from 2017 to 2019. ...” Fifteen minutes later, Richard responded thus: “I have now e-mailed Joel Reyes (RAB manager, Fort Bliss) asking him when the next RAB will be held. (See my ... email just below.) We will see if he responds and with what information. We recall that no RAB has been held since Feb. 2013 so if a RAB is held in March, over a year will have elapsed between RABs. ...”

*Closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation Technical Project Planning Meeting #1 27 February 2014 0900-1300 Sponsored and conducted by “PIKA Arcadis” (see “Frontera Castner AECOM completes acquisition of URS Corporation,” Oct. 17, 2014, and “Frontera Castner URS History of Company.mkt”, Oct. 26, 2014), this 18-page document was distributed at the Feb. 27, 2014 meeting whose goals were cited as “-Confirm project stakeholders, -

Discuss tools and protocols for communication, -Review the MMRP and RI project objectives, - Review site information and current CSM ['Conceptual Site Model'], -Present the proposed technical approach, and 'Introduce and develop preliminary DQO's ['Data Quality Objectives'] (p. 1). (All information throughout the document is presented inside square boxes.) The eight-name list of "Army Project Team Members" (p. 2) includes many familiar folks, among them Rick Smith, Bob Rowden, Sylvia Waggoner, Joel Reyes and Eric Kirwan. The Frontera Land Alliance is listed as one of nineteen "Additional Stakeholders," among them the Border Patrol, the Comanche Nation, the Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board [RAB], the Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma, "Senators, Congressmen, and Congressional Candidates," "Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo" and the "University of Texas at El Paso." Ten individuals are listed as part of the "PIKA-Arcadis JV Team." "Communication Tools/Protocols" include TPP Meetings, which "[D]etermine data needs and develop data collection options (phases II and III), Review work plan / finalize data collection program (Phase IV), Public Meetings, and RAB Meetings [which] provide annual updates to the RAB." The question "What is the MMRP?" is posed; its answers are "Addresses munitions-related concerns, including explosive safety, environmental, and health hazards from releases of MEC and MC found on 'other than operational ranges' on active installations." MMRP also "provides for the investigation and response at sites with MEC, DMM, and/or MC" and "follows CERCLA process ("Superfund")." (p. 3) P. 4 offers "MMRP Phases," "RI Project Objectives" and "RCRA Permit Requirements." "CERCLA vs. RCRA" comparisons are made on p. 5, along with information on the "RCRA Process in Texas" and a brief adumbration of "Castner Range RI Tasks," which include "TPP Meetings, Develop Planning Documents and Conduct Community Relations Support." (p. 5) P. 6 presents "Castner Range RI Tasks" (including "Conduct RI Field Activities" such as "Visual Survey, Analog Geophysics, MEC Characterization/Identification, MC Sampling," "Prepare RI Report: Present Findings, Update CSM, Conduct MEC Hazard Assessment, HHRA and SLERA, Update MRSPP," etc. P. 7? "Land Use" (including "Future use not established at this time. RI will use the most conservative approach for planning—unrestricted land use"), a general term indeed. See also p. 7's "Historical Range Training" map and its "Previous MEC Investigations" photo, both of which have appeared in other documents on multiple occasions. P. 8 does more "previous"—in this case for "MEC Removal Actions" and general "MEC Findings" along with a "Wide Area Assessment (WAA)" recap. (A quote: "WAA technologies evaluated: -Light detection and ranging (lidar), -Orthophotography, -Helicopter-borne magnetometry, -Man-portable electromagnetic induction (EMI) digital geophysical mapping (DGM), -Analog range reconnaissance, and -Intrusive Investigation." P. 9? "WAA Conclusions" as to the results that all those investigative techniques can achieve. P. 10? "Historical MC Investigations" which focus on "2013 ISM Field Demonstration[s]" that reveal this: "explosives detected above ecological benchmarks were limited and localized to known areas of specific munitions use (e.g., OB/OD areas)." See also p. 10's "Historical MC Investigations," portrayed on an aerial map that's been often repeated, plus that page's "MEC and MC Overview," again providing much-repeated information. P. 11: "conceptual Site Model," "CSM-MEC/MC Distribution" and "CSM—Fate and Transport." P. 12: "CSM—Exposure Routes"; "CSM—Receptors"; "General RI Approach/Data

Gaps” (an example: “Collect additional MEC and MC data to fill data gaps: -Vertical and horizontal extent of MEC and MC, MEC density outside “target areas,” Transportation potential of MEC and MC from high to low elevations”). See also this quote: “Target areas from WAA have been integrated with past investigation data—now referred to as CMUAs [‘Concentrated Munitions Use Areas’]. P. 13: Two squares identically titled “RI Technical Approach—MEC” plus one “MEC RI Characterization Tools” square. CMUAs star on p. 14 as “Potential CMUAs” and “MEC Finds and Potential CMUAs.” P. 14 also features “RI Technical Approach—MEC,” tri-paragraphically exposing “WAA assessment anomalies,” “Analog (‘mag and dig’) transects, and “Instrument Assisted Visual Surveys.” Pp. 15-18 give more of the same. Some highlights: “Strengths of ISM vs. Discrete Sampling,” “MC RI Activities” (two squares), “Safety” concerns, two squares presenting “DQO Statement—MEC” (a lengthy narrative featuring what the researchers plan to do, thus “For Site Slopes < 30%). See also the WAA[-]collected data on transects nominally spaced 55 meters, which ensures CMUAs were delineated to an accuracy of +/- 250 ft. –To ensure NCMUAs have a MEC density < 0.1 MEC/acre to a 95% confidence level, will conduct analog transect investigations.” And p. 18 sets forth a very important “Upcoming Project Schedule” as follows: “-Work Plan Development: March-October 2014. –RAB Meeting: 19 March 2014. –Public Meeting: May-June 2014. TPP Meeting #2: October 2014. –Work Plan Finalization: November 2014. Estimated Field Work Start: January 2015.”

Frontera Castner 4C’s Washington DC trip Gaglio and Teschner March 10 2014.docx
Mike [Gaglio] and Richard [Teschner] met [in Washington DC] with Bob Urich of the Army’s “Installation” (‘base property’) program in his Pentagon office from 12:35-1:20 p.m. on March 10 (2014). Both Mike and Richard had met with him (though separately) on previous occasions. It was Bob who had urged the 4C’s [now “3C’s,” i.e., ‘Castner Conservation Committee’] to prepare a Castner Range Land Use Plan [LUP] in conformity with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department standards. We informed him we had done so, and presented him with a copy of the LUP in its present state. He asked whether Fort Bliss’s Environmental Command had commented on the LUP. We responded that we have repeatedly requested comments but had not received any yet.—From 2:30-3:25 p.m. Mike and Richard met in [then-TX District 16 {i.e., El Paso} Congressman] Beto O’Rourke’s office ... with Jeff Hild (Beto’s Legislative Director), Steven Snodgrass ([then-TX 23 Congressman] Pete Gallego’s L.D.), Diem Ha (Jeff Hild’s Legislative Assistant) and Jordan Fahle (Steven’s Legislative Assistant). Conversation centered around the extent to which the Dolly Sods Wilderness of the Monongahela National Forest in eastern West Virginia ... could serve as a template for opening up Castner Range ... despite the presence of MECs and UXOs. (... [T]he Dolly Sods was a US Army artillery and mortar range from 1943 through 1944. It’s been partially cleared of MECs/UXOs on several occasions but still remains home to many.) The main difference between the Dolly Sods and Castner is that “Dolly” was purchased in 1916 by the U.S. Forest Service and was leased to the Army during WWII while Castner ... has been Department of the Army property since 1926 and remains so to this day. When talking with Jeff, Steven et al., Mike and Richard stressed the point that the different histories notwithstanding, Dolly Sods can constitute a precedent for Castner. MEC/UXO-

containing federal land is MEC/UXO-containing federal land, and the fact that Dolly Sods has been open to the public since the late 1940s ... is an important one.—Steven Snodgrass [having left the meeting], ... the conversation was largely between Jeff Hild, Mike, and Richard. Jeff asked this question: ‘Why do you think that the Army is so insistent on retaining Castner Range?’ Richard answered thus: ‘Castner is a major testing ground for a wide variety of private firms involved in the CERCLA clean-up process at military bases around the country. These firms have a stake in Castner as it’s an ideal location for them to try out their products and their processes. The firms have contributed to the many seminar-like events forming part of the WAA [‘Wide-Area Assessment’] process over the last five years, events that most members of the 4C’s have variously attended. An example of such a firm is ‘UXO Pro’ of Lenoir City, Tennessee.’ -Several UXO Pro(s) attended the most recent TPP [‘Technical Project Planning’] meeting (Feb. 27[, 2014] at the Radisson Hotel) and Richard spoke with them at length as he had done on a previous occasion. As an example of a device (‘based on the Navy-funded Advanced Ordnance Locator ... developed by G&G Sciences’) that will soon be tested on Castner Range we mentioned to Jeff the TEMTADS (‘Time-Domain Electro-Magnetic Multi-Sensor Towed Array Detection System’), discussion of which took place at the Feb. 27 TPP. Jeff paid close attention to this information and said he’d be sure to pass it along to Beto. ...”

*Closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation: Restoration Advisory Board [i.e., RAB] Meeting, March 19, 2014. This RAB event began at 6:30 p.m. at the Northeast Regional Command [i.e., El Paso City Police] Center’s Meeting Room, 9600 Dyer St., on El Paso’s Northeast Side. Old Business: “Discuss Changes to RAB By-Laws.” Action: The “changes” discussion will be “continued” into April. Send comments to Sylvia Waggoner. New Business: Eight items:” Former Maneuver Area ‘A’ Remedial Investigation” (of no interest to Castner conservers as ‘A’ is many miles to the east of the Range). “Castner Range Remedial Investigation,” Mike Madl (PIKA Arcadis) presenting. “Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTP) Demonstration in Castner Range,” Victoria Kantsios (URS) presenting. “Flood Control Project in Castner Range,” Lorenzo ___?___ presenting. (No surname given. See the final item in Year 2011, “The Sun Valley Retention Dam (SVRD). June 21 through September 22, 2011” for full information on this matter.) Oro Grande Landfill in New Mexico; unrelated to Castner Range. The meeting’s remaining items are also unrelated to Castner Range. See, for example, “Snake Pit Investigation & Biggs Army Air Field Open Burn/Open Detonation (OB/OD) Pit Remedial Investigation.” In similar fashion, the nine-page handout distributed at this RAB contains “Presentation Topics,” etc., that have largely been topically presented before. See for example “Definitions”—what is MMRP, what is MEC, what is MC, etc. And see “Project Scope,” which tells what the RI will do (“characterize munitions response site conditions, etc.”). And see “Who is Involved?” for a list of well-known participants—“U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Environmental Command, Fort Bliss Garrison Command, PIKA-ARCADIS Joint Venture, Stakeholders [including “Many local and regional groups”],” etc. The “Upcoming Project Schedule” says this: “Work Plan Development: March-September 2014. Public Meeting: May/June 2014. TPP Meeting #2: September 2014.

Work Plan Finalization: October 2014. Field Work: TBD. Final RI Report: TBD.” (p. 4) That same information is repeated on p. 9 s. “Upcoming Project Schedule.”

*Sam’s Club Cleanup, Jan. 2013-April 2014. This “Waste Profile Sheet” (WP-019744) was distributed at a mid-2014 meeting of the Castner Heights Neighborhood Association. The 13.5-acre Sam’s Club property is Castner Range FUDS, i.e., on part of the formerly-used defense site entirely to the east of the U.S. 54 North-South Freeway that forms the eastern boundary of Castner Range proper. This “Sheet” was prepared by “Waste Control Specialists LCC’s Operations Department.” Some excerpts: “A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted to identify recognized environmental conditions associated with the Site. ... Small arms projectiles and casings were encountered at the surface throughout the Site; however, concentrated areas of projectiles and casings were observed on the western and southern portions of the Site. Smaller concentrations of small arms projectiles and casings were encountered on the central and eastern portions of the Site in the vicinity of the excavated area/depressions. Various ordnances were associated with the [area, and] generally included projectiles, mortar, cartridges, rockets, grenade[s], rifle[]s, and small arms ammunition. In Range Complex No 1 (including the Site), the munitions used reportedly were 42-inch white phosphorous mortars; 40 millimeter (mm) high explosive-tracer (HE-T) Mk II cartridges; and 40 mm HE Incendiary-tracer (HEI-T) Mk II cartridges ... The use of potentially radioactive material (e.g, depleted uranium) was not identified during the Phase I ESA.—**Removal Action**[:] As a result of the historic uses of the Site, USA Environmental, Inc. ... was contracted by Dunaway Associates, L.P. ... to perform a Removal Action (RA) at the Site. Approximately 67 pounds of munitions debris (MD) were recovered during USA’s RA. As documented in USA’s After Action Report (AAR), “USA personnel inspected, verified, packaged and shipped all recovered MD items for final processing by an authorized recycling facility.” “The MEC ... Removal Team did not locate any MEC/MPPEH [Material Potentially Presenting an Explosive Hazard] items that required disposal via explosive demolition. The only MEC/MPPEH items that were located included 15 unfired .50 caliber bullets The SUXOS [Senior Unexploded Ordnance Supervisor] turned these bullets over to the El Paso Police Department. **Limited Site Investigation** [:] A subsurface investigation was conducted subsequent to the RA to evaluate potential chemicals of concern based on the results of the historical review (Phase I ESA) and the Removal Action. Based on the investigation results, VOCs and TPH were either not detected above laboratory sample detection limits (SDLs) or were not detected above Texas Risk Reduction Program (TRRP) Tier 1 Residential Critical Protective Concentration Levels (PCLs). Additionally, explosives were not detected above the laboratory (SDLs), based on analytical results.—This profile has been prepared for soil removed from an area where a single lead concentration exceeded the Tier 1 Residential Critical PCL during the investigation. As characterized above, de minimum munitions are present within the excavated material.

**Draft Final Remedial Investigation Report MRS_02 Artillery and Anti-Tank Ranges Munitions Response site former Castner Range, El Paso, Texas (FUDS No. K06TX0054). Contract Number W9126G-11-D-0030. Prepared for United States Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District.*

CAPE Project Number 11130.003. May 2014. This ca. 400-page multi-section multi-appendixed document constitutes what appears to be the final summation of the considerable work that's been performed on that part of Castner Range that lies to the east of the U.S. 54 North-South Freeway. Scattered references to present-time post-1966/post-1974 Castner Range appear throughout, but always in the context of how it relates to or complements the Former Castner Range that lies to the east of the freeway.—For the May 23, 2014 document's most comprehensive (and most accessible) summation, see unnumbered page 2 of Appendix E ("Performance Work Statement / Former Castner Range ... Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study / El Paso, TX / 16 April 2012 (revised) ... Here are some quotes from it: "Fort Bliss began acquisition of Castner Range in 1926 to accommodate the need for a nearby ordnance firing area. The first portion consisted of approximately 3,500 acres. Subsequent expansion of the fort necessitated increasing the size of the firing range. In 1939 another 4800 acres were purchased bringing the total range size to about 8,328 acres. The range remained at this size until 1971 when the DA ['Department of the Army'] reported the range as excess. Initially the General Services Administration (GSA) did not accept the report of excess because of insufficient information concerning remaining ordnance contamination. Following the DA's surface clearance of approximately 1,230 acres [to the east of the freeway] in June 1974, a portion of the land was sold to non-DOD entities including the City of El Paso. This ... 1,230-acre area makes up the eastern parcel of the Castner Range FUDS ['Formerly Used Defense Site'] and was the location of a rifle grenade/antitank range and firing points for several small arms firing ranges and an artillery range."

Castner Range National Monument Scott Cutler info on Trails cleared of UXOs cost per acre Feasibility Study Report.msg The quote from the item: "UXO Clean-Up Costs: Scott spoke with Judy Burdy and asked if she/they could give a rough idea of how much it would cost to clear trail[s] of UXOs They would not be able to give an estimate as it might create a problem for them in the future if they were to bid on the project. ... A study was done on Molokai, Hawaii, on the Makanalua Bombing Range. The document contains costs estimates for various alternative actions. While it doesn't allow for a costs per distance, it does seem to allow for a costs per acre. In particular, pages ES-5 and 6 and page 5-18 (costs) seem relevant. Scott came up with a cost per acre of \$108,214. Not sure how this would translate to a linear cost. Below is the link to the website with the study. [The pdf is large: 19+MB]. FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT FOR MUNITIONS RESPONSE SITE FORMER MAKANALUA BOMBING RANGE FUDS PROJECT NO. H09HI020301. [Its http is:]

<http://www.poh.usace.army.mil/Portals/10/docs/fuds/Final%20MBR%20FS%20May%2022%202014%20rev%20acreage.pdf>

Frontera Castner AECOM acquires URS.msg (See also: Frontera Castner URS History of Company.mkt [Oct. 26, 2014].) Email sent to Castner Conservation Committee activists as follows: "Look what's up with URS! AECOM ['AECOM—A global provider of architecture, design, engineering, and construction services. <http://www.aecom.com/> ...'] is the firm that in October 2014 acquired URS, the firm—or its subcontractors—that undertook the MEC-and-UXO-

finding/analyzing/reporting work on the Range for the last six years as part of the Wide-Area Assessment, the Military Munitions Response Program, etc. So under the aegis of AECOM, URS is now an even bigger elephant. ..." Lengthy confirmation of the acquisition is provided by a one-plus handout—at which meeting I disremember—distributed by AECOM and headlined as follows: "AECOM completes acquisition of URS Corporation / 17-Oct-2014." The handout's second section, boldfaced and entitled "**About AECOM,**" says this, in part: "With nearly 100,000 employees—including architects, engineers, designers, planners, scientists and management and construction services professionals—serving clients in more than 150 countries around the world following the acquisition of URS, AECOM is a premier, fully integrated infrastructure and support services firm. ... The company is a leader in all of the key markets that it serves, including transportation, facilities, environmental, energy, oil and gas, water, high-rise buildings and government. AECOM provides a blend of global reach, local knowledge, innovation and technical excellence in delivering solutions that create, enhance and sustain the world's built, natural and social environments. A Fortune 500 company, AECOM companies, including URS, had revenue of \$19.2 billion during the 12 months ended June 30, 2014. More information on AECOM and its services can be found at WWW.aecom.com ." Now what about Fort Bliss's/Castner Range's other contractor, Arcadis JV? Does it still exist as a separate corporation? Online research unearthed the following headline, dated May 1, 2023: "Arcadis JV [was] selected to provide environmental services at Army National Guard facilities nationwide" and its accompanying sub-header: "Joint venture team to assess PFAS-impacted installations through to 2028." And see the following, a longer text's first paragraph: "Arcadis ... in a joint venture (JV) with managing partner AECOM, is pleased to announce its selection to conduct remedial investigations and feasibility studies for where releases of aqueous foam filling or Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) have occurred at Army National Guard sites nationwide." So the conclusion is this: AECOM bought URS, and AECOM is also the "managing partner" of remnant Arcadis JV. So as of 7/22/2023 we're dealing with one and a half entities.

*ESTCP Classification Demonstration Fort Bliss Castner Range No day, month or year appears on this 14-page project handout, initially archived as just "2014." Once again, Victoria Kantsios is listed as the project's manager, and once again her affiliation is listed as "URS Group, Inc.", the last in the series of publications attributed to URS. (See the immediately-antecedent entry, "Frontera Castner AECOM acquires URS.msg, 8/6/2014 for an explanation of present item's "last" position.) Contents: "DOD's Environmental Technology Programs: SERDP (Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, Science and Technology), ESTCP (Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, Demonstration/Validation) (p. 1). P. 2 contrasts "Traditional Munitions Response" ("Geophysical Survey > Detections > Dig List > Dig All Anomalies") and then declares that Response to be "An Inefficient Process" because "- Costs are dominated by digging scrap," "- Often <1% are UXO," "- Example: Camp Butner, NC: - 146 UXO out of >500,000 digs -Only 0.03% are UXO" while the majority are "scrap metal removal." That inefficient process is contrasted with a "Classification Approach" (p. 3), which consists of "Geophysical Survey > Detections > Cited Data Collection > Extract Parameters > Apply Classifier

> Prioritized Dig List > Dig To Threshold.” P. 3 asks the question “How Do We Classify Munitions?” Answer: “Visually, we use physical attributes such as size & shape ... Because we cannot see buried objects, we must rely on attributes determined from geophysical data.” P. 4’s two squares present “Advanced Electromagnetic Induction (EMI) Sensors” among whose advantages are that “[n]ew UXO-specific EMI technologies have been developed and tested under SERDP & ESTCP,” they employ “[a]ll digital electronics, measuring complete eddy current decay cycle” and “[m]ulti-axis, multi-coil data more completely defines target parameters.” P. 5 presents a comparison of survey data along with “Target Features from EMI Data” discussing “Intrinsic responses (polarizabilities) along target’s principal axis directions [which] fully characterize EMI signal.” P. 6? “Polarizabilities > Classification” and “Size Comparison” of APG Cal Grid K6 105 mm and APG Cal Grid D1 clutter. “Ranked Anomaly List” and “Performance Evaluation” fill p. 7. “Performance Evaluation” continues on p. 8, which also features “Typical Classification Results.” “Potential Savings” appear on p. 9, which contrasts the “Dynamic Survey Using Advanced Sensor” approach (“63% Savings”) with rivals. “Live Site UXO Discrimination Demonstrations” complete p. 9; set forth are “goals, multiple live sites required [and] engagement.” P. 10 maps out “Demonstration Sites”; “Fort Bliss [including Castner Range of course]” is listed as one of just seven sites whose Demonstration activities are still “Underway.” (Ten sites’ Demonstrations have been completed as of—presumably—2014.) Three small photos—one blurred—fill p. 11’s first square. Its second square sets forth the “Castner Range Classification Approach,” which starts with “Geophysical Data Collection (Dynamic Data),” runs through “Anomaly Identification,” “Cued Data Collection” etc. and ends with “Establish Dig Threshold.” “Ground-Based Advanced Geophysics” and “Advanced Geophysics Results” are presented on p. 12. P. 13 concludes the presentation with “Castner Range Lessons Learned,” to wit: “Density of anomalies higher than anticipated,” “Ferrous geology evident in data,” “Litter-mode added additional ‘noise’ to geophysical data,” “Equipment ‘field worthiness’ is measured by “weight” and “cabling,” and “Positioning and depth of metallic objects [are] ‘right on target’.” However, “Classification results [are] TBD [‘To Be Determined’].”

Frontera Castner Remedial Investigation When It Will Begin Vicki Hamilton October 2014.msg Information following appeared in an email sent on Aug. 8, 2014 by Diem Ha, Legislative Assistant, Office of then-Representative Beto O’Rourke (TX-16):” The US Army Environmental Command Cleanup & Munitions Response Division has met with the State of Texas regulators and incorporated initial comments into the plan. Once the Army reviews the draft work plan, a draft-final work plan for final review will be submitted. They anticipate executing the plan at Castner Range in October-November 2014.’ [According to] this information, the October-November 2014 estimated timeline would refer to when the Remedial Investigation will begin—not the completion of the remedial process. The Remedial Investigation would be the first step in the process to evaluate the potential hazards and determine if any remedial action is necessary.”

*Property transfer between federal agencies. 2014. This printout of an email exchange reveals the following: That “the transfer of property within governmental entities is usually not

documented through recorded instruments. That is handled administratively, usually, since the grantor continues to be the federal government. The important fact to note is that the federal government did acquire the property through the aforementioned taking (eminent domain proceedings) in 1940.” (Oct. 28, 2014 email to Richard Teschner from Guillermo Sotomayor, Real Estate Manager, City Development / City of El Paso.) The email chain’s subjects—first “History of taking and transfer, 4301 Woodrow Bean Transmountain Road property” and then “Inter-federal-agency transfer, 4301 Woodrow Bean Transmountain Road property”—refer to what is commonly known as “the Museum of Archaeology property” (earlier “the Wilderness Museum property”), i.e., the 17 acres—originally part of and upon transfer entirely surrounded by Castner Range—on which was built the Museum of Archaeology and, decades later, the Border Patrol Museum. In a nutshell, the 17 acres were the property of Castner Range/Fort Bliss from 1926-1940, they next became the property of the federal government (specifically the then-U.S. War Department—current name “Department of Defense”)—, they were later transferred to the U.S. Department of the Interior, and they were finally acquired—in May, 1975—by the City of El Paso, which continues to own them.

Frontera Castner Beto memo for Secretary Jewell in re Ord, Sam’s Club, excess to surplus etc.docx . [Nov. 17, 2014] Entitled “A Castner Range National Monument for El Paso,” this page-and-a-half-long item is a memo written by Richard Teschner and intended to be shown by then-U.S. Representative Beto O’Rourke (TX-16, i.e., El Paso) to then-Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell under then-President Barack Obama. The memo provides a description of the Castner Range site and gives the history of the Range, both in full detail. A thorough history of the many attempts to conserve the Range and keep it from being developed is provided. Reference is made to the two full-length reports (Nov. 2011’s *Conservation Conveyance Report for Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas*, i, 91 pp. and Nov. 2013’s *Castner Range Land Use Plan*, v, 94 pp.) written, respectably, by the Castner Conservation Committee and by Janae’ Reneaud Field, since late 2011 the Frontera Land Alliance’s full-time Executive Director. A key quote from the end of the memo: If “the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department would only accept as an addition ‘to the [Franklin Mountains State Park] a Castner that had been fully cleared of MECs and UXOs (and the Department of the Army itself would only transfer outside the federal domain a fully-cleared-out Castner), then the [Castner Conservation Committee’s] components ([Franklin Mountains Wilderness Committee], Frontera Land Alliance) and all supporters of Castner conservation would totally oppose such a clear-out. El Paso’s average annual rainfall is eight inches. For vegetation to reestablish itself on Castner Range would take a hundred years. So our present hope is that California’s Fort Ord National Monument can serve as a precedent to Castner. We’re aware that much of Fort Ord was an artillery/bombing range, that much of that land is now part of the Monument, and that the former range’s eastern sector is open to a public that stays on marked trails which have been cleared of MECs and UXOs. Can Castner have that? ...”

2015

*Army's Plans for Castner Range. Feb. 11, 2015. This is a printout from the Army—"Fort Bliss Invites you to their Meeting about Closed Castner Firing Range"—regarding a Wed., Feb. 11, 2015 9 a.m.-1 p.m. meeting it is sponsoring at the Radisson Hotel in El Paso. "Agenda: Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting #2 [on] Closed Castner Firing Range [and] Remedial Investigation (RI). 1. Introductions. 2. Meeting Goals and Objectives. 3. Project Stakeholder Review. 4. Review of TPP Meeting #1 Discussions and Conclusions. 5. Review of Remedial Investigation Quality Assurance Project Plan. A. Munitions and Explosives of Concern Investigation. B. Munitions Constituents Investigation. C. RI Report Preparation. 6. Schedule. 7. Questions and follow-Up Items." "Background: the Army has been working the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) process on Castner Range since at least 2002. We are now in the Remedial Inspection stage. The next step is the Feasibility Study which includes the critical Land Use Plan." "ARCADIS U.S., Inc. is the contractor for this project ... For more information, contact Amy [Aragon] at: Amy.Aragon@arcadis-us.com "

*Closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation. Technical Project Planning (TPP) Meeting #2. 11 February 2015. 9 a.m.-1 p.m. Sponsored by Fort Bliss and "PIKA Arcadis [cf. "ARCADIS U.S. Inc.]," this event's agenda already appeared in the immediately antecedent item (also Feb. 11, 2015). Its meeting goals (p. 4) are: "Review the MMRP and RI project objectives. Review and confirm TPP Meeting #1[s] conclusions. Present the technical approach documented in the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). Confirm regulatory concurrence with investigation approach. Obtain stakeholder input on plan. Initiate field investigation." "Army Project Team Members" include well-known names such as Rick Smith, Bob Rowden, Sylvia Waggoner and Eric Kirwan. The "PIKA-ARCADIS JV Team" is headed up by Project Manager Mike Madl and composed of nine deputies (etc.). "Key Definitions" are given (p. 9) of MECs and MCs ('Materials from UXO, DMM [discarded military munitions], or other military munitions, including explosive and non-explosive materials, and emission, degradation, or breakdown elements of such ordnance or munitions.') (p. 9) A "Review of TPP Meeting #1" is presented on p. 11. (Five activities, including "Introduced and developed preliminary DQOs ['Data Quality Objectives']" and "Reviewed site information and current CSM [which means what, in military parlance? A thorough online search revealed nothing pertinent]." "Actions Completed Since TPP 1 [Feb. 27, 2014]" included "Presented project at February 2014 RAB Meeting, "Prepared Explosives Site Plan—Currently in Army/DOD review, Completed Community Relations Plan, Conducted assessment of high slope appear and ability to conduct visual survey, Developed QAPP [Quality Assurance Project Plan]. P. 13 explains "What is the MMRP?", while p. 14 sets forth the MMRP's eight separate phases (from "Preliminary Assessment" to "Long Term Monitoring"). P. 15 repeats oft-stated "RI Project Objectives," p. 16 "RCRA ['Resource Conservation and Recovery Act'] Requirements" (mostly involving State of Texas requisites), and p. 17 sets forth "Castner Range RI Tasks" (additional TPP meetings, planning document development, community relations support meetings and plans). P. 18's "Castner Range RI

Tasks” include “Conduct RI Field Activities” and “Prepare RI Report.” Numerous photographs— areal maps, warning signs, typical projectiles (some going back to the early 2000s) adorn pages 19-24. “Data Gaps” are presented on p. 25; among them: “Evaluate and utilize previous work, especially: 2012 WAA Field Demonstration Report [and the] 2013 ISM Field Demonstration Report.” On p. 26 we find the “Quality Assurance Project Plan,” a “work plan” for the RI which “evaluated and defined investigation area,” “conducted quality review of WAA and concluded data was sufficient to use for the RI for both MEC and MC,” and “finalized data quality objectives.” (The “Quality Assurance Project Plan” will be finalized approximately February 2015.) P. 27’s “RI Technical Approach—MEC” states that there is “sufficient existing data to: Define boundary CMUAs in [the] eastern side of MRS, [s]how that CMUAs were delineated to an accuracy of +/- 250 ft” and “[c]haracterize nature and extent of MEC within CMUAs.” “Phased field investigation will close remaining data gaps [so as to] Define boundary of CMUAs, if any, in steep areas within western side of MRS,” etc. More maps and photos follow. Pp. 29-31 deal with “RI Technical Approach—MEC,” p. 32 areal-maps “MEC Investigation Areas,” p. 35 presents “Strength of ISM vs[.] Discrete Sampling” (short report: both are highly useful, though for different purposes). And so on and so forth for the rest of the long report (pp. 36-47). See p. 44’s finalizing statement (“Conclusions of the RI Report provide the foundation to develop remedial alternatives during a future Feasibility Study”) and p. 45’s “Upcoming Project Schedule” of these seven tasks and events: “Work Plan Finalization: February 2015. Public Meeting: April/May 2015. RAB Meeting: May/June 2015. Field Work: May-December 2015. TPP Meeting #3: September 2015. Begin RI Report: November 2015. TPP Meeting #4: March 2016.”

*Remedial Investigation [RI], Fort Bliss Closed Castner Firing Range, El Paso, TX / U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Tulsa District / Public Meeting #1 Meeting Minutes—13 May 2015.” A five-page report on the meeting in question. “The purpose of the meeting was to inform the general public on the purpose, scope, schedule, and other details related to the RI project.” (p. 1) Much of what was presented by PIKA Arcadis at the TPP Meeting #2—the immediately-antecedent item (Feb. 11, 2015)—was repeated in the May 13, 2015 meeting. Highlights: Project Goals (“the RI would characterize munitions response site (MRS) conditions, determine the nature and extent of MEC and MC, and risk assessments ...”), Project Stakeholders (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Environmental Command, Fort Bliss Garrison Command/Fort Bliss Directorate of Public Works—Environmental Division, TCEQ, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, multiple local and regional groups, etc.), RI Objectives and Tasks (gathering, assessing, determining, etc.), and that “project tasks would include [TPP] meetings, development of planning documents, community relations support, performance of RI field activities, and preparation of the RI report.” See also p. 2’s “RI Technical Approach,” which states that “[s]ufficient data exists to define the boundaries of target areas [while] existing data indicate that higher MC concentration are correlated to the presence of CMUAs, and that MC does not appear to be present above allowable screening levels outside of the CMUAs.” And this: “[M]etals are expected to be the primary MC, and explosives contamination is likely limited. The RI must still determine the potential presence of MC in subsurface soil, surface

water, and sediment ...” The same “RI Schedule” presented in the Feb. 11, 2015 TPP meeting was repeated in today’s. Among the “Questions and Answers” (pp. 3-5): “Please clarify what is meant by ‘delineation vertically to background’. Would [PIKA Arcadis] continue to bore and take samples if results are above background levels?—Answer: [I]t is likely that background concentrations in soils will be achieved within the 20 foot boring depth planned. If the constituent concentrations are above background levels ... the RI approach includes installation of monitoring wells and collection of a groundwater sample (if present), to address the vertical migration issue.” Question #5 (p. 4): “[A]re these the same statistical approaches that have been discussed in previous TPP meetings? [Answer:] “... the statistical evaluation for the MEC approach is the same as previously discussed at TPP meetings.”

RAB Castner Range monthly update newsletter June 26 2015.pdf A one-page three-paragraph report on the RI meeting held six weeks earlier (May 13, 2015). Four sentences summed up that meeting’s contents: “The topics focused on the field work that is planned for the Remedial Investigation (RI), including a review of the MMRP process, RI objectives, safety considerations, and project schedule.” And “The commencement of the field work discussed in the public meeting is pending the Explosive Site Plan (ESP). The ESP is now expected to be finalized by the end [of] August 2015. Field mobilization is expected to take place in October after the ESP is approved.” Stated was the promise that this “newsletter will be produced periodically and sent via U.S. Mail.” Two more newsletters were. (See the third and the fourth items just below.)

Frontera Castner 4C’s Sally Jewell letter to/through Beto O’Rourke final version.docx This two-plus-page letter (dated August 5, 2015) was written and signed by the eight members of the Castner Conservation Committee and e-sent to then-Congressman Beto O’Rourke (TX-16) with the request that he “pass [it] along to Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Department of the Interior. [This is] as per your request of yesterday afternoon.” The biggest piece of the letter is the section labeled “History,” whose four paragraphs cover most of pages 1 and 2. Keynote: “[In early 2006, m]assive public support to protect the land [from a “high-tech office park” proposed for the eastern thirty percent of the Range] prompted the El Paso City Council to pass, unanimously (March 2006), a resolution to preserve ... Castner from any further development. Similar resolutions were passed unanimously by the El Paso County Commissioners Court (2010) [and] the Texas State and the Texas House (both 2011).” And this (from p. 2 of the letter): “Five months ago we received a request from Congressman O’Rourke’s office that we provide a list of Castner’s petroglyphs and pictographs—where they are located, how they are described, etc. We were told, repeatedly, by the [Fort Bliss et al.] officials whom we contacted that locations of petroglyphs/pictographs on Castner are strictly confidential for their safekeeping.” And this (also p. 2): [I]n January 2000 a[n] “MMRP Site Inspection for Fort Bliss” was submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and that from early 2009 onward the Army and its contractors have been conducting a demonstration of technologies that seek out and characterize the presence of MECs and UXOs on Castner Range. Frequent meetings for stake holders have been held, and we have attended them all.” The letter ends with a twelve-

line section on “Hydrology, topography, Scenery, Archaeology” and a five-line “Summation.” Its punchline: “We signators—some in our 70’s—repeatedly say (and just partly in jest): ‘We’d like to see the Range conserved before we go to join our ancestors.’ We hope the Department of the Interior can help!”

Frontera Castner 4C’s last meeting Aug 5th 2015.msg The most important component of this item is its one-page attachment (“Aug 5 2015 last 4C_Minutes.docx”). Janae’ Reneaud Field briefly introduces the attachment thus: “This is our last meeting under the guidance of the OEA grant funds which were awarded in 2010!” There follow several excerpts from the Minutes: “1. Report by Andy Eby, with Paso Del Norte Surveying Inc., regarding his findings [anent the] markings of the corner points of Castner Range. ... The unidentified markers are not likely to affect the transfer of land to ... BLM since [many of the markers are] adjacent to the FMSP.—2. Overview of OEA Grant Award. [The Frontera Land Alliance was a]warded \$300,000 [in] 2010 by the Office of Economic Adjustment ... The Grant has funded the following: A. Developed and published the Castner Range Conservation Report, 2011. B. Webpage specific to Castner on Frontera [Land Alliance web]site, 2012. C. Developed and published Land Use Plan, 2013. D. Video for Conserving Castner in English, 2014. E. Castner Range Packet for education and outreach, 2014. F. Collection of Support Letters, 2014-2015. G. Survey of Castner Range corner points, 2015. H. Video for Conserving Castner in Spanish, 2015. I. Presentations and meetings are ongoing (next presentation is September 14 at a local Lions Club). J. Travel for education, throughout the length of the grant. K. Design and printing of OEA brochure.—3. To close out the grant: A. Interim Report due October 2015 and Final Reports due December 2015 ... B. Interim Financial Report due October 2015 and Final [Financial] Report due December 2015 ... C. Final reports and deliverables due December 2015.—4. Richard Teschner provided a summary of his visit to Fort Ord.—5. Next Steps for 4C’s: Determined to keep a core group, keep all 4C’s informed and call on those that are needed as projects come up. ... From here forward it is a lot of politics and outreach. ...”

*Closed Castner Range Update—July 2015. This is the second (of three; the third was published in August 2015) one-page news briefs from Fort Bliss Environmental. (“Contact Information: Closed Castner Ranger [sic] email account: usarmy.bliss.closed.castner.range@mail.mil is temporary unavailable. Please send any comments and/or questions to Ms. Sylvia Waggoner at Sylvia.a.waggoner.civ@mail.mil.”) This highly-useful July 2015 news brief contains “the eight steps of the MMRP [Military Munitions Response Program] to be conducted for Castner Range remediation: [Note the future verb tense—“to be conducted.”] 1. Preliminary Assessment (PA): determines whether a site poses threat[s] to human health and the environment. 2. Site Inspection (SI): collects environmental and waste samples to determine what hazardous substances are present at the site. 3. Remedial Investigation (RI): collects data to characterize site conditions, determine nature of wastes and assess risk to human health and the environment. 4. Feasibility Study (FS): evaluates alternatives for remedial actions (technologies and cleanup methodologies) based on potential future land use and the RI conclusions. 5. Record of Decision (ROD): the ROD is a public document that explains which cleanup alternative

will be used. 6. Remedial Design (RD): this is the phase where technical specifications and technologies for the selected cleanup methodology are designed. 7. Remedial Action (RA): this phase follows the RD and involves the actual construction or implementation of the site remediation selected alternative. 8. Long[-]Term Monitoring (LTM): post-closure monitoring such as yearly inspections, signs or fence installation and maintenance may be required for some sites. This is to ensure that response actions provide long-term protection of human health and the environment.—Castner Range is presently at [or “in”?] the RI phase[. A]n Explosives Site Plan (ESP) is under review as part of this phase.”—See the very next item, just below, for a thorough presentation of the nuts and bolts of RI (Remedial Investigation).

Frontera Castner 4C’s Castner Range Fort Bliss Environmental Division August 2015.pdf
“REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION[:] Closed Castner Range is presently in the Remedial Investigation (RI) phase. The objective of Closed Castner Range RI is to gather information sufficient to support an informed decision regarding which remedy appears to be most appropriate. Based on the RI results, a remediation action will be selected in the Feasibility Study (FS) phase. Specifically, the Closed Castner Range RI will delineate potential areas where Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and Discarded Military Munitions (DMM) might potentially be present; identify the nature and extent of contamination; and provide support information that will later be used to select remedial methodologies. The RI phase is also supported by historical records and analyses, previous investigations, ground and geophysical studies, and excavation and soil sampling activities.—The Closed Castner Range RI allowed [and still allows, given that Castner “is **presently** {editor’s emphasis} in the Remedial Investigation ... phrase”] identification of several types of Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) at the site (flares obscurant smoke, grenades, projectiles of various calibers, mortars and small arms), as well as metals and Munitions Constituents (MC).—As part of [the] Closed Castner Range RI, Fort Bliss has also conducted Technical Project Planning (TPP) meetings to inform stakeholders and [the] public of concepts of the site remediation, project objectives, constraints, data needs, and quality objectives; in addition, [Fort Bliss] has conducted area assessments and visual surveys. Presently, the Explosives Site Plan (ESP) is still under review. The ESP addresses safety procedures, area[s] for storage of commercial demolition explosives (magazine), describes methods of disposal, and delineates explosive safe distances.—The Closed Castner Range RI continues to collect data to advance to the FS phase.

The following four items are responses to questions that were emailed to Richard Teschner in early October, 2015 by Marc Rehmann, Legislative Assistant to then-U.S. Congressman Beto O’Rourke (TX-16, i.e., El Paso) at the latter’s request.

Castner Range National Monument 2015 Personal History of the FMSP and CR by John Núñez.msg John worked as a FMSP [Franklin Mountains State Park] ranger for a dozen years or so and grew up in El Paso’s Northeast Side, very close to [i.e., just two blocks south of] Castner Range (CR). [John—henceforth JN—is a] steady reliable fellow who knows a lot about his topic. [Editor’s July 16, 2023 comment: JN’s report runs to seven pages. To avoid paying

excessive attention to one single source, the editor has made necessary ellipses throughout the report.] “... [T]his will be a detailed report of as much as I can remember about Castner Range since my earliest memories ... I will begin ... at the [Range’s] southern boundary ... This information should ... provide further detail of facts regarding Castner Range and should help provide additional background information for the [Castner Conservation Committee’s] land use plan. (1) Hondo Pass [Drive] 1977-1979: Along [this] southern boundary of Castner Range ... there was a barbed wire fence that marked the ... boundary. The fence started at Gateway South Blvd. [now the US 54 North-South Freeway, and] stopped at the intersection of Hondo Pass and Galena Drive. The fence was bulldozed by the El Paso Street Department in 1986 to create a dirt path for runners, walkers and bikers. (2) [Before] 1979, the area that was within Hondo Pass [Dr.], Dyer St., Diana Dr. (formerly this section of Diana Dr. was the start of Range Road #11—War Rd. until [the US 54 North-South Freeway] was constructed in 1975), and ... was still empty land. This section of land included two access roads[;] one paved access road began at the intersection of Hondo Pass Dr. and Dyer St. The road went in a northwestern direction (at an angle) and led to what were facilities on the range prior to 1972. The road was built over when the construction of Skaggs Alpha-Beta Supermarket and [the] Castner Heights [neighborhood’s] housing development began in 1979. Slowly more buildings and housing filled in this former section of the [R]ange well into the 2000’s. (3) the Castner Recreational Park was located at the site of the former Threadgill Ranch headquarters that is ... currently a Girl Scout facility. The park was [abandoned] in 1983 as city development encroached on the area. Video footage of a windmill and some of the rock structures can be seen on the Texas Film Archive website under [“]Hunt Family Vacation Films #1[“]. (4) Just below the foothills, near the intersection of Hondo Pass [Dr.] and Magnetic St. are several trenches used for training. These trenches are clearly visible when viewed on Google Earth. Over the years, I have found many M1 shells from training and ammo boxes, some of which could still be there. (5) A little further north on the trail that starts at Galena Dr. and heads north, there is a really interesting canyon that eventually leads to the highest peak between Hondo pass Canyon and Fusselman Canyon. During the rainy season, there is an intermittent spring that flows through the smoothed-over rock halfway up the canyon. This area has some interesting rock formations and lush vegetation. No sign of spent shells or other UXO [has] ever been spotted in this canyon (to my knowledge). However, on the second highest peak in this area, I did find an unexploded mortar round just below the peak, supporting maps that show the areas that were used as targets (mostly the area south of Fusselman Canyon). (6) Further west, up Hondo Pass Canyon, the boundary for Castner Range crosses approximately 1.5 miles west of Galena Dr. ... No sign of UXO in this region, to my knowledge ... (7) Back down to the lowlands (alluvial fan area south of Transmountain Road, remains of the old target-tow railroad can be found ... I have found many bullet tips and shells throughout this area, mostly M1 rounds. This is the area just north of the water retention dam. (8) Farther west of the dam [and] north of Hondo Pass Drive, there is an old structure made of rock and cement that may be related to the former Threadgill Ranch. There is another structure similar to this located south of Transmountain Road. Both rock structures resemble the ones visible in the Hunt Family film. Also, both structures are on the

jeep trails that lead up to the Fusselman Canyon Dam. ... (9) North of Transmountain Road and west of the Archaeology [Museum] ... is the historically rich area known as Indian Springs Canyon. Prior to 1939, prominent landowner Edgar Park operated the "Indian Campground" in the canyon. There are still remains of the old campground in the canyon. Notably, there is a "beehive"-shaped structure that stands about 5 feet tall, constructed of rock and cement, that was built as a shelter on the spring itself. This structure is just below the saddle that is above Cactus Canyon to the south. The structure is located 20 feet below a 20 year mine-shaft and at the end of the Indian Springs Trail. Just below the structure, there is another concrete and rock structure with a pipe on top of it that appears to be some sort of well. ... As the main trail heads south towards the "beehive" structure, there is a trench along the trail made of rock that appeared to be a drain for the spring ... down to the center of the canyon. At the mouth of Indian Springs Canyon, there is an area known as the "paint-pot" site which is an archaeological site where Jornada Mogollon natives would scrape the deep red rock and use the scrapings for pigment for their pottery. This site is mentioned in the Wilderness park Master Plan that the City of El Paso wrote in 1972. South of this site, in another arroyo, there is another flowing spring. At the [source] of the spring, there is another metal pipe sticking out of the rock. ... [A]nother rock-lined waterway was built to lead water down towards the canyon. ... Further west, just before the main trail heads south, there are some lush trees where there may have once been picnic or camping sites. Following the arroyo that heads due west ... there is a faint trail that heads into an area called 'Mulberry Canyon.' I saw a report that was written about culturally and archaeological[ly] sensitive areas of Castner Range that former Park Superintendent Ron Hillin had given the park back in 2005. [As a former park ranger] I have not seen this report since ... as it may have been buried in confidential files. This particular arroyo has what appears to have been some kind of crude dam that may be from the ... 1920's-1930's. The 'dam' begins at the faint trail and heads north for about 25 yards. Above the dam were remains of an old barbed-wire fence. As the arroyo narrows, there was an intermittent stream that flowed down the arroyo. A little bit further west, there are some really interesting rock formations carved into the granite and some small caves. (I have been told there are some petroglyphs in this area, but I don't know [for sure], since I have not been allowed to visit this area since 1999.) Above the area where the rock formations are, there are several large scrub-oak bushes. Below the bushes, I found some pieces of old purple glass. West of the bushes, there was a mulberry tree that [looked] right on the spring ... However, heavy winds blew the tree down in 1998. According to the report given to [the] FMSP, this was a culturally sensitive area recommended to be off limits to the public. ... North of Indian Springs Canyon, there is a mountain that has a 'nose-shaped rock formation' that goes right up the middle to the top of the mountain where the mountain plateaus out. On top of this mountain, there are naturally formed huecos where water collects and eventually spills out down the rock face of this small mountain (facing east if you are standing on top of [it]). West of this ridgeline, there are several rock and boulder out-cropping[s] and shelters. Further west as the elevation drops, there is a flat area where I vaguely remember seeing about 12 or larger[-]sized boulders that formed a crude circle. The boulders gradually grew in height sequentially as the circle is rounded off. ... I

have my suspicions this could be archaeological in nature and since it lies just above the 'Mulberry Canyon' site, this could be part of the culturally sensitive structures in that area. There is also another small intermittent spring in the area north of this small mountain. It is also my understanding that [on] the jeep trails ... on the face of this small mountain, there was a mining operation that mined rose quartz which is abundant in this area. However, I do not know for sure when this mining operation took place and the purpose of it either. I do know the jeep trails had to have been built during the 1960's or early 1970's. (10) further west on Transmountain Road [and] directly across [from] the TXDOT shade/picnic shelters, there is another archaeological[ly] sensitive area known as White Rock Canyon and White Rock Shelter area. (Sadly this area has been plagued with heavy graffiti and lit[t]er, thus the recent construction of a chain-link fence along the roadway.) In the canyon, there is a small cave known as the White Rock Shelter. The cave is only about 10 yards deep and only about 4 feet wide where it narrows considerably to the end. I have read reports that there were once petroglyphs in and around this cave, but there are only small specks of what remains of the petroglyphs. Outside the cave, there is a large granite boulder that has 5 mortar holes that date back to the Jornada Mogollon people from approx. 950 CE ['Common Era', i.e., A.D.] to 1350 CE. Farther north up the canyon there is an outcrop that has been heavily covered in graffiti. There are several more rock outcrops along the boulder[-]strewn face of this mountain above the canyon and shelter. In some of these boulders on the east-rising edge of this mountain are several more mortar holes from the Jornada Mogollon era. Prior to enforced "No Trespassing" this area was popular with local rock climbers. (11) Above a ¼ of a mile west of this canyon is another canyon called Cactus Canyon. I have noticed that there are several mineshafts ... in this canyon. At the top of the canyon, at the saddle, just below the saddle to the north is where the 'beehive' structure at Indian Springs is located. (12) Another ¼ of a mile from Cactus Canyon there is Oak Tree Canyon. (This is where I went on a Boy Scout[-]led hike back in the spring of 1982.) In this canyon, there is a large Emory Oak Tree. As the canyon narrows and increases in elevation, the vegetation increases considerably and flowing water appears. Further north, there are large trees and a flowing spring. At the top of the canyon, just south of [developer Dick] Knapp's road (now the FMSP North Franklin Trail) lies the banged-up remains of a three-sided navigation light structure. This is the same type of structure that is on top of Indian Peak. When land developer Dick Knapp constructed a jeep trail to the top of North Franklin Peak in 1979, [he] leveled the top of [that mountain]. As a result, the peak elevation dropped from 7,200 feet above sea level to 7,192, and the navigation light structure was bulldozed and pushed off the top of North Franklin Peak [and] it eventually landed on top of Oak Tree Canyon. (13) There were 4 three-sided navigation[-]light structures on the tops of some peaks in the Franklin Mountains. [Editor's note: Those navigation-light structures were put there by the El Paso International Airport or by the U.S. Army to warn planes—at night—not to fly into the mountains.] One is on top of Sugarloaf Peak, another one on top of Mount Franklin Peak [plus] the one on top of Indian Peak, and the damaged one from North Franklin. ... I have heard they were powered by generators. Another source claims [they] were heliographs. This is still a mystery! (14) A [quarter] of a mile west of Oak Tree Canyon is Whispering Springs Canyon. This

is the 'mother lode' [with regard to] large trees, a flowing spring and history. Heading north on the trail, there were pieces of old 2" metal pipe[s] and concrete and rock dams that were from former ranching activity in the Franklin Mountains and below on the flatlands. ... Further up the canyon, there are large trees and the first sign of flowing water. (I can't remember exactly what types of trees are there, but I believe they were Chinese Elms, Cottonwood[s] and Desert Willow Trees.) Higher up the canyon, as it narrows with sharply rising cliffs on both sides, there is Whispering Spring[s]. In an old pamphlet issued ... in the late 1980's there was mention of petroglyphs etched on the canyon walls. I have never seen these[,] as the area has extensive graffiti. ... Heading north-west up the canyon, the vegetation grows sparse and there are several rockslides that provide an easy climb to the top of North Franklin Peak. (15) [In] the area north of the Archaeology Museum ... there are remains of grenade activity and spent bullets. The hills above this area are where the proposed RV site is on the land use plan. To the northwest of the ... Museum, there is a narrow opening between two significant granite cliffs that is an opening to a scenic, un-named canyon. At the bottom of this canyon, there are some more mortar holes in the bedrock from the Jornada Mogollon era. Below a large granite cliff, there is what appears to have been a crude foundation for some type of structure. The area is squared off by piles of rock. South of that structure is a section of granite that has many natural hole[s] in the rock, resembling Swiss Cheese. ... [Up] this canyon is another arroyo that heads south towards the top of 'Mulberry Canyon' where Apache Spring is [located, along with] more interesting boulders and rock formations. According to the land use plan, there is a marker designating a trailhead in this area. (16) North of the proposed RV site, the area comprising several small hills was designated as a demolition area and bomb disposal area. ... [The horrific 1993 wildfire] may have 'taken care' of that issue. (17) On the northern edge of Castner Range, just south of the North Hills subdivision, is an area where I remember finding remnants of military training activity in the form of spent bullets warhead tips and other interesting artifacts. This is just south of the [El Paso Water {Utilities}] water tanks. Further west up the arroyo is a narrow spillway made of granite. On top of the spillway are three mortar holes ... Approximately 50 yards west up the same arroyo are another 18 to 20 mortar holes. The majority of these holes are within the Castner boundary[,] the rest are on FMSP property, including most of the aforementioned arroyo. This part of the [R]ange was part of the Vietnam Village Training Site. (18) In summary, Castner Range is obviously an important part of the Franklin Mountains that is rich in so many ways [and that absolutely must] be preserved ... As far as recommendations for the land use plan, I have a few suggestions, as [I] had the privilege to hike on Castner Range prior to the recent (1999) enforcement of 'No Trespassing.'" [a] Create a trailhead on the south end of Castner near the intersection of Galena Drive and Hondo Pass Drive. This would provide access to some of the most exciting and scenic trails in this section of the mountain[s]. The kiosk at the proposed trailhead should not only include park rules and a map, but should also mention the Army training history of that particular area. [b] Establish a trailhead at Fusselman Canyon leading up and over the saddle and down into Hondo Pass Canyon, allowing public access to the more remote section of FMSP. [c] The Indian Springs area, as funding and staffing allow[,] should be accessible to the public and all historic structures

restored to their original state. [d] All graffiti removed from throughout the entire range. ... [e] Establishing a limited access trailhead and rock climbing activity area at White Rock Canyon. Efforts to ensure better preservation of the area could be established as similar to restrictions placed at Hueco Tanks [State Historical Site]. [f] Establishing a trailhead at Oak Tree Canyon similar to the proposed trailhead at Whispering Springs Canyon. [g] Establish a designated trail leading from Whispering Springs to North Franklin Peak. [h] Establish an official trailhead to Indian Peak at the saddle between North Franklin Peak and Indian Peak, starting from the North Franklin Trail ...

The information I have provided here is from what I have learned about the Franklin Mountains as a whole and not just Castner Range. I grew up on Sands Ave. and Magnetic St., which was on the very edge of the city and a gateway to the mountains. Since the age of four, growing up in this wonderful section of North East El Paso provided an endless 'playground' where I was exposed to nature and history alike. ... [Ours was] a neighborhood where many Army retirees lived. I had the pleasure of asking the neighbors what they knew about the mountains, the neighborhood and Castner Range. I also have come across several books, including the Wilderness Park Master Plan (1972), [the Franklin Mountains State Park] Management Plan (1994), and [the] Cultural Resources Survey ([Texas Parks and Wildlife Department] 1990's). I have received USGS topographic maps in the UTEP Special Collections department ranging from the 1920's to [the] present day. I [was] a volunteer at the [Archaeology] Museum in the summer of 1987 where I gained a wealth of knowledge from then-Curator Alex Apostolides. I frequently hiked on Castner Range up until 1999 when I was approached by ... Range Rider Dean Wood [and told I could no longer access the Range]. Prior to [1999], I and many other people hiked freely on Castner Range. [Editor's note: As of 2023, many people still do.]

Castner Range National Monument 2015 Military Importance of Castner Range.msg Castner Range was established in 1926 and consisted of approximately 3,500 acres. In 1939 an additional ca. 4,800 adjoining acres were purchased, bringing the Range's acreage to 8,328, the largest it has ever been. Castner's size remained unchanged even after the Range itself was closed to artillery usage in 1966. In 1971, however, the GSA [General Services Administration] transferred 1,247 acres (all lying to the east of what is now the US 54 North-South Patriot Freeway) to the City of El Paso. The remaining 7,081 acres—all lying to the west of the freeway—are still the property of the DOD/DOA/Fort Bliss.—Prior to the 1939 purchase of the 4,800 adjoining acres, Castner Range consisted of just four rifle ranges located in the south-central part of the property. By 1943, sixteen ranges were in operation and a mortar range, a moving target course and field artillery were in use, smoke-munitions operations were undertaken, and it is likely that field artillery and air defense artillery played a role at the Range as well. The Army constructed numerous firing and gunnery ranges at the site for 4.2-inch and 81-millimeter (mm) mortars, large caliber artillery, .22 caliber/.30 caliber/.45 caliber and 3.5-inch rockets, and rifle and hand grenades along with 4.2-inch mortars, 81 mm mortars, and 3-inch, 37, 40, 75, 90 and 105 mm projectiles. By 1955 the Range had grown incrementally: twenty-seven ranges were in use including 3.5-inch rocket ranges and demolition ranges. The

Range also included pistol- and rifle-firing sectors, a gravity-course moving target and a field-firing course. Many of these ranges are identified as having been renovated in 1954 with most of the small-arms ranges remaining in the same locations as their pre-World War II-era counterparts. —Documents from 1961 indicate that a complex of firing ranges identified as ‘Trainfire I’ was located along the eastern edge of the Range, and that this complex was used for rifle and other small-arms firing. Several years later a twenty-acre ‘Vietnam Village’ was constructed for close-combat training in the same area as the demolition range in the northern portion of Castner Range. The Army’s Vietnam villages typically included operations which used live hand grenades, bulk explosives and explosive booby-traps.—Three deaths ensued from 75-mm detonations along with one death from an off-base 2.36 rocket detonation. [Editor’s note: Annoyingly, I did not write down the name of the source from which I took the preceding information in October 2015. Given the emphasis on the Range’s military functions, the source may well have been a Fort Bliss publication.]

Castner Range National Monument 2015 Realities of doing archaeological work on Castner Range. The response from Elia Perez.msg The following are excerpts from an October 18-19, 2015 email exchange between the editor and Ms. Pérez, a well-known El Paso area archaeologist. “Good Morrow, Mr. Teschner. ... I mentioned to Marilyn [Guida, a long-time Castner Range National Monument activist] that the report you are looking for, and any reports produced for Fort Bliss, have to be requested directly from them. The most important reason is that there is site information that is not supposed to be released to the public. This information can be in the form of specific site locations, maps, etc. ... Anyway, you can contact Sue Sitton or Martha Yduarte at [the] Fort Bliss Conservation Division. They should be able to give you a pdf file with site location redacted.—In the meantime, I can tell you that the two sites we looked at on Castner Range were prehistoric and historic. We were told not to trowel or shovel[-]test, and most importantly, not to use a metal detector because the small electric signal could set off any buried unexploded ordnance. Prehistoric sites (and there are many) on Castner Range cannot be excavated for the same reason. In the mid-1990s, Fort Bliss spent about 1.5M to ‘clean’ the surface and at least 2 inches below the ground survey of Castner Ranger [sic]. They did not get everything ... [ellipses in the original] —Also, if you haven’t already, you can speak to the Curator and/or Director of the Fort Bliss Museum.” [Editor’s note: I myself sent out this electronic exchange’s chronologically first email. It contained the following: “I have a favor to ask. I badly need to consult ‘Pérez, Elia et al. Archaeological Investigations of Seven Historical Sites within Fort Bliss, Texas. TRC Environmental, 2003.’ It contains information I must include in a report on Castner Range that I am doing ... for Beto O’Rourke’s staff. I have checked, online, both the UTEP Library and the El Paso Public Library and neither site includes your book in its collection. I can order the book online (Amazon has it), but I won’t receive it until Thursday at the earliest. So is there any way that I could simply borrow a copy from you yourself?]

Castner Range National Monument 2015 FW Fort Ord Questions.msg This is the last of the four reports that I submitted to then-Congressman Beto O’Rourke’s assistant Marc Rehmann. He asked me to answer three questions. Here they are, along with my responses: [Question #1:]

“Can you elaborate a little more on what you learned in regards to [Fort Ord’s] remediation process, getting the national monument named, and how that process continues?” EDITOR’S RESPONSE: The western half of Fort Ord (FONM) is the “U.S. Army-Managed Portion of National Monument” and is “currently closed to public use” because of “munitions hazards.” (Info from the BLM [Bureau of Land Management] brochure and map made available to visitors.) From another BLM brochure: “After reviewing the records of past training activities, the Army identified areas where ordnance may still remain and began conducting investigations and removing ordnance from those areas. Cleanup of all identified areas will not be completed for many years.” Twenty-one photos of ordnance with names attached appear on the brochure as well, thus “37 mm Projectile,” “Claymore Mine” and the like.—From the July 2014 Fort Ord BRAC [‘Base Realignment and Closure’] Office’s *Fort Ord Environmental Cleanup 2013 Annual Report’s* “Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Lands Receive Comprehensive Safety Evaluation” article: “... the Army is conducting a final comprehensive evaluation of explosives safety under the Superfund process at Fort Ord. This evaluation will address BLM Area B [the western half of the FONM] within the Fort Ord Public Lands. It will also include a final review of a parcel known as Munitions Response Site 16 or MRS-16 ... Munitions and explosives of concern were removed from the surface and subsurface at MRS-16 following a prescribed burn in 2006.” Other articles in the same eight-page publication: “Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Results from BLM Area B and MRS-16,” “Prescribed Burns Produce Some Smoke Impacts,” “Soil Contamination Cleaned from Areas on Site 39,” “Groundwater Cleanup—Capsule Summaries.” When visiting the FONM (Friday, July 31, 2015) we were also given five on-page/both-sides factsheets bearing these names and containing these quotes of interest: Fort Ord Track 3 Impact Area Munitions Response Area (“The Impact Area [‘western half’] was used for military training from 1917 until base closure in 1994. Military munitions found ... include rockets, artillery and mortar projectiles, rifle and hand grenades, practice land mines, pyrotechnics, and demolition materials. ... This area is fenced, posted with warning signs, and is off-limits to unauthorized people.—As part of the comprehensive evaluation of munitions response sites ... a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) was developed for [the western half]. The RI/FS evaluated remedial alternatives to address MEC to support the future reuse of the area as a habitat reserve to be managed by the [BLM]. Prescribed burning and alternative methods to clear vegetation, needed to gain access to the ground surface to conduct MEC removals, were also evaluated in the RI/FS.—The Army’s selected remedy for cleaning up the [western half] is Technology-Aided Surface MEC Remediation, With Subsurface MEC Remediation in Selected Areas and Land Use Controls [emphasis in original]. ... The Army has been conducting a remedial action within the Impact Area MRA [‘western half’] since 2008.” And much much more of this sort of thing. Some section titles on the other fact sheets: “How Does the Army conduct Detonations?” “Who Authorizes Fort Ord Detonations?” “Who is Consulted Prior to a Detonation?” “Fort Ord Munitions site Security Program.” “Assessment and Cleanup of Site 39 Soil Contamination.” “Habitat Restoration and Monitoring.”—By “getting the national monument named” do you [Marc Rehmann] mean “How did the BRAC-closed Fort [Ord] eventually become a national monument?” If so, then please consult the attachment to

the present e-mail. (If on the other hand you mean ‘Who chose the name ‘Fort Ord National Monument’?’ then sorry, I don’t have an answer, but it’s a logical if pedestrian name for the place, is it not?)—[Question #2:] “Can you elaborate on how the Conservation Land[s] Foundation was instrumental in Fort Ord gaining national monument status? Do you have a relationship with them?” MY RESPONSE: The answer to the first of these two questions can be found in the last paragraph of the attachment. As for the second question, no. I have [or had, as of 2015] no relationship with the CLF. One member of the 4C’s, John Moses, is a regular attendee at annual CLF conventions, but we only learned by accident of his relationship with that organization. Quite frankly I get the impression that CLF assistance is helpful to people—such as those [living] near Fort Ord twelve years ago or so—who are neophytes in the process of campaigning for the establishment of a national monument. The CLF puts people in touch with their elected representatives for example. By us 4C’s, being in touch with our City, County, State and Federal reps is like breathing. I for example am personally acquainted with all of them, and often attend their events.”—[Question #3:] “Can you discuss how FONM was successful despite not having a visitors center.” MY RESPONSE: Monterey, CA is a major tourist destination for the millions of people who live in the San Francisco Bay Area ... and is located just eight miles from the main or ‘western’ entrance to the FONM. I hadn’t been to Monterey in years—ever since the early ‘sixties when I was an undergraduate at Stanford—and I was astonished at how many hotels/motels/inns/B&Bs (along with eateries) the place is home to now. And ‘Monterey Bay’ is extremely scenic, with lots of tourist attractions to draw the folks. The FONM, then, benefits greatly from all these visitors, despite (in my opinion) the monument’s marginally-attractive scenery. It’s true however that if you’re in the Monterey area and want to hike and bike a lot, the FONM’s the place to visit.” [ADDENDUM—i.e., a separate one-page-plus sheet of paper—to the “Marc Rehmann” email, whose final line is just above. The addendum’s title is “The Conservation Lands Foundation and the Establishment of the Fort Ord National Monument.”—“I [Richard Teschner, editor] have now had the opportunity to follow up on John Moses’ mention of his lengthy discussion with Arthur McLoughlin last month at the Las Cruces Ramada Inn conference of the Conservation Lands Foundation. (See John’s e-mail below, along with the e-correspondence it gave rise to.) I spoke with Mr. McLoughlin by phone for 54 minutes yesterday. Mr. M., a 79-year-old retiree who’s been a Monterey Bay-area resident since 1975, is the secretary of the Fort Ord Recreational Trails [FORT] Friends, a 501(c)3 organization that was instrumental from its 2007 founding in moving forward most of the former Fort to conservation as a national monument, which took place in 2012. Here are the points Mr. M made in our call: (1) From the moment Fort Ord was shut down (in 1994) as the result of the second BRAC, the public has been allowed to hike in the ‘bivouac activities’ areas of the eastern sector of the Fort. (In and prior to 1994 the Army had looked for but had not found MECs and UXOs on those eastern sector zones. Cf. the sector’s ‘storage areas’ which are still off-limits and continue being cleared.) (2) Once the Fort Ord National Monument (FONM) was declared in 2012, the number of visitors to the FONM tripled, in part because more hiking and equestrian trails had been opened up by then, in part because their users felt free to publicize the FONM to friends throughout the state and beyond, who

flocked to see the place. (3) The warning signs on the trails are non-threatening ('Please don't go beyond this sign'—as opposed to 'If you go beyond the sign, you will explode'). But the signs appear at frequent intervals. (4) The FONM lacks a visitors' center, though one remains desired. (The BLM would be satisfied with a small building; the FORT Friends want something larger.) Kiosks providing printed information are positioned at the two southern entrances to the FONM's eastern sector. (5) The FORT Friends is run by a seven-person board of directors which meets every month in a local restaurant's back room. Quarterly meetings are held at the City of Seaside's Community Center for the ca. 30 dues-paying FORT Friends members and persons wishing to join. Dues are \$40 per year. (6) There is a Fort Ord Re-Use Authority which works in collaboration with the Army Clearance Group. The clean-up is being undertaken by means of a drag sled 'with equipment that reaches down a few feet to catch all metallic responses.' Burns are required for some areas, though since the [ca. 2013] onset of the Great California Drought, climatic conditions have not allowed burning. As a sector is cleared, it is opened up for use. Last year just one additional sector was opened. Mr. M estimates that it will take from five to ten more years before all un-cleared areas are open to the public. [Editor's note: As of 2023, they still are not.] (7) Until the FONM was declared, warning signs were routinely disregarded and indeed torn down by neighbors who felt they had the right to enter and walk on Fort Ord land at will. Predictable public pressures have arisen over the years, ranging from demands by sustainable-use groups that the Fort remain untouched ('Keep Fort Ord Wild!' is the slogan) to formal proposals by the Seaside City Council to approve the plans of a developer wanting to build a race track and an equestrian-centered resort complex on Fort Ord land. (Seaside in particular was hard-hit by the BRAC-mandated closing [of the Army base]. At the time, thousands lost their jobs.—What I found most interesting were Mr. M's comments (both telephonic and, subsequently, transmitted by e-mail) about the Conservation Lands Foundation (CLF). The CLF ... was founded in 2007 with funding from the Packard Foundation (i.e., David and Lucille Packard, he a founder of Hewlett-Packard), which it continues to receive. Mr. M said that nearly 200 people representing about 60 organizations attended the two-day March 2015 Las Cruces conference. Here is what he wrote me by email: 'CLF sent staff to help us [residents of the Monterey areas] organize Community support, provided funding to send representatives to Washington DC to meet with California representatives and with President Obama at [the] White House. CLF then arranged for the Secretary of [the] Interior to come to a community meeting ... in Marina [just up the Coast from Seaside] where a large and supportive audience demonstrated their commitment for making Ord a National Monument. CLF then worked with us on organization development and provided a monetary grant to help launch our Friends group.' ..."

2016

Frontera Castner 4C's Historical Items information request and how Fort Bliss responded.msg
Jan. 1, 2016 correspondence between Janae' Reneaud Field (writing with Richard Teschner) and Judy Ackerman with regard to a request from then-Congressman Beto O'Rourke (TX-16, i.e., El

Paso) through his legislative assistant Diem Ha plus Mrs. Field that the latter send her various types of information. See the following quotes: “Good afternoon, Congressman Beto.—About five weeks ago Diem Ha requested that we send her some additional information about Castner Range including—specifically—a list of all its pictographs and petroglyphs: Where they are located, how they are described, etc. Reference to the existence of these can be found in both Castner Conservation Conveyance Committee (4C’s) publications (the 2011 *Conservation conveyance Report for Castner Range* and the 2013 *Castner Range Land Use Plan*) but each reference is strictly ‘in passing,’ as no further information was available to us then, especially not in the Fort Bliss publication *Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan*. At John Moses’ suggestion, I contacted the Texas Historical Commission, requesting the info we lacked. The THC said that access to archaeological site-location information (including pictographs and petroglyphs) is restricted. This is in accordance with Sec. 442.007 of the Government Code of Texas (Title 4, Subtitle D, Chapter 442, Subchapter A), and intended to prevent looting of archaeological sites. I also contacted Fort Bliss’s Environmental Division and spoke with its head, Vicky Hamilton. Vicky responded thus: The federal government cannot send or even show to anyone the list of pictographs/petroglyphs on Castner Range; that list is strictly confidential. The Frontera Land Alliance in particular will not receive such a list, as she fears we would post it on our website, thus encouraging the general public to enter Castner Range and deface or remove the items. She shared that Fort Bliss is still engaged in negotiations with various Native American tribes to determine where their sacred sites might lie (as ... Fort Bliss is unaware of all the locations). Vicky went on to say that Fort Bliss now has a ranger who will be ‘monitoring and handing out tickets to all trespassers’ and that Bliss is working hard to keep people off the Range.—In sum, it’s clearly not possible for the 4C’s/the Frontera Land Alliance to acquire the Castner ... information that Diem requested. Perhaps your office could do so, if such information remains important to the campaign to conserve Castner Range. ... —Janae’

EM 200-1-2 Technical Project Planning Process—EM__200-1-2.pdf—

publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/EngineerManuals/EM_200-1-2.pdf

Unfortunately the editor of the present volume was not able to access a copy of this document, nor does typing out the pdf address generate the usual blue-colored underscored-and-therefore-clickable contact information. So the editor has made do with notes that he took, presumably from an on-screen copy of the document at a TPP meeting on Feb. 29, 2016. There follow the titles of the document’s five chapters and its six appendices (followed by a 14-page Glossary): Chapter 1. Define Current Project (Phase 1); 30 pages. Chapter 2. Determine Data needs (Phase 2); 14 pages. Chapter 3. Develop Data collection Options (Phase 3); 13 pages. Chapter 4: Finalize Data Collection Program (Phase 4); 9 pages. Chapter 5: Beyond Planning for Data Collection. Implementation of Data Collection Program and Closeout Strategy; 3 pages. Appendix A: References; 6 pages. Appendix B: Outline of TPP Activities; 2 pages (plus Table B-1: Outline of TPP Activities; 5 pages. Appendix C. Crosswalk to EPA’s DQO [Data Quality Objective] Process. [Includes Table C-1, “Crosswalk from EPA’s DQO Process to the TPP Process”; 9 pages. Appendix D. Worksheets for Documentation; 44 pages. Appendix E. Verification of DQO

Attainment; 2 pages. Appendix F. Examples of Decision Logic and Dynamic Approach; 4 pages. Glossary; 14 pages.

Technical Project Planning “20 February 2016” and 5/5/2015, i.e., second edition of 1998’s <http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions?Environmental?TechnicalProjectPlanning.aspx> . US Army corps of Engineers. Environmental Quality. Engineer Manual.

Castner Range National Monument Federal Officials Report.docx The full title of this pathfinding encyclopedic document is: *Castner Range National Monument Fort Bliss, El Paso, Texas: A Report for Federal Officials on a CRNM’s Value to the Community and the Nation*. 22 unnumbered pages. March, 2016. Produced and sponsored by The Frontera Land Alliance, the El Paso Community Foundation (incorporated 1977) and the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition, the document consists of twelve concise chapters plus three appendices. Ch. 1 (“Overview of Castner Range,” p. 3) provides basic facts about the Range—location, size, importance to the 16-mile-long Franklin Mountains chain, brief history of the Range, its terrain, its geology, its climate, its fauna and its flora. Also mentioned are the benefits created by declaring the Range a national monument. Ch. 2 (“A Long-Term Grass-Roots Effort in El Paso, Texas”) describes the history of the campaigns to conserve the Range, in particular the activism of the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition (“... from 1979 to the present day the FMWC has succeeded in preventing construction and development on all but the extreme southeastern part of the Range. The FMWC’s efforts were especially effective in 2006 when it successfully galvanized opposition to an ambitious plan to develop the entire eastern twenty-five percent of the Range”). Mentioned is then-Congressman Silvestre Reyes’ success in obtaining “\$300,000 in National Defense Authorization Act ... funds ... that were earmarked for the study of ways in which Castner Range could be conserved. ... From March 2010 to the end of the funding (Sept. 2015) the [Castner Conservation Conveyance Committee] produced two book-length works (*Conservation Conveyance Report for Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas* [2011] and [the] *Castner Range Land Use Plan November 21, 2013*) along with a *Surveyor’s Report: Franklin Mountains State Park and Castner Range Corners* (2015), two 9:47-minute videos ... , several brochures, a ‘packet’ of Castner Range materials, and various position papers.” Ch. 1 applauds Congressman Beto O’Rourke’s legislation (HR 4268) to make Castner Range a National Monument. Chapter 3 (“U.S. Army Post Fort Bliss and [the] History of Castner Range,” pp. 5-7) relates the relationship between the Fort Bliss Army Post—now and for many years El Paso’s biggest payroll—and its Castner Range property. Various studies and activities—among them the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) and a Remedial Investigation (RI)—are mentioned and described. “It has been noted that the Army had undertaken previous if limited clearance [of MECs and UXOs from Castner Range] prior to 1995. P. 7 is noteworthy for its list of City of El Paso Castner Range-related publications such as the El Paso City Open Space Master Plan, the El Paso Sustainability Plan, and the second volume of Plan El Paso, which addresses habitat and biodiversity. P. 8 adumbrates the role that Castner Range plays in conserving floodwater run-offs, and mentioned the fact that “30% of the remaining arroyos [stream beds] connect to the edge of the Franklin Mountains State Park,” especially into and through Castner

Range. P. 9 write at length about the Range's Fusselman Canyon ("the largest in the Franklin Mountains"), its Northgate Dam (which serves to prevent floodwaters from inundating the Texas Department of Transportation ... maintenance yard in the far southeastern corner of Castner Range), which stands as a reminder that if "any further development were to take place on the flatter or more developable' eastern twenty-five percent of Castner, four more dams of [that] sort would have to be constructed," thereby altering or destroying the landscape and its vegetation. Ch. 6 ("Impact on Health and Education," pp. 9-10) notes that a conserved Castner Range "will be an easily accessible and very attractive location for people to ... exercise in a natural environment and learn about the natural world." Ch. 7's "Soldiers: Active and Veteran" convincingly relates Castner Range to Fort Bliss's military population, both still on base (the "U.S. Army Family and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Program," the "Warrior Adventure Quest") and outside in the community ("Outdoor Recreation" "Southwest Adventure," "Family Programs for Active Military and Wounded Warriors," et al.). Ch. 8's "Economic Impact" (pp. 11-12) makes the point that "[r]esearch on the economic contribution of national monuments in the West ... found that adjacent economies grew, adding new jobs, and per capita income increased, in real terms, in every case [thereafter]. *Headwaterseconomics.org Winter 2012*" Local proof that conserved lands bring dollars is this: "[I]n 2006, the Hueco Tanks State Park [in the far northeastern part of El Paso County] brought in \$582,207 in county sales and \$331,774 in county residents' personal income." Ch. 9 ("Eco-Tourism," pp. 12-13) ties in the growing popularity of our city's Franklin Mountains State Park (created in 1979, open to the public six years later, and directly bordering on Castner Range from Hondo Pass Drive to just west of the North Hills neighborhood). The FMSP attracts "over 40,000 registered visitors ... annually [, and] between 5,000 to 10,000 non-registered individuals visit the park each year." (p. 13) (For the most part, the FMSP's boundaries are not demarcated by fences.) Ch. 10 ("Social Justice," pp. 13-14) gives these statistics—83% [now 85%, as of 2023] of El Paso's residents are ethnically Hispanic. "Median household income ... is approximately \$39,000, lower than the State level. ... [T]he City's poverty rate [is] greater than 20%—higher than the State rate. Low income, however, is offset by a lower cost of living as compared to other cities in the United States—1.8% lower than the national average ..." Ch. 11 (pp. 14-15) presents an impressive array of statistics on "Flora and Fauna." Samples: "A key characteristic of Castner Range is its seasonal flora, in particular the Mexican Gold Poppy. This species is found in its greatest abundance ... on the lower slopes of Castner Range [and is] an iconic flower that provides color and beauty to the region." Also cited are "the Southwestern Barrel Cactus ... an uncommon plant species in the Northern Chihuahuan Desert." Other facts: "[a]bout 33 species of reptiles [have been] confirmed [along with over 100 species of birds recorded from sightings within the park boundaries. ... [S]ome 30 species of mammals are known to be present ..." The final chapter (#12, "Cultural Landscape," pp. 15-16) says this: "Over one-third of the [R]ange has been surveyed for cultural materials and over 30 sites have been recorded. Civilian Fort Bliss staff has conducted periodic monitoring of Native American archaeological sacred sites on Castner Range." A fact of note is that "[t]he Army established its first post in [El Paso] in 1849 and moved to its present location in 1893." So Fort Bliss is 130 years old as of 2023. "Prehistoric

habitation of the Fort Bliss/Castner Range area began about 10,000 years ago and ended just under 340 years ago. While there is speculation about the Pre-Clovis (500,000-10,000 B.C.) period, prehistoric occupations in the area are known to include the Paleo-Indian (10,000-6,000 B.C.), the Archaic (6,000 B.C.-200 A.D.), the Formative (200-1450 A.D.), the Pre-Contact (1450-1580 A.D.) and the Protohistoric (1580-1659 A.D.) periods.” (p. 16) “A few ranchers had moved into the region in the late 1860s/early 1870s, but the main ranches were [established] shortly after the arrival of the railroads [in 1881].” (p. 16) A thorough and substantive “Castner Range Historical Timeline” covers pp 18-21 and presents fifty separate dates ranging from “1926-1966[:] Castner Range extensively used for weapons firing. (All firing ceased in 1966.)” Other key Castner dates: “Feb. 1986[: The Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition {FMWC}} learns that TxDOT [the Texas Department of Transportation] proposes a 10-acre maintenance yard be located in the middle of Castner Range[, right on Transmountain Road] ... March 1986: TxDOT agrees to relocate the proposed maintenance yard to ... the far southeast corner of Castner facing Hondo Pass Drive.” “1986: Cohen [Baseball] Stadium proposed for the middle of Castner ... 1987: Cohen Stadium site relegated to the eastern side of the US 54 Freeway ...” “1994: The start of the clean-up studies and the [start of the] initial clean-up of ... MECs and ... UXOs on Castner.” “April 1966: El Paso Mayor Larry Francis proposes that a sports-concert arena be located in the middle of Castner ... This proposal is opposed by the FMWC and is abandoned.” “[Late] Nov. 2005: REDCO (‘Regional Economic Development Corporation’, a joint City-private venture) proposes to build a ‘high-tech’ office center on all possible parts of Castner Range—roughly the eastern or ‘flattest’ 25% of the Range’s 7,081 acres. ... Jan.-Feb. 2006: [The] FMWC holds a series of public meetings to discuss REDCO’s plans for Castner. March 2006: Unanimous City Council Resolution to preserve all 7,081 acres of Castner Range from development.” “2009-2013: The U.S. Army conducted a ... Wide Area Assessment (WAA) to investigate methods to characterize the presence of munitions on Castner Range. Frequent WAA meetings open to stake holders were held. 2007-present [March 2016]: Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) undertaken. Various Technical Project Planning (TPP) activities and meetings held over the same time period. ‘Pursuant to the ... MMRP, Castner Range underwent a preliminary assessment in 2003 and a site inspection in 2007, which recommended further characterization of the site through a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study [RI/FS].” (Oct. 7, 2009 letter signed by Keith Landreth, Chief, Environmental Division, Directorate of Public Works, Fort Bliss ...). 2014-present: As part of the MMRP, the U.S. Army and contractors have been conducting a Remedial Investigation (RI) of Castner Range that leads to the undertaken of a Feasibility Study (FS) of the Range and of ways to deal with its munitions. [Footnote {bottom, p. 21}: The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) represents the methodology that the Superfund [CERCLA] program has ... established for characterizing the nature and extent of risks posed by uncontrolled hazardous waste sites and for evaluating potential remedial options. The RI serves as the mechanism for collecting data ... [T]he FS is the mechanism for the development, screening and detailed evaluation of alternative remedial actions. (From website <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/policy/remedy/sfremedy/rifs.htm>)] November 2015, December 2015, January 2016, January 2016: A “Resolution urging that Castner Range be

dedicated as a National Monument” is unanimously approved on separate occasions by the El Paso County Commissioners’ Court [an elected legislative body], the El Paso City Council, the Public Service [i.e., the governing] Board of the El Paso Water Utilities and all six members of El Paso’s State of Texas legislative delegation. —The 22-page Report closes with a 16-item Bibliography containing these items of special interest: Castner Range Conservation Report (October 5, 2011); Castner Range Land Use Plan (November 21, 2013); Northeast Master Plan, City of El Paso, <http://www.elpasodevnews.com/search/label/Northeast> .

*March 9, 2016 Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Old Business: Closed Castner Range Remedial Investigation (RI).—The March 9, 2016 RAB meeting (held just across the state line in the Chaparral (NM) Multipurpose Center that is directly to the north of El Paso’s “Northeast” neighborhoods) dealt with just two “Old Business” areas, one of which was Castner Range. Of the six “New Business” items, only one gives the initial impression that it might impinge on Castner Range (“North Castner Range—Preliminary Assessment (PA)”), but that impression is false. That property is also known as “North **of** [editor’s emphasis] Castner Range,” and though over the years it was not exempt from military activity, it has never been viewed as a part of the 7,081-acre “real” Castner Range, the sole subject of the present annotated bibliography. (Ca. 75% of the “North of Castner Range” property has lain within the boundaries of the Franklin Mountains State Park since the early 1980s. The rest of it is in private or municipal hands.)—But back to the March 9, 2016 RAB. Its key document is the twenty-page “Closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation,” handed out at the RAB meeting. Contents: P. 2: “Presentation Topics: -Safety Considerations, -Remedial Investigation Objectives, -Current Project Status, -Field Work Review, -Current Project Schedule. P. 3: Munitions Safety: -Castner Range is a restricted area—do not enter[.] –UXO is dangerous, no matter the size!! –UXO can look like everyday objects.—P. 4: “Definitions [:] –Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) ... -Munitions Constituents (MC)—materials originating from [within] the above items, including explosive and non-explosive materials.” –P. 5: “Key Definitions [:] –CMUA—Concentrated Munitions Use Area [aka ‘Target Area’] – Areas where there is a high likelihood of finding UXO or DMM [‘Discarded Military Munitions’] and that have a high amount of munitions debris (MD) [.] –NCMUA—Non-Concentrated Munitions Use Area ... —P. 6: What Is Being Done? –The Remedial Investigation (RI) will: -Characterize site conditions -Determine nature and extent of MEC and MC -Determine risks/hazards to human health and environment; conduct risk assessments —What is not addressed in this project? –Development of cleanup alternatives – To be conducted during the next project phase -Future land use decisions -Munitions removal/remediation — P. 7: Task Status [information appearing in rectangular charts:] TASK: TPP Meetings (4 total) = STATUS: Meetings 1 & 2 complete[;] Meetings 3 & 4—2016. TASK: Work Plan/Site Safety and Health Plan. STATUS: Completed. TASK: Explosives Site Plan. STATUS: Approved 19 February 2016. TASK: Public Meetings (2 total). STATUS: Meeting 1 complete. Meeting 2—2017. TASK: Fort Bliss [RAB] Meetings (all sites). STATUS: Meeting 1 complete[,] Meeting 2—today[,] Meeting 3—2017. — TASK: Field Investigation. STATUS: March 2016-Fall 2016. — TASK: Final RI Report. STATUS: Summer 2017. — P 8: What We Know [:] –For MEC: -

Boundary of CMUAs on eastern side of Castner Range. –CMUAs are delineated to an acceptable accuracy level. –Nature and extent of MEC inside the CMUAs[.] — For MC: -Higher MC concentrations found within CMUAs[.] –MC not present above screening levels within NCMUAs. — P. 9: What We Need to Determine[:] –Presence of CMUAs, if any, in western areas[.] –Verify low MEC density within NCMUAs[.] –Migration potential of MEC (and MC) from higher to lower elevation areas. –Potential for MC presence in subsurface soil, surface water, and sediment. – Overall risk to people and the environment[.] All of these will be determined through the field investigation. — P. 10: Field Work[:] –MEC investigation began 7 March 2016[.] –Activities you may see: -UXO personnel traversing entire site including mountains[.] –Sampling teams[.] – Movement of trucks, UTVs, equipment. –Possible demolition actions. ... — MEC Investigation[:] –Visual Surveys – Conducted in mountainous areas; meandering path surveys[.] --Intrusive Investigation[:] –Investigation of existing anomalies—flatter terrain areas – 1750 100-foot transect segments selected[.] –Analog (“mag and dig”) transects—moderate terrain areas[.] - 452 randomly placed 100-foot transect segments[.] — DGM [? Abbreviation not fleshed out. Possibilities: Direct Graphical Models? Digital Geophysical Mapping? Digital Grade Model? Directed Graph Mapping?] –DGM surveys of 22 grids (100 feet x 100 feet) with highly accurate GPS positioning[.] –Data recorded electronically, then processed by computer to select anomalies for investigation[.] — P. 12 shows three attractive photographs, one of a “Handheld Metal Detector,” one of an “Intrusive Investigation,” and one of the “DGM Data Collection.” — [Unnumbered] p. 13 repeats an attractive and informative map—“MEC Investigation Areas”— appearing in earlier RAB et al. publications. — P. 14: “MC RI Activities—Phase 1[.] –Surface Soil Sampling[:] –Area Wide Horizontal Delineation –Using incremental sampling approach[;] -149 sample locations, located in areas previously not investigated[;] –Small arms range backstop berms—10 locations. —Drainage Area Sampling (arroyos)[:] –Sediment samples—up to 50 samples[;] -Surface water samples[:] –Arroyo: Up to 12 locations[;] –Seeps: 9 locations. — Unnumbered p. 15 is entitled “Previous ISM [? Abbreviation not fleshed out. Possibility: International Safety Management Code?] Soil Sampling Locations” and provides an attractive map of Castner Range. — Unnumbered p. 16’s “ISM Soil Sampling Locations” suffers from the same who-knows-what-the-abbreviation-means defect as p. 15’s. — Unnumbered p. 17’s “Surface Water and Sediment Sampling Locations” gives a map whose legend points out **proposed** surface water and sediment sample locations. — P. 18 contains the following: “MC RI Activities—Additional Phases [which are:] –New CMUAs[,] –“Step Out” Sampling—surface soil, sediment[,] Second surface water sampling event[,] –Subsurface soil[,] [Groundwater assessment (if required) [and] –MEC find.” P. 19—the final content-containing page—contains this: “Upcoming Project Schedule[:] TASK -Field Investigation[;] TENTATIVE DATES –March 2016-Fall 2016[;] TASK: MEC Investigation[;] TENTATIVE DATES: March-May 2016[;] TASK: MC Investigation[;] TENTATIVE DATES: Phase 1: May-July 2016[,] Phase 2: September-November 2016[;] TASK: TPP Meetings[;] TENTATIVE DATES: Meeting 3—During Field Work[,] Meeting 4— During RI Report[.] TASK: -Public Meeting #2[;] TENTATIVE DATES: 2017—Reporting stage[.] TASK: Final RI Report[;] TENTATIVE DATES: Summer 2017.

Castner Range National Monument \$2.05 million for investigation and cleanup activities thru 2014 DOD Database.msg A June 28, 2016 email from Marc Rehmann to Richard Teschner. It forwards an email from a Jonathan Ramseur (JRAMSEUR@crs.loc.gov) to Mr. Rehmann. Key information in Mr. Ramseur's email is as follows: "By my read, [the DOD database <http://www.denix.osd.mil/arc/index.cfm>] lists costs (investigation and cleanup activities in aggregate) through FY 2014 (the most recent year) as totaling \$2.05 million for the Castner Range site. http://www.denix.osd.mil/arc/mrs/installation-detail.cfm?ins_id=TX69799F648000&comp_id=9799&reportOutput=HTML&year=2014 I hope this is helpful. Let us know if we can provide further assistance."

2017

Castner Range National Monument EP Times Like Saving Money Teschner op-ed.docx This essay, submitted on January 8, 2017 in hopes that the El Paso Times would print it as an op-ed entitled "Like Saving Money? Make Castner Range a National Monument!", was sadly never published. Here are some useful quotes from the unpublished essay: "Castner Range has something in common with the 1970's TV show 'All in the Family.' As Archie Bunker might have said, 'You can have your cake and Edith too.' Along those lines, Castner Range can become a national monument without undergoing the clearance changes that would alter the landscape and cost many millions. ... [T]hough the Range was closed in '66 it still contains a lot of the OE ('ordnance and explosives') shot there by soldiers training for active duty. Since closure, some OE has been removed in surface sweeps but it wasn't until the [early] 2000's that the Department of the Army included Castner in a 'Wide Area Assessment' (WAA) that applied a Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) to the Range. ... Over the last ten years, dozens of WAA/MMRP meetings were held in El Paso ... —In years gone by, two assumptions were made. The first was that all OE could be removed from Castner Range and that this would be good. The second was that once the Range was totally cleared, it could be incorporated into the adjacent Franklin Mountains State Park to make the nation's largest urban park—40 square miles—even bigger by adding Castner's eleven. But then came Sam's Club. In late 2012 [we] learned that Wal-Mart Stores sought to build a 'Club' on the southeast corner of Diana Drive and the US 54 ... Freeway. The land was zoned commercial and the store was wanted by most neighbors. The land was also part of the 1,248 acres of the original Castner Range that the City of El Paso acquired in 1971 and that now must meet stricter federal standards before development can occur. Once a week I drove by the Club site. First the land—off-limits to the public—was stripped of all vegetation. Next, ca. foot-deep holes were dug at foot-wide intervals throughout the entire property. When the job was completed, the surface of Mars looked lovely by comparison—but that didn't matter, since a large store, a gas station, a parking lot and a loading dock would permanently cover it all within months.—Not so Castner Range. Stripping then digging the Range would leave permanent scars plus a surface that would quickly erode in the summer monsoons and blow away in the spring dust storms. Vegetation would need years to take root and fully grow. All of a sudden, the Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department's offer to annex the Range to the [FMSP] "provided the land is cleared of all OE" looked very unattractive, quite apart from what that operation would cost—at least \$75 million, as we learned at the MMRP. But then we heard about California's Fort Ord National Monument, dedicated in 2012 and similar to Castner Range in all ways except luck. (The Fort Ord Army Post was closed in 1993 by the second BRAC ['Base Realignment and Closure' Act]. The eastern half of the FONM is open to the public if it stays on marked trails, all of which are cleared of OE; the FONM's western half—home to much OE—is off-limits. The Army maintains a presence on the FONM, and participates in decisions involving it.—'But why not sell those parts of Castner Range that are flat enough for development?', as some El Pasoans proposed in late 2005. 'Think of the money the Army would make!' But think of what the Army Corps of Engineers would spend on dams located up-arroyo from the flatter turf. Complete in 1973 on Castner was the Northgate Dam, which protects from flooding the TxDOT maintenance yard on Hondo Pass in the Range's far southeastern corner (and—more recently)—the adjacent Border Patrol station). If further development took place throughout flatter Castner, four more dams would have to be built and paid for. Since the [DOD] is responsible in perpetuity for all OE-generated mishaps on Castner and any formerly-used artillery range, the dam-site lands and their access roads and equipment parks must be cleared of OE before construction could begin. That too would cost millions.—In sum, a Castner Range National Monument modeled on Fort Ord's is the most cost-effective solution to the 'problem' that is Castner Range. It is also the only way to preserve, in perpetuity, a tract of land that all El Paso loves ..."

Castner Range National Monument BLM, Defense Department to help preserve Castner EP Times Jan. 21, 2017.mht This item was originally published in the USA Today Network. Some quotes: "In one of the last acts of the Obama administration, two executive departments have agreed to work to preserve and clean up Castner Range. The measure falls short of the goal adopted by U.S. Rep. Beto O'Rourke, D-El Paso, and thousands of El Pasoans to persuade Obama to declare the parcel a national monument. O'Rourke's office released a letter Friday morning—Obama's last in office—that was signed by Neil Kornze, [outgoing] director of the Bureau of Land Management, and Maureen Sullivan, deputy assistant secretary of defense. ... The letter details how the Interior and Defense departments will cooperate to meet the Antiquities Act's requirements to qualify as a national monument. ... O'Rourke said the letter amounts to a commitment by the two government agencies to preserve the sweeping views of the former weapons-training range and make at least part of the site accessible to hikers. 'We have a letter that not only commits the [DOD] and the [BLM] not only to preserve Castner, but open part of it,' O'Rourke said. He was referring to the higher elevations of the western third of the land, which already has trails, even though the public is supposed to stay out ... More than 35,000 members of the community have signed a petition asking for the declaration, Janae' Reneaud Field, the executive director of the Frontera Land Alliance who has helped lead the effort, said last week. Also, more than \$1.3 million in private money has been pledged to defray any costs associated with the effort. ... 'It's disappointing that after 40 years with no opposition, with more than \$1.3 million sitting there ... that it hasn't been declared a national monument,'

she said. ... **In their letter, the federal officials said they anticipate completing their cleanup of Castner by 2023** [editor's emphasis added] ...”

Castner Range WAA_Field_Demo_Report_Final_Jul2012s.pdf “A three-page Executive Summary begins this ca. 650-page document, whose pages are not numbered consecutively, but strictly within each chapter. Ca. 40 of the document's sheets bear the words “This page intentionally left blank.” Nor do any of its eight-item appendices include contents; each appendix is named, then left un-contented. This document carries the title “Final. Wide Area Assessment field Demonstration Report for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas[:] Prepared for: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District[,] U.S. Army Environmental Command[,] July 2012[,] USACE Contract Number: W912OR-08-D-0011[,] Task Order Number: DK01[,] URS Project Number: 39455641” (Prepared by: URS Group, Inc., ... Arlington, VA 22202). The document's Table of Contents reveals its scope: “1. INTRODUCTION. 1.1 Project Purpose. 1.2 Site Description. 1.2.2 Climate. 1.2.3 Vegetation. 1.2.4 Wildlife. 1.2.5 Geology. 1.3 Historical Information. 1.3.1 Overview of Historical Uses. 1.3.2 Munitions Fired Onsite. 1.4 Previous Studies. 1.5 Current and Projected Land Use. 2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES. 2.1 Problem Statement. 2.2 Purpose of Study. 2.3 Study Objectives. 2.4 Study Boundaries. 2.5 Technologies used. 3. SITE CHARACTERIZATION. 3.1 Planning and Preliminary Activities. 3.1.1 Site Survey. 3.1.2 Determination of Transect Spacing through Visual Sampling Plan. 3.1.3 Geophysical System Verification. 3.2 Characterization Methods. 3.1.1 Lidar and Orthophotography. 3.2.3 Man-Portable Geophysics. 3.2.4 Analog Reconnaissance. 3.3 Preliminary Target Area Delineation. 3.3.1 Data Analysis. 3.4.1 Equipment and Methods. 3.4.2 Anomalies Investigated. 3.4.3 Data Analysis. 3.4.4 Characterization Results. 4. CONCLUSIONS. 4.1 Lidar and Orthophotography. 4.1.1 Conclusions. 4.1.2 Lessons Learned. 4.2 Helicopter-Borne Magnetometry. 4.2.1 Conclusions. 4.2.2 Lessons Learned. 4.3 Ground-Based Geophysics. 4.3.1 Conclusions. 4.3.2 Lessons Learned. 4.4 Analog Reconnaissance. 4.4.1 Conclusions. 4.4.2 Lessons Learned. 4.5 Intrusive Investigation. 4.5.1 Conclusions. 4.5.2 Lessons Learned. 4.6 Stakeholder Lessons Learned. 5. REFERENCES. Eight appendices follow. Their titles will be cited but their contents can't be summarized, since none of the eight **contains** any contents, only blank space. Anyway, here are the titles: [Appendix] A: Brock & Bustillos Inc. Survey Report. B: URS Instrument Validation Strip Report. C: SKY Research, Inc. HeliMag Survey Report. D: NAEVA Geophysics Inc. Geophysical Investigation Report. E: SKY Research, Inc. Ground-Based Geophysics and Associated Activities Report. F: Proposed Anomaly Reacquisition, Intrusive Investigation, and Characterization. G: Target Area 5 Hot Rocks investigation Report. H: Technical Project Planning Presentations and Minutes.

*Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting March 28, 2017—6:30 p.m. El Paso Community College, Transmountain Campus. —This handout sheet lists (under “Old Business”) just one Castner Range-related item, the sixth in a six-item series: “Closed Castner Range—RI [Remedial Investigation],” as presented by Mike Madl, Arcadis, Project Manager. Section 2.6 (unnumbered pp. 5-7) deals with the “Closed Castner Range RI.” Some quotes: Mike Madl “started the Closed Castner presentation by mentioning that the information to be provided ...

would be a summary of the Technical Project Planning ... meeting held in January 2017. The purpose of the ongoing RI was stated [and it] included the study of the nature and extent of potentially present MEC and MC and determination of potential hazards to human health and the environment. He added that information from past investigations was utilized to determine additional fieldwork needed to complete the RI. [He] listed the activities included in the RI scope of work, mentioning it excluded any site remediation, large[-]scale contamination removal efforts and future land use decisions. ... [T]he MEC investigation was completed last year [2016], along with a programmed first phase of MC sampling. The available preliminary results were listed, including the surveyed areas and the amount of studied transects and sampled grids. [Presented were] maps depicting previously studied areas, the RI extent and the identified Concentrated Munitions Use Areas (CMUAs), where there was high likelihood to encounter MEC. Additional maps indicated the results on investigated areas, including found MEC. Mr. Madl also referred to the CMUAs determined during prior projects and explained their recommendation to increase the area of some CMAs based on their investigation results. He also explained ... [there still existed] the probability to find MEC on areas outside of the identified CMUAs. A member of the audience asked about one of the proposed CMUAs, located north of Transmountain Road. The area[’s] shape depicted a horizontal straight line ... [Madl] indicated that the line represented an arroyo where many hand grenades were identified. ... [He] then introduced the MC investigation scope of the RI, which consisted of soil sampling and analysis for metals and explosives. The results ... would be evaluated against residential and ecological screen levels. He added that soil samples collected from berms, sediment, seeps and arroyos would be analyzed for MC. [He] pointed to the sampling areas on a map, depicting locations where MC exceedances were identified. He also introduced the sampling Phase II, which was used to delineate the contamination where exceedances were identified during the first sampling phase. Phase II sample [had been] completed and results were pending. ... [B]ased on comments during the January TPP meeting ... additional sampling [was performed] on arroyos flowing towards U.S. Highway 54. The preliminary results indicated no exceedances. Finally, Mr. Madl listed the upcoming project schedule including the lab results, RI reports and future public meetings. A picture of one 37 mm projectile found during the investigation was shown, emphasizing that objects like these were hard to see, giving a sense of how these items blended in[to] the environment.—Dr. Teschner requested additional information on the FS. [Mike] Bowlby stated that the FS was projected for FY 18 and would be followed by a DD [? , but] the budget programmed by the Army had not been released. The FS would include stakeholders to help develop appropriate remediation alternatives [and] would take a couple months on the planning stage, and might take up to a year to get the project started.—Dr. Langford asked what compounds exceeded the ecological levels. Mr. Madl indicated lead and arsenic were the most common. ... Any future work and land use decision would be determined at the end of the FS and DD. [The FS] might take up to two years [according to Mike Bowlby], since this was not a typical FS based on high public interest, and that stakeholders would need to participate and a lot of public meetings conducted. ...” [Editor’s comment: Participation and meetings we’ve had, believe me.]

Castner Range TPP #3, 19 Jan 2017 Slides and Minutes.msg Email from Judy Ackerman to members of the Castner Conservation Committee and others. Main point: "To view the latest Army reports on Castner Range[,] visit:

<https://www.bliss.army.mil/dpw/Environmental/EISDocuments2.html> and go down to #38. The slides and minutes from the 19 Jan 2017 meeting "closed Castner Firing Range Remedial Investigation" are called "TPP Meeting #3 Slides" and "TPP Meeting #3 Minutes." (Editor's note: Unfortunately, the https material is no longer accessible as of June 23, 2023.)

Castner Range Cutler Scott op ed El Paso Times Fall 2017.docx [In] October 2017, President Trump signed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018. ... Thanks to the superlative hard work of then-Congressman Beto O'Rourke and his staff, the 2018 NDAA contains language (in Section 2825, pp. 868-869) that goes a long way towards conserving Castner Range in perpetuity. Sec. 2825 says that Castner cannot be conveyed to any 'government, public, or private entity unless the recipient agrees to prohibit the commercial development of real property; and to conserve and protect the .. resources" of the Range. ... [W]hile we were disappointed that President Obama did not declare Castner Range a national monument, we took heart in the letter ... signed on his last day in office ... containing this language: "[B]oth the Army and [the Bureau of Land Management] stand ready to work with you to reach your goal of ensuring Castner Range is conserved with compatible public access where feasible."—But the letter contained a catch: '[T]he Army anticipates completion of the selected remedial action (cleanup) at Castner Range in 2023,' a full six years from now. For at least the last ten years, the DOA has been sponsoring studies of Castner's subsurface ordnance and explosives. The projects range from 'Wide Area Assessment' to 'Military Munitions Response Program' to 'Remedial Investigation,' 'Technical Planning Project' and the capstone 'Feasibility Study' which 'represents the methodology that the Superfund CERCLA program has established for characterizing the nature and extent of risks posed by uncontrolled hazardous waste sites,' etc. By our count, 19 study-driven meetings have taken place since 2009, and more of them are planned. Two full-length reports on those studies have been issued[;] more are in the pipeline. Contractors taking part in the studies and issuing the reports include 'the URS Corporation an AECOM Company' and 'PIKA-Malcolm Pirnie joint Venture LLC' aka 'Pika-Arcadis JV.'—In sum, and until Castner Range becomes a national monument (with conservation guarantees like those successfully preserving California's Fort Ord National Monument ...), our long campaign—began in 1971 with the publication of the City of El Paso's 'Castner Range Master Plan'—continues. ..."

Castner Range NDAA November 2017 Sec. 2846 [as introduced by then-Congressman Beto O'Rourke, TX-16 {El Paso}.] Key language: "Section 2844 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2157) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection: '(e) ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS ON FUTURE USE OF CASTNER RANGE.—(1) CONDITIONS.— ... there shall be no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles or motorized equipment, no landing of aircraft no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure,

building or installation of any kind, except measures required to protect the health and safety of persons.”

*Fort Bliss CIP Interview Questions.docx [May 8, 2018] Persons seeking (re)appointment to the Fort Bliss Restoration Advisor Board (RAB) were asked to respond, in writing, to thirteen interview questions. Among them: “(3) How would you characterize the relationship between the Army/Fort Bliss and the surrounding communities?” (4) What do you know about the Army’s cleanup and environmental restoration activities [e.r.a.] at Fort Bliss? Are you interested in learning more about the e.r.a.s at Fort Bliss? (8) Are you aware that Fort Bliss has a formal [RAB] that serves as a forum for two-way communication between the installation, the community and other stakeholders, such as the state, private landowners and private organizations, regarding the investigation and restoration? (11) Do you trust the Army’s handling of the Fort Bliss restoration?” The following was my answer to Question (11): “I am fully aware of the pressures the Army/DOD are under and the constraints they are subjected to, especially as regards the contracts they have signed with URS, AECOM and other corporations. It is also the case—as we are always made aware—that CERCLA plays a major role in the Fort Bliss restoration in general and in the investigatory efforts that have long been applied to Bliss’s 7,081-acre Castner Range property ... “

*Reappointment to the Fort Bliss RAB [Aug. 29, 2018]. By USPS letter I [Richard Teschner] was informed I had been appointed for a two-year period to the Fort Bliss RAB.

Teschner Unfinished Business and the Long Range Plans for Conserving Castner Range.docx
This is a five-page report, written September 3, 2018 by the editor of the present annotated bibliography. Material from the bottom of the report’s p. 1 to the top of its p. 3 is still worth reading today (late 2023). Here is the quotation: “[S]everal things happened on the last full day of the Obama administration (Jan. 19, 2017) and subsequently ... The first was the transmission (Jan. 19) of a standard-issue letter ... [which sounded] the usual themes: ‘[T]he Army will continue to work with the State of Texas Commission on Environmental Quality [TCEQ] to determine the cleanup required for military munitions to allow the land to be used for its intended purpose [which is carefully not revealed]. The Army has already completed a preliminary assessment and site inspection [going back as far as 1974 ...] and expects to finalize the remedial investigation [RI] later this year. (If the RI was finished in 2017, that milestone was never publicized.) ‘[T]he Army will develop a feasibility study [FS] to evaluate cleanup alternatives. ... [The FS] can help inform future decisions about potential phasing of parcel conveyances and the degrees of public access feasible for each parcel. ... Based on the current schedule, the Army anticipates completion of the selected remedial action (cleanup) at Castner Range in 2023.’—We’ve often heard that year before. In recent times, “2023 has been mentioned at the public meetings I’ve attended, in particular the two most-recent Restoration Advisory Boards (RABs—March 9, 2016 and March 28 2017) and the two most-recent Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) events (May 13, 2015 and Jan. 19, 2017). ‘2023’ is five and a half years away from July 19, 2018. ... By 2023 the long-awaited FS will have been

completed (or so we are told) and something called a SUMP ('Site Use Management Plan') will have been prepared for proximate actualization. (SUMP must be a new acronym, as I googled it up on seven on-line acronym sites but found nothing related to the military, to 'sites' or to 'management.')

—It's the SUMP that concerns me most. For the moment at least, there's good news. Thanks to the impressive efforts of El Paso's [then-]U.S. Representative Beto O'Rourke, the 2018 NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) contains Sec. 2846, 'Imposition of additional Conditions on Future Use of Castner Range, Fort Bliss, Texas' whose crucial part reads as follows: 'To protect and conserve ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources within the real property ... there shall be no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles or motorized equipment, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and **no structure, building or installation of any kind** [editor's emphasis], except measures required to protect the health and safety of persons.' —I had a role to play in the inclusion of Sec. 2846's 'there-shall-be-no' language. [The] original submission—Sec. 2825, recorded June 20, 2017—to the 2018 NDAA was very different and considerable weaker. [Its core] read as follows: '[Castner Range] may not be conveyed to the Department [of the Interior] or any other governmental, public, or private entity unless the recipient agrees—(a) to **prohibit the commercial development** [editor's emphasis] of the real property; and (b) to conserve and protect the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural [etc.]'. The sticking point was the word 'commercial.' In July 2017 and in private conversation with Beto I suggested that 'commercial development' meant just that—development by and/or for profit-making entities such as stores, dealerships, factories, high-tech companies, real-estate trusts and the like. I backed up my assertion with [written] information I'd obtained from one of my attorneys, Ryan Little (then of El Paso's Pierce, Little and Madrid law firm), who had researched the use of the word 'commercial' in federal statutes. Beto's response was to put Frank Pigulski (his military research assistant) to work on the matter. Early in August, Beto told me Frank had concluded that in federal usage the word 'commercial' actually encompassed any incorporated entity whatsoever, including strictly non-profit public-benefit organizations such as the YMCA or the Boys' and Girls' Club. Beto also said that it was now too late for changes to be made in the House of Representatives version of the 2018 NDAA, since doing so would draw attention to Sec. 2825, which might get deleted altogether from the Senate version of the NDAA (by, perhaps, the very man that Beto was challenging in the 2018 Texas senatorial contest, Sen. Ted Cruze, who sits on the Senate Armed Services Committee). Displeased by not defeated, I said that if there was any way for Sec. 2825's language to be strengthened [by simply eliminating the word 'commercial'], I'd greatly appreciate it. I heard no further from Beto on this, but it appears that he substituted Sec. 2846 for Sec. 2825 at some point during the House/Senate Conference Committee stage of the process. ..."

*Closed Castner Firing Range Feasibility Study. Restoration Advisory Board [RAB] Meeting. 05 December 2018. Held beginning 6 p.m. in the Geological Sciences Building on the UTEP campus, this RAB meeting addressed Castner Range addressed "Closed Castner Range" as both Old

Business (Mike Madl, ECC/Arcadis) and New Business (from the standpoint of the Feasibility Study [also Mike Madl]). Distributed at and then after this RAB meeting, the ten-page document bearing the six-word title of the present section contains the following: "... (CERCLA) Process: Where We Are Today" (p. 2), "Remedial Investigation" "[c]ompleted July 2018 [which] "[c]haracterized site conditions in the Munitions Response Site [and] [d]etermined nature and extent of: Munitions and Explosives of Concern [and] Munitions Constituents [and d]etermined risks/hazards to human health & environment." P. 4 maps out "Remedial Investigations Actions" (especially "Munitions and Explosives of Concern" in one section of the Range, and "Munitions Constituents" in another section. P. 5 maps out "After the Remedial Investigation, citing munitions response sites, CMUA sites prior to RI, final CMUA sites after RI soil exceedance zones, arroyo exceedance zones and so forth. The important "Project Milestones Schedule" (p. 6) gives "projected date[s]" for the following: Technical Project Planning Meeting #1—February 2019; Draft Feasibility Studies—September-December 2020; Technical Project Planning Meeting #2 and Public Meeting—March 2021; Technical Project Planning Meeting #3 and Public Meeting Meeting—June 2021; Draft proposed Plans—October 2021; Draft Decision Documents—August 2022." The activities of a Feasibility Study are set forth on p. 7. "Possible Remedial Alternatives For Munitions and Explosives of Concert" are listed on p. 8, as is the "Feasibility Study['s] First Step" (e.g., "subdivide into smaller Munitions Response Sites, [make] detailed risk evaluations for each Munitions Response Site, [and prepare a] Performance of Feasibility Study on each Munitions Response Site." P. 9 maps "Preliminary Site Subdivisions," reworking information provided above. P. 10 thanks the participants for attending this RAB.

2019

RAB Agenda 2019 and PSA—Dec 20 6:00 pm.msg This "Public Service Announcement" for the Dec. 10, 2019 "Fort Bliss Restoration Advisory Board Public Meeting" includes these items: "Castner Range—Remedial Investigation" and "Feasibility Study, Closed Castner Range." The meeting's handouts, send-outs or other publications include the following separate entities:

RAB Minutes December 10 2019 Rab minutes.msg In its entirety, item 6 of page 3 of this three-page document reads as follows: "Arcadis presented on the status of the Closed Castner Firing Range (Castner Range) FS ['Feasibility Study'] project. Arcadis began with a summary of the CERCLA Process and stated that the RI ['Remedial Investigation'] phrase was completed in July 2018 and that the FS is currently underway. Arcadis reviewed the purpose of the RI performed for the Castner Range munitions response area (MRA) and presented the RI end points, which included delineation of 7 concentrated munitions use areas and 8 MC exceedance zone areas. Arcadis then presented the FS purpose and discussed what has been done to date, including: 1) Pre-FS tasks; subdivision of the MRA into individual munition response sites (MRS), evaluation of current/potential future land uses, and MEC risk evaluations for each MRS, and 2) completion of Technical Project Planning [TPP] Meeting No. 1 with the TCEQ in January 20219. Arcadis discussed the National Defense Authorization Act [NDAA] requirement from 2013 and 2018 which set conditions on future land use of Castner Range and presented alternatives that

will be evaluated during the FS to address MEC risk. The 9 criteria which are used to evaluate remedial action alternatives during the FS were then discussed. Finally, a project schedule for completing the CERCLA process (through Decision Documents) was presented: No questions were asked of Mr. Mike Madl at the conclusion of his presentation.”

RAB slides December 10 2019 SLIDES.msg Of all the items in this ten-page printout, p. 60's "Project Schedule" is the most helpful. Inside a demarcated square divided into "Milestone[s]" and then "Projected Date[s]" for each milestone, there appears the following information: "Technical Project Planning meeting #1: January 2019 (completed)." "Technical Project Planning Meeting #2 and Public Meeting: December 10, 2019 [i.e., at the RAB event, information anent which appears in the present—Dec. 10, 2019—item]," "Draft Feasibility Studies: September-December 2020," "Technical Project Planning Meeting #3 and Public Meeting: March 2021," "Draft Proposed Plans [whose accompanying * {asterisk} states this: 'Public comment occurs at the proposed plan stage']": October 2021," and "Draft Decision Documents: August 2022." Other information: P. 52's "Remedial Investigation Purpose" [which] "Determined nature and extent of: Munitions and Explosives of Concern [and] Munitions Constituents," "Determined risks/hazards to human health & environment," "Established Concentrated Munitions Use Areas," and "Established munitions constituent exceedance zones." P. 53 shows a small map that demarcates "Remedial Investigation End Points [i.e., MRS boundaries, CMUA boundaries, etc.]" . P. 54's "Feasibility Study Purpose" tells us what it is. P. 55's "What Has Been Done to Date" reviews "Pre-Feasibility Study Tasks" (including "Subdivision of the Munitions Response Area into individual Munitions Response Sites," "Evaluation of Current and Potential Future Land uses" and "[MEC] Risk Evaluations for Individual [MRSs]" along with "Technical Project Planning Meeting No. 1" (Jan. 2019), which presented "Results of the above to [TCEQ, i.e., Texas Commission on Environmental Quality]" and also "Provided Training on New Methodology for Risk Evaluations." P. 56 gives a map of "Preliminary Site Subdivisions" that focusses on CMUA and non-CMUA areas. P. 57's "Land Use Considerations" sets forth "National Defense Authorization Act [NDAA] ... Conditions for Future use of Castner Range," providing FMSP etc. information that went out of date as of 2014. P. 58's "Remedial Alternatives to Address Risk" reproduces a square that shows "Signage to Stay in Cleared Areas" and states that "FS Must Evaluate 3 Alternatives" ("1. No Actions. 2. Remediate to Unrestricted Use/Unrestricted Exposure Site Condition. 3. Remediate to Protective Site Condition with Land Use Restrictions/Controls" and "Possible Remedial Alternatives to Address Risk" ("Land Use Controls. Surface MEC Removal. Subsurface MEC Removal. "Long-Term Monitoring"). P. 59 presents "9 [Predictable] Criteria to Evaluate Alternatives," including "Overall protection of human health and the environment," etc. P. 60's important time-line information is presented at the beginning of the present item.

(Closed Castner Firing Range Feasibility Study [presented at the] Technical Project Planning Meeting 10 December 2019." This nineteen-page handout largely repeats information already presented elsewhere; see p. 1's "Meeting Agenda" ("Introductions. Safety Moment. Closed Castner Range Site Background. Feasibility Study (FS) Process. Pre-FS Tasks: [-Munition

Response Site (MRS) Subdivision. –Land Use Considerations. –Risk Management Methodology (RMM) for MRSs.] Where We Go From Here? Questions and Answers.” Highlights: P. 3: “Site Background,” featuring a small map that requires a magnifying glass to decipher. P. 4: Once again the “Remedial Investigation (RI)[’s] Purpose. Also: “RI End Points,” which presents a small but decipherable map that tells where (and what kind of) MEC can be found on Castner Range, where “MC” (‘Munitions Constituents’) can be found, and which “2 berms contained MC above protective concentrations.” Pp. 5-6 repeat earlier “CERCLA Process Goals,” “FS Purpose,” and the like. P. 7 gives “RAO [‘Remedial Action Objective’] Development Considerations” along with “FS Considerations,” which include “Possible Remedial Alternatives to Address Risk” such as “Removal of Soil for MC,” “Surface & Subsurface MEC Removal,” Land Use Controls,” and “Long-Term Monitoring.” P. 9’s “10 MRSs [Munitions Response Sites] Defined” features a helpfully-colored but magnifying-glass-necessary map that separates Castner Range into ten MRS areas, by far the largest of which is “MRS 10 (Western NCMUA [i.e., the Range’s most mountainous zones].” P. 10’s “Current Land Uses” contains useful information—thus “Two Dams (land conveyed by easements [but held by whom?])” and “Existing Trails (use is unauthorized)”—plus in-need-of-correction misinformation such as “Two Museums (city owned)”; only the Museum of Archaeology is owned by the City of El Paso; the Border Patrol Museum is privately owned. Annoyingly out-of-date statements appear on p. 11 (thus “Castner Range may be conveyed to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department [t]o establish and operate park as an element of Franklin Mountains State Park”) along with up-to-date information from the 2018 NDAA (which of course is now out of date, given the conditions established in the March 21, 2023 declaration of Castner Range as a National Monument). More material of historical interest only appears on p. 12. P. 14’s “MEC HA [not “Mecca” or “Mecha”] During RI Phase” states that it supports “Alternatives Analysis [and] NOT Assessment of Risk.” “Munitions and explosives of Concern Risk Management Methodology” speaks of the “United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise (2016)”’s “Decision Logic to Assess Risks Associated with Explosive Hazards, and to Develop Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) for Munitions Response Sites.” P. 15’s “RMM [Risk Management Matrices] Application to Castner Range” once again maps out MRS areas and shows that in general terms the Range’s most mountainous zones are its least contaminated. A helpful delineation of the six different categories of MECs—“2-37 mm High Explosive projectiles (UXO), M19A1 rifle grenade[s], White Phosphorus (DMM), 40mm M81 projectile[s] still in cartridge (DMM), MK27 point detonating fuze (UXO), 60mm mortar, fuzed (UXO) [and] Stokes mortar (UXO, found outside the investigation area)” —that were “Found Site[-]Wide During Remedial Investigation” appears on p. 16. Four different categories of highly detailed “Matrix Results” are presented on p. 17; they run from “Likelihood of Encounter” through “Severity of Explosive Event” and “Likelihood of Detonation” to “Acceptable or Unacceptable Site conditions.” P. 18’s “What’s Next?” square informs us as to low-complexity, moderate-complexity and high-complexity Feasibility Studies components such as “areas most likely to be suitable for some public use after remedial action implementation” (low complexity) versus “CMUAs which contain MC exceedance zones” (high

complexity). The “RAB slides December 10 2019 SLIDES.msg” entry (q.v. supra) is repeated on the present document’s p. 19.

Castner Range Practical Reasons Why Castner Range Must Be Conserved and Not

Developed.docx A five-page essay by Richard Teschner and first made public on Dec. 18, 2019. It is a lengthy expansion of points made previously but updated here. The following topics are covered: (1) Cost of clearing and removing MECs, UXOs etc. “from just one acre of Castner Range and transporting it to a certified waste-disposal landfill [would be] ca. \$20,000. CR contains 7,081 acres. About 70% of those 7,081 acres are too mountainous to be developed except at much greater cost or not at all. The remaining ca. 2,124 acres ... could be developed if cleared ... [at an approximate total] cost of \$42,480,000. These numbers are based on Figure ES-1, ‘Future Land Use Scenarios,’ Executive Summary, Parsons Report [q.v., separate document], which states that 1,932 acres or 27.28% of CR constitute the ‘zone to be modeled as suitable for residential or commercial development.’ That same source’s p. ES-2 states that ‘\$38,600,000-\$39,000,000’ would be the cost of the ‘Removal of OE Items to a Depth of One Foot’ throughout the 1,932 acres. (These are 1998 prices.)—The present essay then repeats ‘[i]nformation [q.v. supra] regarding the only former-Castner Range property that has been subsurface-cleared of MECs, UXOs and contaminated soil,’ i.e., the 13.5-acre Sam’s Club site on the southeast corner of the U.S. 54 Freeway and Diana Drive. This fact-filled ‘Sam’s Club’ information continues on p. 2 of the present document. Pp. 2-3 then present facts showing that ‘[f]or development to occur ... at least three more dams (with their respective levees and diversion channels) must be constructed to prevent the floods of El Paso’s rainy season—typically July, August and September—from damaging any downstream developments ... At present, two such dams have been erected.’ Their costs and their complications get full billing. P. 3 makes the point that ‘the dam sites themselves must be cleared before building begins and the land on which roads to those sites are built plus the sites’ adjacent construction yards must also be cleared.’ Again, see the Parsons Report [separate document] for full construction-and-cost-related information.—Pp. 3 and 4 recap what we already know [q.v. supra] about the late-2013 decision by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department [TPWD]—restated in 2017 and again in early 2020—to only accept Castner Range into the Franklin Mountains State Park “if and when [the] ordnance and any other hazards have been completely cleared and removed from the site.” (Happily, Castner Range is—as of March 21, 2023—a National Monument, so TPWD’s decision is of historical interest only.)—Pp. 4-5 complete the essay by describing—once again—the pace-setting success of the Fort Ord National Monument near the central California coast, and by making the following suggestion: “to keep costs low and ... to prevent the Range’s land from being ‘Sam’s Clubbed’ (and thus scarred, eroded and wind-damaged for generations or forever), our plan is to open up two or three trails directly connected to trails already existing in the state park and leave the rest of the land alone. While it’s true that any [Castner Range] trail construction would be subjected to CERCLA procedures, a typical trail is 10’ wide, and once smoothed out and covered with gravel it would be maintained like any other FMSP trail. The Parsons Report (q.v. supra, p. 4-4) says this: ‘[I]t may be necessary to fend off an area within a

future park that has a high quantity of OE which is inaccessible to clear.’ That is the plan: Fence off (or otherwise warn people from accessing) all of the Range except the trails. ... [And see] the following quotes from: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District. *Fort Bliss Mission and Master Plan Programmatic Environmental Statement. Prepared for U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center and Fort Bliss Directorate of the Environment ...* Vol. 1. July, 1998, p. 4.1-30: ‘... surface cleanup is sufficient for uses requiring no earth[-]disturbing activity when construction would result.’

2020

Castner Range NEBA presentation The Campaign to Conserve Castner Range.docx October 2020. “NEBA” is ‘The Northeast [area of El Paso] Business Alliance’, a volunteer organization of business owners and agents located in the Northeast, whose boundaries are—on the south—Fred Wilson Road, on the east the Fort Bliss lands, on the north the Texas-New Mexico state line, and on the west the Franklin Mountains State Park. All of Castner Range lies within the Northeast. Although not a businessperson (though definitely a Northeast activist), this document’s editor has been on NEBA’s Board of Directors since the spring of 2021. The Oct. 20, 2020 presentation to NEBA members at a meeting sought to be humorous. Check out the following snippets: “The Campaign to Conserve Castner (CCC) began in 1971. We’re still campaigning. A big CCC victory was achieved in March 2006 when the private/public sector REDCO group tried putting a ‘high tech office park’ on the eastern 25 percent of Castner Range. The CCC fought back. REDCO lost. In a classic case of ‘First You Say You Do, But Then You Say You Don’t,’ for decades it was assumed that the Franklin Mountains State Park would simply annex Castner Range. But all that changed in 2013 when the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department said: ‘No clearance, no acceptance’. That’s still TPWD’s stance today. Hence the CCC’s switch to a ‘national’ something, preferably a Monument (Plan ‘A’) but if necessary a wildlife refuge (Plan ‘B’). In mid-October 2014, I was one of a small number of folks attending then-Congressman Beto O’Rourke’s ‘Powered by People’ event, so I caught him and asked if I could meet with him and senior staff in his DC office next month. He said Yes. I went, and on two occasions we talked ‘national monument’. By the spring of 2015, Beto was ‘making requests’ of me, the late Judy Ackerman, Scott Cutler, Janae’ Reneaud Field, Pat White and others. And he’d hired a staffer to work full-time on Castner. On Nov. 12, 2015, Beto called a meeting of the CCC campaigners at the El Paso Community Foundation to announce that he himself would henceforth lead the campaign. Many events and vast amounts of work ensued. By mid-December 2016 and after a campaign that in and of itself was highly impressive, Beto told the CCC core about his flight—with then-President Obama on Air Force One to Asia—and how receptive Obama said he was to dedicating Castner as a national monument. But by the morning of Inauguration Day (Jan. 20, 2017) there was still no national monument. So Section 2846 of the 2017 NDAA is the only concrete achievement so far, but it’s still a very important one as it forbids construction on Castner Range. Meanwhile, the CCC’s assert that further development threats will not come from the private sector but from Government—from City

(Museum of Archaeology), State (TxDOT Maintenance Yard), and Federal (the Border Patrol Station, plus Customs and Border Protection housing for migrants). But here's the funny part: Along with Section 2846, the best protection for Castner comes from the MECs and the UXOs that lie beneath its surface. Main reasons why? It's because major corporations have been making lots of money off Castner for more than twenty years, and want to keep on doing so through studies, reports, presentations, reviews, meetings, more studies, more reports ... "

*Five-item August 4, 2020 e-correspondence plus two July 2020 exchanges anent the Museum of Archaeology fence and related topics. July 21, 2020 e-exchange between the editor and Sylvia Waggoner, Supervisory Environmental Engineer, Division Chief, Environmental Division, Fort Bliss. Original Message: "I've been following the 'Kemron' matter and I've been told that this company no longer works for Fort Bliss/the DOA on matters related to ... the construction of a fence to surround the Museum of Archaeology property, itself surrounded ... by Castner Range. My questions then are these: ... (1) Is Kemron's replacement now being actively sought, and if so then according to what timeline ...? [Ms. Waggoner's and/or Grady Greene's response: "This will be an FY21 action, no set dates as of yet. Once we get started on the new contract I will be sure to let you know."] ... (2) What instructions were given Kemron with regard to the fence surrounding the Museum of Archaeology property (henceforth FMAP), and in what way—if any—will those instructions have changed before Kemron's successor signs its contract? [Ms. W's and/or Grady Green's response: "This original design KEMRON was to install has changed and the new design will be installed by the new contract."] ... (3) Will the FMAP be continuous throughout, i.e., ... be built across the arroyos, or will the arroyos 'interrupt' the FMAP (i.e., the fence will stop on one side of the arroyo and resume on the other side of the arroyo)? [Ms. W's and/or Grady Greene's response: "The new design will address the terrain (arroyos) to include wildlife protection features." [Editor's response to Ms. W's response: "... Wildlife protection is very important, and so is flood protection, by which I mean the damage that flood waters will do to any fences that cross—without interruption—the several arroyos that flow from west to east through the Museum of Archaeology property." [No response from Ms. W. or Grady Greene.]—(4) "What is the FMAP's anticipated completion date? ..." [No response from either party.] — On July 27, 2020 Ms. Waggoner emailed Grady Greene ("PM. RPEC-Tulsa". No further identification provided) as follows: "Grady, Can you please respond to Dr. Teschner. I am teleworking and can be reached via email, gov cell ... or personal ... " It appears, then, that some or all of the responses quoted just above are Mr. Greene's and not Ms. Waggoner's. Mr. Greene's email to me—quoted here in full—was as follows: "Sylvia passed on your questions concerning the KEMRON contract at El Paso and in order not to violate procurement sensitive regulations I provide to following brief responses below;". —Teschner's final response to Ms. Waggoner/Grady Greene: "Thanks for the rapid response. The next 'RAB' meeting—probably this December—would be a logical place for the fence design to be presented, and for other Castner Range concerns to be vetted. (The Museum of Archaeology is, after all, on former Castner land, and is surrounded on all sides by the Range.)"

*E-correspondence *re* Wed., Dec. 9, 2020, 6:45 p.m. DCS Platform-based RAB meeting. — Initial e-question (Oct. 4 2020) from Richard Teschner to Sylvia Waggoner (Supervisory Environmental Engineer. Division Chief, Environmental Division. Directorate of Public Works. Fort Bliss) asking when this year's RAB will be held, and whether it would be held via Zoom or some other medium. Ms. W's Oct. 4, 2020 response: "... we will likely have an MSTEams meeting ... We don't have Zoom for some reason." — Ms. W's Oct. 15, 2020 follow-up: "This is to let you know I will be retiring at the end of the month. ... Your points of contact regarding the RAB will be Mr. Jesse [Jesús] Moncada and Mrs. Danielle Nguyen. ..." — Excerpts from Jesús Moncada's Oct. 23, 2020 email: "We were still discussing the platform that can best achieve a virtual meeting ... We are going with the Department of Defense's Defense Collaborative Services (DCS). It is a web-conference tool we feel achieve[s] the three objectives above. ... This is a first time doing this so some of the questions you ask are new to us. ... Please let me know if you think setting up a pilot in a few weeks would be beneficial.—Mr. J.D. Moncada. Chief, Compliance Branch. DPW, Environmental Division. USAG Ft. Bliss, TX 79916 ..."

*Closed Castner Firing Range Feasibility Study. Fort Bliss, TX. Version 2. As of 2 Dec 2020.—Mike Madl (no further information) is listed as the author of these materials, which were distributed online in advance of the Dec. 9, 2020 online RAB meeting. The seven pages relating to the Feasibility Study were photocopied and form part of the editor's print-out materials. Most of those pages are repeats from previous in-person meetings and/or mailings. Thus p. 57's "Where We Are Today: comprehensive Environment Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Process," according to which the Remedial Investigation was "completed: July 2018," while the Feasibility Study is "currently underway," and the "Proposed Plan" along with the "Record of Decision/Decision Document" are "in progress." "Remedial Design and Remedial Action" are "future." P. 59's map ("Munition Response Sites: First Step: Break Site Up Into Smaller Areas For Evaluation"'s "Pre-Feasibility Study Task") is a repeat, discussed and distributed before; the same is true of p. 66's "Project Schedule." By-now seriously out-of-date information in the "Assumed Future Land Use" page (62) states that Castner Range "[m]ay Be Conveyed to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department." P. 63's "Feasibility Study Development" map-based information is useful, as it states that "3 Feasibility Studies" have divided ten Munitions Response Site[s] into three aggrupations: Study No. 1 ("MRS 8, 9, & 10"), Study No. 2 ("MRS 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7") and Study No. 3 ("MRS 1 & 2"). Generalities anent the "Feasibility Study Process: Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives Against 9 Criteria [Threshold, Primary Balancing, Modifying]" fill p. 65 and set forth these generalities: "overall protection of human health and the environment ... Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Standards ... Long-term effectiveness and permanence" and so forth.

*An undated but ca. Dec. 2020-written yellow-colored sheet gives the names, the titles and the contact information of five of the many frequent players in the Castner process.

*Castner Range RAB question FB_Form_37_E_Freedom of Information Act Request Form. This is the sheet of paper that Richard Teschner was told—at the Dec. 9, 2020 RAB—he needed to

fill out and submit to: “FOIA Officer, Department of the Army, Directorate of Human Resources, Administrative Services Division, Freedom of Information Act, BLDG 29115, Cramer Road, Fort Bliss, Texas 79916 ...” Here in full is the editor’s seven-line Request: “Requested: Information answering the question I asked at the Dec. 9, 2020 meeting of the (El Paso) Fort Bliss Army Base’s RAB (‘Restoration Advisory Board’), on which I’ve sat from 2012: ‘Since 1997 and at least once a year since 2009 El Paso public meetings—RAB and FS, RI etc.—have been held concerning Castner Range [the 7,081-acre closed artillery range by the Franklin Mountains; Castner was active 1926-1966]. Over the years these corporations (separately or merged) have worked—filed reports, held meetings, etc.—on the surface/subsurface MECs/UXOs of Castner: AECOM, ARCADIS, Malcolm Pirnie, PIKA and URS. Now only AECOM and ARCADIS exist. **So how much has the Dept. of Defense/of the Army paid these corporations since 1997 for Castner Range work they have done?**” [Editor’s emphasis.]

*More on the same topic from Richard Teschner. “Total paid to ARCADIS et al. for Castner Range-related work” email sequence to/with multiple parties at Fort Bliss and elsewhere. — On Dec. 16, 2020 (and seven days after the Dec. 9, 2020 online RAB meeting) I emailed Mike Bowlby (“CIV USARMY IMCOM USA”) the following, as I was requested to do at the RAB: “Good morning, Mike. This is just the written version of the question I asked toward the end of last Wednesday’s ... meeting of the RAB. ...: ‘Since 1997 and at least once every year since 2009, El Paso-area public meetings—often RAB but also FS, RI etc.—have been held concerning Castner Range. Over the years the following corporations (separately or merged) have done work—and have filed reports, held meetings, etc.—on the MECs and UXOs of Castner Range: AECOM, ARCADIS Malcolm Pirnie, PIKA and URS. At present, only these exist: AECOM and ARCADIS. My question tonight is this: Exactly how much money has the Department of Defense/Department of the Army paid these corporations since 1997 for the Castner Range work that they have done?” My email was answered late Dec. 16, 2020 by Ms. Danielle Nguyen, Environmental Scientist, Fort Bliss as follows: “After a quick chat with our legal department, we have been told that Athis [sic] question needs to go through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. You can call Ms. Taylor for instructions on how to submit a FOIA request. Her information is below. Please let me know if there is anything else that we might be able to help you with.” I thereupon phoned Ms. Taylor. The result of my phone attempt is summed up in the following email that I sent to Ms. Taylor: “I just dialed your office phone 915.538.5279. After five rings there kicked in a voicemail message which said ‘The person you are calling is unavailable. Please try again later.’ And I will try again later, but meanwhile can you tell me what time (and what day) would be best for me to call?” Ms. Taylor emailed me thus (again, Dec. 16, 2020): “As of right now I am teleworking due to the COVID. I will be in my office tomorrow at 0700-1600. What can I help you with?” My immediate emailed response was: “What you can help me with is my request for information that I was told earlier today (see—two emails below—the correspondence from Danielle Nguyen received by me at 12:28 PM CST) that I had to go through the **FOIA process** to obtain. Ms. Nguyen also said that you were the person I had to contact for that. ... What I need (quoting Ms. Nguyen’s email) are ‘instructions on how to

submit a FOIA request.” —On Dec. 17, 2020 at 7:45 a.m. Ms. Taylor emailed me as follows: “Attached is a copy of the FOIA request form. Please fill out the form email form [sic] back to me. Please be very specific. If you have any question please feel free to give me a call I [sic] will be in my office until 1600 (lunch 1130-1230). —That same morning (Dec. 17, 2020, 10:59 a.m.) I emailed Ms. Taylor as follows: “Do you know what? The copy of the FOIA request form [that you sent me] disappeared from this email chain when I responded ... to your emailed response of early this morning. (I’m talking about ‘FB_Form_37_E_Freedom of Information Act Request Form,’ q.v. at the bottom of the present email.) So could you please send me the copy of the link once again? Sorry to bother you with this request.” Ms. Taylor’s Dec. 17, 2020 11:50 a.m. response: “Not a problem, try this one.” —My 4:04 p.m. Dec. 17, 2020 email to Ms. Taylor follows: “Good afternoon again, Mrs. Taylor, and thanks so much for re-sending the attachment above (“FB_Form_37_E_Freedom of Information Act Request Form.pdf2.pdf”) as well as a re-activated version of <FB_Form_37?E_Freedom of Information Act Request form.pdf2.pdf3.pdf> way below. I accessed the attachment above, and here is what popped up: ‘Please wait... If this message is not eventually replaced by the proper contents of the document, your PDF viewer may not be able to display this type of document. You can upgrade to the latest version of Adobe Reader for Windows[R], Mac, or Linux[R] by visiting <http://www.adobe.com/go/reader?download> For more assistance with Adobe Reader visit <http://www.adobe.com/go/acreader> ” As I don’t even have an earlier version of “Adobe Reader for Windows[R], Mac, or Linux[R]” —what I have is Firefox and an older Windows—I took a pass on that attachment. I next scrolled down to the <FB_Form_37_E [etc. at the very end of this email chain. Since clicking on it produced no results, I typed out the whole address on my browser. Up popped a dozen choices. The first choice was www.uscic.gov for the Department of Homeland Security’s U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. I read it. My request is unrelated to it. Next was www.foia.gov which turned out to be a history of the FOIA. Third was www.southcom.mil which given the “mil” I thought would be of help. Not. Then there was www2.ed.gov (Department of Education) and www.cms.gov (Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services) and so on and so forth. —In any event, what I now will do is turn over my request for Castner Range information to the D.C. office of our U.S. Rep. Veronica Escobar, and her military legislative attaché Alex Sabater. I know both well, and I’m sure they can guide me through the complicated cyber-bureaucracy. —Once again, thanks so very much for your assistance in this matter.” —And so I wrote a two-paragraph email to Ms. Sabater (Dec. 18). Paragraph One sums up everything I’ve written above. Paragraph Two reads thus: “... I’ve done two or three FOIAs before but only at the local level. Here’s why I want to know how much has been paid to the five contractors for Castner Range work since 1997: The paid-out amount will give the Department of the Interior et al. an idea as to how much more the present contractor (ARCADIS) might request if the conservation of Castner as a national monument follows the pathway already created for what is now the Fort Ord National Monument ... (where, as you know, DOD/DOA work on MECs and UXOs continues apace on about 40% of the FONM land, and will do so for the foreseeable future). So I’d very much appreciate it if you could find out what the five contractors (ARCADIS plus AECOM, Malcolm Pirnie, PIA, URS) have earned since

1997.” —Ms. Sabater USPS-mailed me a Freedom of Information Act Request form. On Jan. 4, 2021 (i.e., once the holidays were over) and in addition to repeating all that I’ve mentioned above, I responded at length—26 lines of type—to the FOIA Request form’s ‘Include a specific explanation’ of why “[d]isclosure of the requested information to me is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in my commercial interest.” I wrote that—see RAB FOIA request Statement accompanying.docx—, I filled out the form and then USPS-mailed both to: “Department of the Army / Directorate of Human Resources / Administrative Services Division, Freedom of Information Act / BLDG 2915, Cramer Road /Fort Bliss, Texas 79916.” Two days later (Jan. 6, 2021, 9:11 a.m.) I emailed these four Fort Bliss/Army individuals—Michael Bowlby, Kyle Deatrack, Jesus Moncada and Yvette Waychus—along with Danielle Nguyen to this effect: “This is just to let you know that I now have mailed (by USPS) the “Freedom of Information Act Request Form” (FB Form 0037-E-ASD 20 January 2017) that I filled out, together with its requested ‘[S]pecific explanation’ of why ‘[d]isclosure of the requested information to me in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding ...’ ... **The only return address given on the FOIA Request Form was ‘Department of the Army. Directorate of Human Resources, Administrative Services Division, Freedom of Information Act. BLDG 2915, Cramer Road, Fort Bliss, Texas 79916,’ so that is the address to which I sent—by USPS—the Form and the Explanation.**” [Boldface in the original.] Mr. Moncada immediately responded as follows: ‘Thank you for the information and update. ... I am currently teleworking ...’ My same-time return email to him and the others: ‘Thanks so much for the rapid response. And do let me know if you’d like any further documentation or information ...’ Two weeks later (Jan. 21, 2021, 8:53 a.m.) I emailed the same five parties as follows: ‘Please let me know whether the [FOIA form] that I sent on Wednesday, January 06, 2021 (by USPS, following the form’s instructions) ... has arrived, and whether it is now being processed. ...’ On Feb. 4, 2021 I emailed Danielle Nguyen with the exact same request. She responded immediate thus: ‘I am sorry Dr. Teschner, I did not have an answer for you so I had hoped someone else with more information would respond to you. I will look into this myself and get you some sort of answer soon.’ That same day, she wrote me as follows: ‘Mr. Moncada just reached out to our FOIA office here and they have not received the FOIA request. That may just mean that the request has been forwarded to a different installation (which is most likely the case since the information you are requesting would not be kept here anyways). Mr. Moncada will reach out to the other office for a point of contact. I will make sure to keep following up with him to [see that] this gets done ...’ That same day, I wrote expressing thanks. After three years of waiting, I still have not received an answer to my question.

2021

Castner Range UXO Backgrounder_updated and edited.docx This is a three-page-plus-map-attachment emailed communication sent to Janae’ Reneaud Field et al. by Marc Rehmann, as of the present document’s date (February 13, 2021) no longer on by-now-ex U.S. Representative

Beto O'Rourke's staff. It does a very helpful job of summing up the Castner Range-related actions undertaken—or promised—by the Department of the Army. Seventeen footnotes complement and complete the e-text itself. The footnoted information will appear between square brackets in the summary below. "Bullets," not accessible on the editor's desk-top computer, will be represented by the ~ *tilde* symbol. Some quotes from Mr. Rehmann's Feb. 13, 2021 communication: "The Department of the Army [DOA] has stated that it is currently completing the remedial investigation stage of Castner Range's required Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) site inspection. [As of Feb. 13, 2021] the Department had thoroughly investigated more than half of Castner Range's 7,081 acres (including trails on the Range that were formerly used) through a Wide Area Assessment (WAA) that led to the issuance of a Field Demonstration Report. [Fn. 1: U.S. Army Environmental Command, *Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas*. Prepared for: Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, U.S. Army Environmental command, July 2012, at page iv.] The Army's next step is to write a Feasibility Study on their findings. This is a step that the Army had already taken at Fort Ord (CA) and Fort Monroe (VA), with most of those studies (but not all) having been finished prior to the Presidential Proclamation. As Castner Range's remedial investigation finishes up and a report is completed, there is no further reason to prevent President Biden from dedicating El Paso's Castner Range as a national monument.—**UXO Requirement**: Since the 1980s, the Department of Defense has been required to conduct research on, restore and make safe any land that the DOD has damaged. And, indeed, the DOD has conducted various cleanups on Castner Range since the 1970s. ~ Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA; P.L. 96-510) in response to a growing desire for the federal government to ensure the cleanup of the nation's most contaminated sites to protect the public from potential harm. [Fn. 2: Bearden, David M., CRS, *comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act: A Summary of Superfund Cleanup Authorities and Related Provisions of the Act*, June 14, 2012 (hereinafter: Bearden June 14, 2012).] ~ Title II of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-499) authorized the Defense Environmental Restoration Program and included the remediation of UXO within its scope, but did not specifically require the DOD to prioritize sites with UXO for remediation. [Fn. 3: Bearden June 14, 2012 *citing* 10 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.] ~ the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2002 (P.L. 107-107) authorized the Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) as a sub-element of the DOD Defense Environmental Restoration Program and directed DOD to prioritize non-operational (i.e., decommissioned or closed) U.S. military training ranges and former munitions disposal sites for investigation to determine whether remediation is warranted. ~ The U.S. Army has been conducting a remedial investigation of Castner Range at Fort Bliss under the MMRP to identify potential hazards so as to determine the feasibility of remediation and potential land conservation. Until that effort is completed, some uncertainty about the level of remediation and potential land uses will remain. ~ While we are not aware of all DOD lands where UXO are present as well as those that have been transferred to other federal departments and agencies, we do know where the DOD has spent federal funds to clean up lands. [Fn. 4: Department of

Defense, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, *Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress*, June 2014, at pages 7-8 (last visited: April 17, 2016: <http://www.denix.osd.mil/arc/upload/FY13-DEP-ARC.pdf>). ~ From 1918-2003, there were 126 documented UXO incidents across the United States in which civilians were injured or killed by contact with UXO found on both former and active bombing/artillery ranges, proving grounds and other military sites in the United States. [Fn. 5: United States General Accounting Office, *Military Munitions: DOD Needs to Develop a Comprehensive Approach for Cleaning Up Contaminated Sites*, December 2003 (last visited April 23, 2016: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/250/240856pdf>).] ~ The following section will explain previous extensive UXO investigations that have taken place on Castner Range since it ceased to be used as a firing a [sic] range in 1966. **Castner Range Previous Ordnance and Explosive Investigation:** Several organized ordnance investigations have been conducted at Castner since 1971. [Fn. 6: Parsons Report. {Editor’s note: See the separate document entitled “Parsons Report Excerpts from May 1998 final version” for Castner Range organized ordnance investigations et al.}] ~ In September 1971, personnel from Fort Bliss conducted a surface investigation of approximately 200 acres of the Range. [Fn. 7: *Id.*—i.e., Parsons Report—at 2-23.] ~ In May 1974, fort Bliss personnel conducted a surface sweep of the 1,230 acres of Castner Range that had been located east of the North-South Freeway (U.S. Highway 54). [Fn. 8: *Id.*] ~ In January 1975, The Engineer Studies Group of the Department of Army, Chief of Engineers’ Office prepared a report concerning the unexploded ordnance contamination of Castner Range. [Fn. 9: *Id.* at page 2-29.] ~ During December 1979, a surface sweep was conducted on 200 meters of land on either side of Transmountain Road (TX Loop 375) and along a two-mile portion of the US. Highway 54 right-of-way. [Fn. 10: *Id.* at 2-29, 2214.] In 1989, the Army conducted a surface sweep for ordnance along the Transmountain Road’s right-of-way and along a portion of the North-South Highway [Editor’s note: The ‘N-S H’ is commonly called “the U.S. 54 North-South Freeway.”] right-of-way. [Fn. 11: *Id.*] ~ In 1994, Environmental Hazards Specialists International, Inc. (EHSI) investigated roughly 6,700 acres of Castner Range. [Fn. 12: *Id.*] In 1995, a surface removal action was performed on areas that were determined to pose an immediate risk to the public where the potential for encountering Ordnance and Explosive Waste (OEW) was suspected at the Range. The action cleared 569 acres. [Fn. 13: *Id.* at page 2-38, 2.2.3.] ~ A 1998 report released a calculation of the probability of accidental detonation for all of Castner Range. It was estimated that the total number of deaths and/or injuries over twenty years would be less than one accidental detonation in a 20-year period. [Fn. 14: *Id.* at 2-60.] ~ In 2001, the Transmountain Buried Drum Site investigation covered approximately six acres of Castner Range adjoining the eastern slopes of the Franklin Mountains. [Fn. 15: U.S. Army Environmental Command, *Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas*. Prepared for: Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, U.S. Army Environmental Command, March 2012, at 1-10, section 1.4 (hereinafter: Wide Area Castner Assessment).] ~ In 2004, UXO removal was performed. The subsurface was cleared on 167 acres excavating approximately 41,000 subsurface anomalies; 975-acres [sic] were surface-cleared for a total of 1,142-acres [sic] cleared. [Fn. 16: *Id.* at 1-10,

Section 1.4.] ~ In 2012, helicopter-borne magnetometry data were collected over those parts of the closed Castner Range MRS (Munitions Response Site) with an average slope of less than 5% or about 1742 acres, representing just under 25% of the total range area. [Fn. 17: U.S. Army Environmental Command, *Wide Area Assessment Field Demonstration for the Closed Castner Range Fort Bliss, Texas*. Prepared for: Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District, U.S. Army Environmental Command, July 2012, at page iv.] ~ In 2012, two contractors each surveyed approximately half of the safely-accessible acreage (i.e., areas with an average slope of less than 18%), which totaled approximately 3,521 acres, or just under 50% of the MRS. They also did additional testing on trails that had been frequented by the public [Fn. 18: *Id.*] Feasibility study is part of the MMRP; the U.S. Army and contractors have been conducting a Remedial Investigation (RI) of Castner Range that leads to the undertaking of a Feasibility Study (FS) of the Range and of ways to deal with its OE [ordnance and explosives]. (See, just below, the “RAB December 9, 2020”’s “Milestone and Projected Date” square, copied from the Dec. 9, 2020 RAB meeting.) ~ December 10, 2019. Technical Project Planning (TPP) meeting reviewed the new protocol for MEC (Munitions and Explosives of Concern) Hazard Assessment. The RMM [not fleshed out; probably ‘Remote Monitoring and Management’] realizes that some places on Castner have a greater possibility of hazards than others. Sarah Alder-Schaller of ARCADIS explained about MRS subdivisions based on the concentration of possible MECs. They define 10 different JRS’s on Castner and place them in three categories: High, Moderate or Low Complexity (density of MEC). For areas (most of Castner) that have the lowest MEC density, ‘Area most likely to be suitable for some public use after remedial action implementation.’ [Editor’s note: The immediately antecedent sentence is incomplete. “For areas that have the lowest MEC density” **what?** “Rapid clean-up and proximate opening to the public is recommended?” Needs fixing.] — RAB December 9, 2020.

MILESTONE	PROJECTED DATE
Technical Project Planning Meeting #1	January 2019 (completed)
Technical Project Planning Meeting # 2 ...	December 10, 2019 (completed)
Draft Feasibility Studies	FS No. 1 Submitted November 2020
Technical Project Planning [TPP] Meeting #3 ...	March 2021
Draft Proposed Plans	March 2022
Draft Decision Documents	September 2022

[Sheet 4—of 4—of this document is a photocopy of the “Feasibility Study Development” map; see the December 2020 RAB entry *supra*.]

(A footnote to this document is Castner Range UXO Backgrounder revised FINAL DRAFT.docx, released in July 2021. It contains two new sections: “Toplines” (which adds this: “More than \$1 million has been promised by the El Paso community to finance needs related to Castner Range”), and “Public Lands with UXOs,” in particular Fort Ord National Monument (“The Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, shall continue to manage the lands and interests in lands under the Secretary’s jurisdiction within the monument boundaries until the Army transfers those lands and interests in lands to the BLM in accordance with the 1995 Memorandum of Understanding ... between the Department of

the Army and the BLM ...”) See also: “Cleanup continues on those parts of the Fort Ord National Monument where the concentration of MECs and UXOs is the heaviest. That land is surrounded by high and heavy fences and is off-limits to the public. The rest of the Monument is fully open to public use.”

Castner Range booklet Teschner Final Version February 17, 2021.docx The title of this sixteen-page item, known in Frontera Land Alliance circles as “the booklet,” is *Conserving Castner Range: The Long Campaign Continues*. Its original version was published in 2017; the present 2021 or “revised” version—sponsored by the El Paso Community Foundation (1977), the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition and the Frontera Land Alliance—runs to 16 pages of text, contains three full-color photographs of Castner Range by Scott Cutler (long-time President of the Coalition and many-times President of the Frontera Land Alliance itself) and Mark Clune, and presents the most complete history yet published of what indeed has been the long campaign—since 1971—to conserve the Range. The booklet consists of seven chapters: “Widespread Support for a Castner Range National Monument” (pp. 1-3), “Prehistory and Early History of Castner Range” (3-4), “The Creation of Fort Bliss’s Castner Range” (5-6), “Closed Castner Range, Clean-ups, and Plans to Put Buildings upon It” (6-8), “The OEA Grant, Conservation Conveyance and Expanded Recognition” (8-10), “The Drive to Make the Range a National Monument” (10-13), and “Working with Government, Politicians, Neighborhood Associations, Students and Business Organizations for Permanent Protection of All of Castner Range” (13-16). Now that Castner has become a national monument (thanks to President Joe Biden’s March 21, 2023 proclamation), the long campaign has taken its penultimate *paso*, leaving only the opening up of trails on the Range as the final step in the process.

Castner Range Escobar Introduces Legislation to Conserve and Protect Castner Range April 22, 2021.msg Twenty-three months before President Biden declared Castner Range to be a national monument, Congresswoman Veronica Escobar (TX-16, i.e., most of El Paso) introduced H.R. 2752, the *Castner Range National Monument Act* (CRNMA) to “conserve and protect the ecological, cultural, historical, natural integrity of the land for present and future generations of El Pasoans and Americans to enjoy.” The Congresswoman’s Act was endorsed by eight local, regional and national figures including Eric Pearson (President and CEO of the El Paso Community Foundation [1977]), Brian Sybert (Executive Director of the Conservation Lands Foundation), Athan Manuel (Director of the Lands Protection Program of the Sierra Club), Janae’ Reneaud Field (Executive Director of the Frontera Land Alliance), Judy Ackerman (Secretary of the Franklin Mountains Wilderness Coalition), Mark Magaña (Founding President and CEO of Green Latinos), and Ángel Peña (Executive Director Nuestra Tierra Conservation Project). According to the Congresswoman, a CRNMA would designate the Castner Range federal lands within El Paso County as a National Monument to conserve and protect the integrity of the land, protect the Range’s role as a water-conservation sanctuary, its significance as a habitat for diverse and uniquely mountainous wildlife and vegetation, protect habitat restoration and recreational-enhancement opportunities, and call for the establishment of a

Castner Range National Monument Advisory Council to advise in areas regarding the preparation and implementation of the Monumental plan.

Castner Range Escobar editorial I'm Deeply Committed to Castner Range El Paso Times.docx
This editorial was written by El Paso's Congresswoman Veronica Escobar and published in the *El Paso Times* in October of 2021. Some highlights: "On January 16, 2017, just before Barack Obama left office, the El Paso Times made 'One final plea for Castner Range monument' in which it said: "Obama so far has created 34 national monuments, more than any other president" and implored him "one final time to use his authority under the Antiquities Act to create [a] Castner Range National Monument [that] would be a tremendous final entry to his preservation legacy." That didn't happen. But our campaign to make the 7,081-acre Range (containing 25% of our beautiful Franklin Mountains) a national monument never stopped. And now, once again, it's really heated up. I'm proud to say I'm part of it. [In March of 2020] I reintroduced to the House Armed Services Committee (on which I sit) and the House Natural Resources Committee the 'H.R. 6234 Castner Range National Monument Act,' which when approved will conserve our beloved Range forever. Since March 12th the Act has been referred to subcommittees at whose meetings I have testified. I've had face-to-face conversations with Deb Haaland our Secretary of the Interior ... whom I knew well when she represented Albuquerque in Congress. When we met, I emphasized that El Pasoans overwhelmingly want the Range conserved. From November 20015-January 2017 over 35,200 of us signed letters supporting a Castner Range National Monument. Proclamations to that effect were unanimously approved and signed by our City Council, our Commissioners' Court, the Public Service Board of El Paso Water, all State Representatives and our State Senator. The campaign received 157 letters of support including 102 from businesses and 25 from civic groups and neighborhood associations. It collected \$15,000 in funds, and garnered an endowment of ca. \$1.5 million available through the El Paso Community Foundation. And this year alone, thousands more letters have been signed, and once again our representatives have expressed their full support. On April 23 I held a press conference featuring Castner Range campaigners and fully covered by the *Times* and all media. On July 23 I was the featured speaker at a well-attended rally near th Museum of Archaeology, as close to the still-off-limits Range as possible. El Paso had just experienced four weeks of wonderful rainfall, and I pointed out the important role that Castner Range has always played in absorbing floodwaters and channeling rainwater down into our ever-thirsty *bolsones* ['natural underground water reservoirs'].—As I wrote to U.S. Representative Raúl Grijalva last December when reintroducing HR 6234, a Castner Range National Monument has unique historical significance for El Paso, with multiple Indigenous People's archaeological sites, the El Paso Tin Mine (recognized on the National Register of Historic Places), [along with] substantive wildlife habitat and a wide range of flora. ... In sum, my work continues. I'm fighting hard to make our Castner Range a national monument. Please join me in this wonderful campaign!"

Fort Ord National Monument—A Precursor to a Castner Range National Monument.docx A
narrative largely taken from Wikipedia's 11-page "Fort Ord" article, "last edited on 223 June

2021” according to an end-of-text statement by the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. See this website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fort_Ord

*Dec. 9, 2021 RAB Agenda. Held by Zoom, this meeting’s Agenda featured presentations by Kyle Deatrick (Fort Bliss Installation Restoration Project Manager), Yvette Waychus (Fort Bliss Environmental Branch Chief, and the well-known Mike Madl (ECC [Environmental Chemical Corporation] and Arcadis) and Mike Bowlby. Mike Madl made the only presentation on Castner Range (pp. 20-31), entitled “Closed Castner Firing Range Feasibility Study [FS].” He pointed out that the Remedial Investigation had been completed in July 2018 and that the FS was “currently underway.” As set forth on the printout, the answer to the question “Why a Feasibility Study?” is that “Unacceptable Risks/Hazards Are Present from: Munitions and Explosives of Concern [i.e., MECs] [as well as] Munitions Constituents [i.e., MCs]. Categories of munitions with explosives hazards [include] unexploded ordnance and discarded military munitions. Chemicals from Munitions and Explosives of Concern [include] explosive and non-explosive materials.” Presented yet again (p. 23) was the by-now-well-known “Munition Response Sites” map, with the “Site [i.e., all of Castner Range] Divided Into Smaller Areas For Evaluation.” The “Feasibility Study[’s] Purpose” (p. 24) is to “address unacceptable site risks by: Establishing remedial action objectives, identifying technologies, developing remedial alternatives [and] performing detailed analysis & comparison of the alternatives.” P. 23’s map reappears on p. 27, which mentions yet another by-now-oft-presented “3 Feasibility Studies: 1. Munitions Response Sites 8, 9, & 10, 2. Munitions Response Sites 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7” and “3. Munitions Response Sites 1 & 2.” The “Feasibility Study Process [to] Develop Remedial Alternatives to Address Risk” (p. 28) sets forth a “Minimum of 3 Alternatives” which are “1. No Action, 2. Remediate to Unrestricted Use/Unrestricted Exposure Site Condition [and] 3. Remediate to Protective Site Condition with Land Use Restrictions/Controls.” The same page’s “Possible Response Actions [are] Land Use controls, Surface Removal of Munitions and Explosives of Concern, Subsurface Removal of Munitions and Explosives of Concern [and] Long-Term Management.” One statement made on p. 29 (“Alternative Examples: What this May Look Like for Two Alternatives”) is of more than passing interest, for the first “alternative” considers the following possibility: “Army[-]Retained Alternative: Status Quo: No Entry[,] U.S. Army ownership[,] Land Use Controls: Fencing & signage.” (P. 29’s second alternative, “Remedial Action to Allow Recreation,” conjectures “Surface/subsurface removal for trails, trailheads & parking areas” and even “Surface removal beyond trails” along with “Land Use Controls: Trailhead information boards, signs, monitoring systems, safety fencing.” Generalities appear in p. 30’s “Detailed Evaluation of Alternatives Against 9 Criteria,” including “Overall protection of human health and the environment, Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Standards, “Long-term effectiveness and permanence, Reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume, Short-term effectiveness, Implementability, Cost, State acceptance [and] Community acceptance.” P. 31’s “Project Schedule” states the following: “Technical Project Planning Meeting #1: January 2019 (completed). Technical Project Planning meeting #2 ... December 10, 2019 (completed). Draft Feasibility Studies: Feasibility Studies 2 & 3—Late 2021/Early 2022.” The “projected date” for

“Technical Project Planning Meeting #3” is “Fall/Winter 2022”; the projected date for “Draft Proposed Plans [asterisked footnote: “Public comment occurs at the proposed plan stage”]” is “March 2023.”—The three-page Dec. 9, 2021 RAB’s “Minutes” were dated “31 January 2022” but were not mailed out until Feb. 8, 2022. The bulk of the Minutes consists of questions (asked by members of the RAB, especially Richard Teschner, and by members of the public, especially Judy Ackerman) and answers (given exclusively by Mike Bowlby). Richard was first to speak, but rather than ask a question he made a comment, which the Minutes reported thus: “[Teschner] [c]orrected Arcadis reference to NDAA Section 2846 and stated that 2846 prohibits ALL construction.” Mike Bowlby’s response, as written in the Minutes: “Provision of NDAA language allows for limited construction to support safety for limited recreational land use.” See, in the immediately-following “2022” item “Misinformation in Feb. 8, 2022 Minutes of Dec. 9, 2021 RAB meeting,” an email exchange between Richard and Congresswoman Veronica Escobar in which Richard provides information that contradicts Mike Bowlby’s response. Judy Ackerman’s second question: “Areas 8, 9, and 10 of the MRS; is the Draft FS available to [the] public? Mike Bowlby’s response: “The FS is still in internal draft form.” Judy’s third question: “Last year’s schedule said the Technical Project Planning III meeting was supposed to be in March 2021. Why was it delayed? COVID?” Mike Bowlby’s response: “Some COVID delays, but more [delays] due to the complexity of the process.”

2022

*Misinformation in Feb. 8, 2022 Minutes of Dec. 9, 2021 RAB meeting [—the immediately-antecedent item, the last in Year 2021] . On Feb. 22, 2022, Richard Teschner wrote Congresswoman Veronica Escobar as follows: “... On p. 2 and in item 5.a. of the [RAB Dec. 9, 2021 meeting’s] Minutes (pdf form attached) there appears this exchange ...: ‘[Richard Teschner] Corrected Arcadis reference to NDAA Section 2846 and [he] stated that 2846 prohibits ALL construction. Mike [Bowlby] ... responded thus: “**Provision of NDAA language allows for limited construction to support safety for limited recreational land use.**” —That statement is false; hence the question I asked. Rather than start a RAB debate, I decided to wait for the Minutes to appear. ... [T]hey contained the quote I insert in the foregoing paragraph. And so I did my research. It consisted of an online “Ctfl f” digital search of all five recent NDAAs—2018 (which first contained the “Sec. 2846” that Beto introduced), 2019, 2020, 20221 and 2022—for the word “Castner.” For obvious reasons it appeared repeatedly in NDAA 2018 (“Sec. 2846”) **but did not appear in NDAA 2019, 2020, 2021 or 2022** [emphasis in the original]. ... The pertinent language—the language that appears in NDAA 2018 and that governs any and all construction on Castner Range—is this (pp 1482-1484), which here I cite in full: “(1) CONDITIONS.—To protect and conserve ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources within the real property described in subsection (a), subject to rights and improvements in existence as of December 31, 2017, there shall be no commercial enterprise, no permanent road, no temporary road, no use of motor

vehicles or motorized equipment, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, **and no structure, building or installation of any kind** [editor's emphasis], except measures required to protect the health and safety of persons." (Of the three remaining 'conditions,' only one—# (4), "Military Munitions"—contains additional language tangentially applicable to what can be done on Castner Range and what uses the Range can be put to, namely: "The Secretary shall conduct military munitions response actions on the real property described in subsection (a) in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 and actions shall also minimize disturbance of natural and cultural resources present on the real property described in subsection (a).") Therefore, [the] statement (this email, paragraph 2 above) is false. (I reiterate what I wrote in paragraph 3 above, namely, that **NDAAs 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 contain no mention whatsoever of Castner Range**, so "allows for limited construction to support safety for limited recreational land use" is pure fiction.)—On several occasions you've told me that in hearings you've attended, "the Army" is always raising objections to your ongoing attempts to conserve Castner Range (with—in this case—the H.R. 6234 that you've sponsored so persistently and professionally) by claiming that this statement, that statement, the other statement (etc.) is wrong, false, misunderstood, contrary to established legislation and so forth. I hope the facts that I provide above will be of use to you in future encounters with Army employees and the people who work for the corporations ... that are under contract with the Army.—Best regards from, Richard Teschner."

*Castner Range RAB slides October 12, 2022. Frontera Land Alliance Executive Director Janae' Reneaud Field sent out this eight-page "slides" email, which contains photographs of eight pages' worth of material from the Dec. 9, 2021 RAB meeting's handouts. Page 1's photograph and p. 8's photograph are of interest for the revised "Projected Date"s they provide for various "Milestone"s, namely (p. 1) "Feasibility Studies" = "2025," and "Technical Project Planning Meeting #3 ..." = "2026." Earlier RAB et al. mailings cite earlier dates for those events. Page 8's "Completed CERCLA Steps": "Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Process" lists (*inter alia*) the Feasibility Study as "Currently Underway," whereas earlier RAB et al. mailings list it as having been completed.

*Castner Range Veronica Escobar cited in her July 2022 Month in Review Congressional Update.msg Among many other pieces of information, the following note appears: "During #LatinoConservationWeek, it was my privilege to welcome fellow advocates of Castner Range at the Capitol. In addition to a roundtable with the Undersecretary of the Army, Department of the Interior, and White House Council on Environmental Quality, we held a reception to talk about our progress.—Sharing our combined efforts to designate Castner Range as a national monument makes me confident we'll soon accomplish this goal."

Castner Range NDAA 2023 DRPT-117hrpt397.pdf Status Update on Castner Range Feasibility Study and Authority for Transfer.docx NDAA 2023 Section: Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations, Title III—Operation and Maintenance/Items of Special Interest, Other Matters, p. 113, NDAA 2023. **Title of Section: "Status Update on Castner Range Feasibility**

Study[.] [emphasis in the original] Entire text of section *in toto*: “The [House Armed Services] Committee is monitoring the pace and scope of the Army’s feasibility study to determine options and costs for cleanup of the Castner Range, a 7,081-acre area in northeast El Paso that is under consideration for being converted into public use. The Army used a large section of this land between 1926 and 1966 as a live firing range. The Committee encourages the office of the Secretary of the Army to ensure timely completion of this feasibility study and, once the study is completed, to work with the Committee to identify and secure the resources needed to fulfill the Army’s cleanup responsibilities. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by no later than December 1, 2022 providing a status update on the ongoing feasibility study on Castner Range.”

Castner Range NDAA 2022 Text—H.R. 2752—117th Congress (2021-2022) Castner Range National Monument Act Congress.gov Library of Congress ... Introduced 6/15/2021 by Congresswoman Veronica Escobar, this NDAA 2022 item’s stated purpose is “[T]o establish the Castner Range National Monument”. See, in particular, unnumbered pp. 2 and 3 for specifics (such as, for example, “The purpose of the National Monument is to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, scenic, wildlife, recreational, cultural, historical, natural, educational, and scientific resources of the lands included in the National Monument ...” The Act also sets forth—unnumbered pp. 6-7—the parameters of the “Castner Range National Monument Advisory Council.”

Castner Range Escobar’s letter to President Joe Biden requesting he declare Castner Range a national monument.msg Dated April 7, 2022, this two-page five-paragraph letter on Congresswoman Escobar’s House-of-Representatives stationery thanks the President for his “strong commitment to the conservation of America’s public lands and waters,” reminds him that as one of his “first actions in office, you committed your administration to the goal of conserving 30% of this nation’s lands and waters by 2030” and that his “administration’s *America the Beautiful* initiative has made many strides in the past year to achieve that goal.” Subsequent paragraphs describe Castner Range—its history, its landscape, etc.—and closes by urging the President “to consider using the powers granted to your office under the Antiquities Act to designate Castner Range as a national monument.”

Fort Ord Precedent History.docx Dated June 21, 2022, this two-page five-paragraph single-footnoted op-ed piece points out—once again—the fact that the central California coast’s Fort Ord former Army base (since 2012 the Fort Ord National Monument) most definitely sets a precedent for turning Castner Range into a national monument as well. Especially important is this piece’s 25-line second paragraph, a series of quotes from the email that Richard Teschner received from Eric Morgan (then and still the Fort Ord monument’s manager) in response to Richard’s questions. Also extremely useful is the email’s second page’s Selective Bibliography, which lists nine items from the “Fort Ord Cleanup” series (such as, for example, the <http://fortordcleanup.com/reference/documents/interim/action/reports/> piece) along with “Frequently Asked Questions,” a link to contacts, and so forth.

2023

*Castner Range DC check-in ... January 3, 2023 8:30 a.m. (Print-out not e-archived.) An email to Richard Teschner from Frontera Land Alliance Executive Director Janae' Reneaud Field to the following effect: "Again, nothing new on the DC front when I just now searched the sites for 'Castner Range'. Screen shot below"—which shows no forward movement on "H.R. 2752—117th Congress (2021-2022) Castner Range National Monument act," sponsored by Congresswoman Veronica Escobar.

Will President Biden Designate a Castner Range National Monument revised version.docx (1/29/2023). A four-paragraph op-ed authored by Richard Teschner with co-authors Pastor Moses Borjas, Scott Cutler, Wendy Díaz, Janae' Reneaud Field, Rafael Gómez Jr., Kathia González and Rocío Ronquillo. Its first paragraph cites "President Biden's Sunday, January 8 visit to our city, here to witness the border first hand and discuss migration [which at the time had reached epic proportions]" and asks the following question: "But might there have been another reason for the visit—our decade-long campaign asking that the White House use the 1906 Antiquities Act" to make Castner Range a national monument? The op-ed touches on by-now customary justifications—the campaign's unanimous long-time support by El Paso City Councils, Mayors, the County Commissioners Court, the County Judge, El Paso's delegates to the Texas House and Senate, and above all the El Paso Community Foundation (1977), El Paso's U.S. Representatives, the Conservation Lands Foundation, the Green Latinos, Hispanic Access, the Nuestra Tierra Conservation Project and in particular the Frontera Land Alliance—and repeats the oft-cited fact that there is indeed a federal-level precedent (the central California coast's Fort Ord National Monument) for declaring MEC and UXO-strewn former Army land to be a national monument. The op-ed closes with a reminder to President Biden that just weeks before—on January 10th—he, Mexico's president and Canada's prime minister signed the "Declaration of North America" the final sentence of whose second section reads thus: "In partnership with Indigenous Peoples, we reiterate our pledge to protect biodiversity, to work toward ending deforestation, and doing our part to conserve 30 percent of the world's land and waters by 2030" and the contribution that a Castner Range National Monument would make to achieving that goal.

Castner Range National Monument Congresswoman Escobar Announces Designation March 21, 2023.msg At 8:16 a.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023 El Paso's Congresswoman's Legislative Director Zahraa Saheb sent out the following e-blast—"Congresswoman Escobar Announces Designation of Castner Range as a National Monument"—to the media in general and to the Castner Range National Monument Committee and the Frontera Land Alliance in particular. Here are the highlights of "Congresswoman Escobar Announces Designation of Castner Range as a National Monument": "I'm absolutely thrilled about the designation," said Congresswoman Veronica Escobar. "Today's historical announcement has been decades in the making. Generations of activists have dedicated countless hours and resources toward achieving this once seemingly impossible goal. It brings me such joy to know that El Pasoans will

soon be able to enjoy the beauty of this majestic, expansive landmark for years to come.” Noted was the fact that this announcement “comes after over 50 years of advocacy from the community. ... The Army ceased operations on Castner Range in 1966 and declared the land excess in 1971, at which [point] community support for conserving the range as open space began to build.—Congresswoman Escobar has been a fierce and tireless advocate for this designation. During her first term, she introduced the Castner Range National Monument Act, a bill to conserve and protect Castner. ... In addition to pursuing this designation through legislative means, Congresswoman Escobar invited several key Biden Administration officials [to] El Paso to expedite the protection of Castner Range. In March 2022, she hosted Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland for a tour of Castner Range. Most recently, she welcomed the Undersecretary of the Army and native El Pasoan Gabe Camarillo back home in August 2022 to continue discussions about the designation. This visit was a follow-up to a meeting in June 2022 coordinated by Congresswoman Escobar in which several El Paso stakeholders joined her for a meeting at the Pentagon with Undersecretary Camarillo and the White House Council on Environmental Quality. Additionally, [she] also wrote to President Biden twice over the past year, urging him to designate Castner through the Antiquities Act.” The Congresswoman’s media release makes a point of quoting Undersecretary Camarillo as follows: “Castner Range has been an indelible part of U.S. Army history, but now it’s time to write a new chapter about the future of this natural treasure. Moving forward, the U.S. Army stands ready to execute a complete clean up, manage remaining munitions and make Castner Range safe for public access.” See the immediately following item for lengthy quotes from the President’s proclamation.

Castner Range National Monument Biden’s Proclamation.msg 6/28/2023 Dated March 21, 2023—the day that President Biden proclaimed the establishment of the Castner Range National Monument—, this nine-page document contains many quote-worthy passages which are reproduced in part as follows: “In addition to containing evidence of Castner Range’s [henceforth ‘CR’] important historical role in our Nation’s national defense. CR hosts significant archeological sites documenting the history of the Tribal Nations that inhabited the area since time immemorial ... Once it is safe for public access following remediation of military munitions and munitions constituents, CR will become a natural classroom offering unique opportunities to experience, explore and learn from nature ... Access to nature is particularly important for underserved communities, like those bordering CR, that have historically had less access to our public lands. ... As a result of the cessation of military activities, much of this rugged landscape has since been reclaimed by nature. ... Initial investigations ... within CR have uncovered evidence of occupation between 900 B.C. and 1400 A.D., including rock art, fire pits, pottery, bedrock mortars, and lithic scatters. ... Although completely contained within the city limits of El Paso, CR is undeveloped due to its history of military use and, following the cessation of live fire exercises ... CR has reverted to a state that is representative of the natural Chihuahuan ecosystem of the region. Indian Springs, Cottonwood Springs, Mundy Springs, and Whispering Springs provide sources of water and rate habitat for wildlife in this harsh desert ecosystem. ...

CR also contains undeveloped geological resources. ... Over time, erosional events exposing the Red Bluff Granite followed by the deposition of the Bliss Sandstone have resulted in a geological feature known as an unconformity. The Castner Limestone formation of the mid-elevation foothills is the oldest rock in the El Paso area and contains abundant, well-preserved, and ancient Precambrian fossilized algae. Two specimens were closely examined in 1958 and were identified as *Oollenia frequens*. It is expected that future research will identify other specimens once access becomes possible. ...” —The Presidential Proclamation itself runs from unnumbered p. 5 to the end of the document and contains the following important quotes: “WHEREAS, I find that the boundaries of the monument reserved in this proclamation represent the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects of scientific or historical interest to be protected by the Antiquities Act; NOW, THEREFORE, I, JOSEPH R. BIDEN JR., President of the United States of America ... hereby proclaim ... the CR National Monument (monument) and, for the purpose of protecting those objects, reserve as part thereof all lands and interests in lands owned or controlled by the Federal Government within the boundaries described on the accompanying map ... All Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the monument are hereby appropriated and withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selection, sale, or other disposition under the public land laws or laws applicable to the Department of the Army, including withdrawal from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; from disposition under all laws relating to mineral, solar, and geothermal leasing; and from conveyance under section 2844 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2013.—The Secretary of the Army (Secretary) shall manage the monument pursuant to applicable legal authorities, including section 2846 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2018 ... The Secretary shall prepare, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, a management plan for the monument, which shall include access for outdoor recreational opportunities as well as historic and scientific research at a time and in a manner determined by the Secretary (considering ongoing and future remediation of hazardous substances or munitions, any needed controls to ensure explosives safety, and other limitations provided in law) ... The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations for management of the monument as the Secretary deems appropriate. The Secretary shall provide for maximum public involvement in the development of the management plan, including consultation with federally recognized Tribal Nations, State and local governments, and interested stakeholders. The final decision over any management plan and regulations rests with the Secretary.—The Secretary shall expeditiously conduct military munitions response actions at Castner Range in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA] of 1980, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9615 *et seq.*), and section 2846 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2018, and shall conduct response actions in a phased manner that allows for public access to areas of the monument when and under the conditions necessary to protect human health and safety. Nothing in this proclamation shall affect the responsibilities and authorities of the Department of Defense under applicable environmental laws within the monument boundaries. Nothing in this proclamation shall affect the Secretary’s ability to authorize access to and remediation of contaminated lands within the monument.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent

permitted by law and in consultation with Tribal Nations, ensure the protection of sacred sites and traditional cultural properties and sites in the monument and provide access to Tribal members for traditional cultural, spiritual and customary uses, consistent with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 42 U.S. C. 1996, and Executive Order 13007 of May 24, 1996 (Indian Sacred Sites). Such uses shall include allowing collection of medicines, berries and other vegetation, forest products, and firewood for personal non-commercial use in a manner consistent with the proper care and management of the objects identified herein, and in consideration of the presence of military munitions and munitions constituents.—In recognition of the importance of these lands and objects to Tribal Nations, and to ensure that management decisions affecting the monument reflect Tribal expertise and Indigenous Knowledge, the Secretary shall meaningfully engage with Tribal Nations with cultural ties to the area to develop the management plan and to inform subsequent management of the monument.—The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights, including valid water rights. Consistent with the proper care and management of the objects identified above, nothing in this proclamation shall be construed to preclude the renewal or assignment of, or interfere with the operation, maintenance, replacement, modification or upgrade of, existing water infrastructure, including flood control, pipeline, or other water management infrastructure; State highway corridors rights-of-way; or existing utility and telecommunications rights-of-way or facilities within or adjacent to the boundaries of existing authorizations within the monument.—Nothing in this proclamation shall preclude low-level overflights of military aircraft, flight testing or evaluation, the designation of new units of special use airspace, or the use or establishment of military flight training routes or transportation over the lands reserved by this proclamation.—Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of Texas with respect to fish and wildlife management. Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the rights or jurisdiction of any Tribal Nation.—Nothing in this proclamation shall be construed to alter the authority or responsibility of any party with respect to emergency response activities within the monument, including wildland fire response or search and rescue operations.—Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to revoke any existing withdrawal, reservation, or appropriation; however, the national monument shall be the dominant reservation.—Warning is hereby given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of the monument and not to locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof.—If any provision of this proclamation, including application to a particular parcel of land, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this proclamation and its application to other parcels of land shall not be affected thereby.—IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of March, in the year of our Lord two thousand twenty-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and forty-seventh.—JOSEPH R. BIDEN JR.

Castner Range National Monument April 2023 Stars and Stripes Page 13.docx Entitled
“Massive cleanup needed at firing range: Army to lead effort at Castner Range, which was
named a national Monument,” Rose L. Thayer, dated “April 2023,” this piece—appearing in

“Stars and Stripes” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stars_and_Stripes_\(newspaper\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stars_and_Stripes_(newspaper)) , which is described in Wikipedia as “a daily American military newspaper reporting on matters concerning the members of the United States Armed Forces and their communities ... It operates from inside the Department of Defense, but is editorially separate from it, and its First Amendment protection is safeguarded by the United States Congress to whom an independent ombudsman ... regularly reports ...”—sums up President Biden’s Proclamation—see the immediately-antecedent piece—and provides additional information of considerable value. Some quotes: “The Army will spend years leading a massive cleanup of unexploded ordnance at [the] former Fort Bliss firing range before the land can be opened to the public as a national monument, according to the White House and service leaders. ... President Joe Biden recently named Castner Range as a national monument, announcing the Army will remain the manager of the land and continue to lead the efforts to clear it of dangerous munitions, such as grenades, mortars, rockets and small-arms items. It could be nearly 15 years before the work is complete, the Army said. ... It is the first national monument under the military’s management since national battlefields were transferred to the National Park Service in the 1930s, according to the White House.—Rachel Jacobson, assistant secretary of the Army for installations, energy and environment, said the Army is ‘excited’ to lead the conservation effort of Castner Range. ‘The Army has a proud history of managing natural resources and recreational areas on installations,’ she said. ... [F] 40 years, the Army used Castner Range as a firing range before shutting it down in 1966 and leaving the land littered with unexploded ordnance. The Army said it has been conducting a cleanup of ordnance on the range since 1971. Only 1% of the 6,803 acres has been 100% investigated for ordnance, Guy Volb, a spokesman at Fort Bliss, said in August. Based on the cleanup of that small segment, base officials estimate there could be more than 4,800 additional munitions scattered across the range, he said. The Army has spent about \$7.2 million since 2007 through the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act [CERCLA] and Defense Environmental Restoration Program ... The money is allocated through the Army’s Environmental Restoration account. In 2018, the Army began a study on the cleanup process that should be completed in 2025, according to the service. The [A]rmy will then develop a plan and seek formal input from regulators and the public before initiating the cleanup. The Army anticipates cleanup work to occur between 2027 and 2037. Once deemed safe from explosives, community advocates envision a park with trails and space for hiking, mountain biking, recreational driving or camping and backpacking. Because the land has been inaccessible for so long, it’s unclear exactly what remains of sites where Native American tribes lived ... Three of those sites—the Fusselman Canyon Rock Art District, the Northgate Site, and the Castner Range Archaeological District—are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, according to the proclamation. Janaé Reneaud [F]ield, Executive Director of the Frontera Land Alliance ... said she was excited by Biden’s announcement. ‘We look forward to being involved with the planning, and the next phases for cleanup, to determining public access, as well as preservation of ecological, historic and cultural components,’ she said.

*Castner Range National Monument Coalition Day, Monday, May 8, 2023, 9:30 a.m.-12 noon, El Paso Museum of Archaeology. Seventeen well-known Castner advocates met inside the Museum for a two-and-a-half-hour “Castner” event. Starting off was a “Castner Campaign Review/Celebration” featuring Janaé Reneaud Field (Executive Director, the Frontera Land Alliance), who summed up the campaign’s highlights since the start of 2012. She was followed by Scott Cutler (once again the President of Frontera’s Board of Directors) and Richard Teschner (the present document’s author and editor). Each of the remaining fourteen attendees then highlighted his/her contributions to—and memories of—the Castner Campaign. “Lessons Learned”—a discussion of what worked and what didn’t work—constituted the celebration’s next chapter. Following was a synopsis of “The Immediate Future of Castner”; it featured finance-oriented proposals and responses by several attendees, in particular Eric Pearson, President and Executive Director of the El Paso Community Foundation (1977). Various plans regarding murals, museum exhibits, websites, sales of merchandise, etc., were brought forward, along with a presentation on “Army Engagement Strategy” by Norma Molina (Community Relations, Fort Bliss) and an information-filled synopsis by Sebastián Rivas-Normand, Director, the El Paso Museum of Archaeology.

*Castner Range National Monument Exhibit, Museum of Archaeology, November 18, 2023 to August 31, 2024. This four-page handout (numbered pages 1 and 2; unnumbered pages 3 and 4) was prepared by Sebastián Rivas-Normand, Director, the El Paso Museum of Archaeology, and made available in May of 2023 to Castner campaigners. It presents the museum’s plans for a far-ranging Castner exhibit (November 18, 2023 to August 31, 2024). The exhibit will consist of seven separate sections: (1) “Biodiversity” (to feature a “large built-in case to showcase fauna, flora and geology of Castner Range” along with a “small flat case with extra items relate to fauna and flora” along with “original reports and other documentation plus geology—fossils, minerals, rock samples, etc.—and information anent the natural water springs (Indian, Whispering, Mundy’s); (2) “Prehistory and Proto-history” (featuring a “large built-in case to showcase images, artifacts and other [items] related to archaeology in Castner Range” that will “cover the archaeology of the region and tie especially Archaic, Formative and Proto-Historic periods to the narrative with artifacts and images”); (3) “Historic and Military Periods” (“will work with the El Paso Museum of History and Fort Bliss to obtain historic and militaria [sic] artifacts that are period[-] accurate or have been found on Castner Range) showcasing ranching, San Andres (Lake Lucero) salt trail mining and prospecting, and especially Army use as a target training area”; (4) “The long road to a National Monument” exhibit will feature “a wall[-]mounted section of images, scanned documents to showcase the 52-year effort to create the National Monument since its inception until the actual proclamation [and will] feature main people involved [in] or critical to the movement; (5) “Castner Range and the community”: “This is basically a section displaying art ... from artists, schools, and other[.]s that showcase Castner Range in any of its facets; (6) The Timeline: “The interior wall in between the entryways to the gallery will feature a mixed media (vinyl and mounted) timeline of Castner Range’s History; and (7) Tittle wall (“Outside wall in between entryways to the gallery will be redone, eliminating

current mural and very old timeline”). Estimated cost of this: \$20,000, with \$8,000 going for the Exhibition and \$4,000 for Public Programs (honorariums, talks/lectures, invitations/opening, and food and beverages).

*A two-sided single-sheet invitation to a “Castner Range National Monument Public Planning Meeting, Friday, June 30, 2023, 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.” at the Wyndham El Paso Airport Hotel and Water Park was distributed to a wide variety of people, about a hundred of whom attended the event. Featured speakers included MG James P. Isenhower III, Commanding General, 1st Armored Division and Fort Bliss (“Welcome and Introductions), Ms. Army Borman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety and Occupation Health (ESOH) (“Senior Leader Remarks”), Mr. Matt Dayoc and Mr. Mike Bowlby, both U.S. Army Environmental Command (“Castner Range Cleanup timeline”), and Ms. April Gray, Interim Superintendent, Castner Range National Monument, Chief of Staff, G-9 (“Planning DRNM: What’s Next?”). Well-known information is offered up by both the one-sheet two-sided “agenda” document (distributed to participants in person) and the unnumbered seven-page DENIX FAQs piece (Castner Range Army June 20, 2023 Castner website.msg) on the following site: <https://www.denix.osd.mil/crnm/> Noteworthy excerpts: “President Biden’s selection of the U.S. Army as the manager of the site will better enable the service to execute its environmental cleanup responsibilities and leverage its strong, preexisting relationships with the El Paso community. It will also be the first national monument that the military has managed in over 90 years, showcasing the ability of the Army to steward our lands for both military use and the general public.” And this: “Cleanup is underway to address military munitions under the ... (CERCLA) process. The Army currently is conducting a Feasibility Study, to be completed in 2025. The Army will then seek formal input from regulators and the public before selection and implementation of the final remedy.—The Army will continue its cleanup of Castner Range in a manner that protects the objects of historic and scientific interest and supports limited public access in a manner consistent with the proclamation. Due to [the] complexity and magnitude of the cleanup, it will be years before the property will be safe for public access.” (DENIX FAQs document, unnumbered p. 4.) “Future Plans[:] The Army will continue to remove munitions on Castner Range, a process that will take many years to fully complete. As areas are made safe for public entry, the Army will analyze the public access opportunities.” And this: “For more information: Email: usarmy.pentagon.hqda-asa-iee.list.crn@army.mil (both items, DENIX FAQs document, unnumbered p. 6.)

Conservation Lands Foundation, two-page 2022 Annual Review (distributed May 2023) from Brian Sybert, Executive Director, CLF. This letter, sent to donors both actual and prospective, mentions President Biden’s designation of Castner Range as a national monument and is complemented by a six-page “Annual Review” that lists the CLF’s many accomplishments, including Castner Range, which it briefly mentions. It prompted donor Richard Teschner to contact the CLF with the request that in a proximately future communication it include his longer narration of the Castner Range National Monument campaign and its achievements. The request was quickly granted and a single-page four-paragraph piece was written. See this item:

https://www.conservationlands.org/Castner_range_of_el_paso_is_finally_a_national_monument

*Biodiversity of the Castner Range, a delicate balance. April 21, 2023. Authored by Rick LoBello, Education Curator at the El Paso Zoo (founded and owned by the City of El Paso) and long-time supporter of Castner Range conservation, this unnumbered 14-page study provides a very thorough list—pp. 3-14—of plants, lichens and mosses, invertebrates, reptiles (“[t]here are about 33 species of Reptiles confirmed to inhabit Franklin Mountains State Park [and therefore presumably Castner Range as well,” p. 4]), birds (“[t]here are at least 100 species of birds recorded by direct sight within the park boundaries,” pp. 6-11) and mammals (pp. 11-14).

*“What’s next for Castner Range National Monument. Posted by ELPASOZOO on MAY 19, 2023 ...” In Rick LoBello’s (q.v. immediately above) short month-later piece, he notes that the “Frontera Land Alliance has been communicating [ever since the March 21, 2023 national-monument declaration by President Biden] with the Army helping to get some answers to all kinds of questions” and quotes from Army documents to the effect that “[t]he range is currently undergoing investigation, risk assessment and feasibility for munitions removal. As a result, no determination can be made as to when publicly accessible trails will be available, where they will be located or what types of public activities will be permitted on the range.”