

| Question                                | Answer  |
|---|---|
| What are you looking for?               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC)</li> <li>• Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)</li> <li>• Discarded Military Munitions</li> <li>• Explosive Munitions Constituents (MC)</li> </ul>   |
| What was Swan Falls PBR No. 4 used for? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swan Falls PBR No. 4 first fell under the command of Gowen Army Airbase, Idaho. The Army Air Corps took control of the Boise Air Terminal on 17 December 1940. Construction of the base began on 21 January 1941. Gowen Army Air Base was to become a Second Air Force base for the training of heavy bombardment units. Troops began arriving to the base in May 1941. The base became operationally active in the summer of 1941 with the arrival of bomber aircraft (USACE, 2003).</li> <li>• By December 1942, Gowen Field engaged in the training of medium bombardment crews for combat and reconnaissance. Units' first training at the field included the 42<sup>nd</sup> Bombardment Group and the 16<sup>th</sup> Reconnaissance Squadron. First training in B-17 bombers, in 1943, B-24 bombers arrived for training. During this period, numerous other squadrons trained with practice bombs and flew from Gowen Army Air Base (USACE, 2003).</li> <li>• Swan Falls Precision bombing Range No. 4 was used in 1943 as a simulated building area with dummy oil dumps. Missions would have used practice bombs, such as the M38A2 practice bombs. Bombs were stored in the ordnance area at Gowen Field. Bombing altitudes were varied to give experience in high, medium and low altitude bombing (USACE, 2003).</li> <li>• Swan Falls PBR No. 4 was used at least until March of 1945. The land was available for surplus on 31 December 1945. The range was declared surplus to the needs of Gowen Field by letter dated 15 November 1946, placed in caretaker status during 1947 and relinquished to the Department of Interior on 13 October of that</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>year. A final retransfer to the Department of Interior transpired on 1 December 1947 (USACE, 2003).</p>   |
| <p>Why is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers involved?</p>              | <p>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for Department of Defense environmental programs on former lands. In the late 1980s the Formerly Used Defense Site program was initiated. The Corps has conducted several activities leading to the current project.</p>  |
| <p>What prompted the current Site Investigation?</p>                  | <p>In 2002 (National Defense Authorization Act), Congress required DoD to create an inventory of defense sites known or suspected of containing munitions or munitions constituents.</p> <p>DoD will prioritize the nationwide sites needing action and provide Congress with a response plan. All the Site Inspections need to be completed by the year 2010.</p> |
| <p>How many sites are you inspecting?</p>                             | <p>Nationwide, DoD has identified over 3,300 sites with the following breakdown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active installations (1,333)</li> <li>• Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) (318)</li> <li>• Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) (1,658)</li> </ul>   |
| <p>What is the goal of the Site Inspections?</p>                      | <p>To determine if munitions or munitions constituents are present.</p>  |
| <p>What are the possible outcomes after completion of the SI?</p>     | <p>Possible Outcomes of an SI are the elimination of a site from further action or identify the need for further investigation.</p>  |
| <p>What if there is a need for further investigation?</p>             | <p>If there is a need to investigate further work may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remedial Investigation (RI)</li> <li>• Feasibility Study (FS)</li> <li>• Determine need for a time-critical removal action</li> </ul>  |
| <p>How will the SI information be used if further work is needed?</p> | <p>SI provides information needed for EPA's Hazard Ranking System for National Priorities List (Superfund) sites. DoD will use the information for a new Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol.</p>  |
| <p>What all is</p>  | <p>The process begins with a review of available data,</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| involved in the Site Inspection process?                   | what we already know. Next a Technical Project Planning (TPP) is developed followed by a work plan, actual field work and finally a final report summarizing all activities.  |
| What is the Technical Project Plan?                        | The TPP is developed by meeting with stakeholders (regulators, property owners, local businesses, etc) and identifying their issues concerns. Identifying Areas of Concern (AOCs) at the former camp, reviewing site information, verifying current and future land use. The TPP will develop a Conceptual Site Model, Identify Data Gaps and Data Objectives. Finally all parties will concur on a field work approach.  |
| What types of munitions were used at Swan Falls PBR No. 4? | Based on historical document, physical evidence, and historical aerial photographs, munitions used at the Swan Falls PBR No.4 consist of 100-lb Practice bombs (M38A2) with associated Spotting charges (M1A1), 100-lb GP HE bomb (AN-M30) with associated tail fuzes (AN-M100 series), and Bomb nose fuzes (AN-M103A1), and small arms ammunition (up to .50 caliber).   |
| What other activities were there at Swan Falls PBR No. 4?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified at this time</li> </ul>  |
| What other work has been done on the Swan Falls PBR No. 4? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory Project Report (USACE, 2002). A Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) FUDS Draft Inventory Project Report (INPR) for the Swan Falls PBR No. 4 was completed in September 2002. The findings determined that the site had been formerly used by the DoD and was therefore eligible under the DERP program. A Risk Assessment Code (RAC) of 4 was assigned to the bombing range.</li> <li>• Archives Search Report (USACE, 2003). USACE completed an ASR in September 2003 to assess the presence or absence of contamination from facility activities. The ASR included a visit to the site on April 22, 2003. The primary purpose of the site visit was to assess the presence of MEC through non-intrusive means. Interviews, historical research, and site reconnaissance.</li> <li>• INPR Supplement (USACE, 2004). An INPR Supplement was completed in November 2004</li> </ul> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>identified the Swan Falls PBR No. 4 as a Range Complex No. 1 (1,405 acres) consisting of three sub-ranges: Bombing Range No. 1 (649 acres), Bombing Range No. 2 (649 acres), and Air-To-Ground Range (296 acres). The INPR Supplement assigned a RAC score of 4 to Range Complex No. 1, and confirmed of use of M38A2 practice bombs, M1A1 spotting charges, and .50-caliber munitions on the range. No additional new information is provided in the document.</p>                                 |
| <p>Have munitions been found in the area?</p>            | <p>No Munitions have been found, but suspected use of munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) on the former Swan Falls PBR No. 4 is based on the finding of craters. Suspected MEC consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100-lb Practice bombs (M38A2)</li> <li>• Spotting charges (M1A1),</li> <li>• 100-lb GP HE bomb (AN-M30)</li> <li>• Tail fuzes (AN-M100 series)</li> <li>• Bomb nose fuzes (AN-M103A1),</li> <li>• Small arms ammunition (up to .50 caliber).</li> </ul> |
| <p>What will the Corps be inspecting?</p>                | <p>The Corps' contractor will be taking samples of soil, surface water and sediment, and groundwater.</p>  |
| <p>Will the Site Inspection involve heavy equipment?</p> | <p>The SI will be non intrusive type of reconnaissance. The process will be visual and with the use of Magnetometers. The SI will be done by trained Unexploded Ordinance Experts. Their goal will be to avoid UXO, select samples and evaluate munitions.</p>   |
| <p>Where will they get their samples from?</p>           | <p>The will be getting samples from shallow soils, surface water/sediment and groundwater (existing wells).</p>  |