| Question   | Answer   |
|--|--|
| What are you looking for?                                  | <ul> <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 Mountain Home AFR No. 3 used for?                 | The former Mountain Home AFR No. 3 initial consisted of 2,563.3 acres of land acquired by the War Department from the State of Idaho and Department of Interior for use as a precision bombing range in September 1943. The 6,000 ft diameter circular range was built and utilized by Mountain Home Army Airfield and was known as Precision Bombing Range No. 3. After creation of the U.S. Air Force in 1947, the range became known as Mountain Home AFR No. 3. The range was used until November 1953. The range was relinquished to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management on 30 November 1956 (USACE).  In December 1998, Mountain Home Air Force Base reacquired two parcels of the former Mountain Home AFR No. 3 (Section 21 (640 acres) and a one acre lot within Section 15), from the Bureau of Land Management for use as No-Drop 1 – Tactical Training Range. This reacquired land is not included as part of the FUDS property. Therefore, the initial property size of the former range listed in the MMRP Inventory is reduced from 2,563.3 acres to 1,919 acres (USACE, 2004). |
| Why is the U.S.<br>Army Corps of<br>Engineers<br>involved? | 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 the initiated. The Corps has conducted several activities actions leading to the current project.   |
| What prompted the current Site Investigation?              | 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.  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.  |

| How many sites are you inspecting?                             | Nationwide, DoD has identified over 3,300 sites with the following breakdown.  • Active installations (1,333)  • Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) (318) Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) (1,658)  |
|--|--|
| What is the goal of the Site Inspections?                      | To determine if munitions or munitions constituents are present.   |
| What are the possible outcomes after completion of the SI?     | Possible Outcomes of an SI are the elimination of a site from further action or identify the need for further investigation.   |
| What if there is a need for further investigation?             | If there is a need to investigate further work may include:  Remedial Investigation (RI) Feasibility Study (FS) Determine need for a time-critical removal action  |
| How will the SI information be used if further work is needed? | SI provides information needed for EPA's Hazard<br>Ranking System for National Priorities List<br>(Superfund) sites. DoD will use the information for a<br>new Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol.  |
| What all is involved in the Site Inspection process?           | The process begins with a review of available data, 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<br>Technical Project<br>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 Mountain Home AFR No. 3?  | 100 pound Practice Bombs (M38A2) with<br>Spotting charges (M1A1)   |
| What other   | None identified at this time   |

| activities were<br>there at Mountain<br>Home AFR No. 3?       |  |
|---|--|
| What other work has been done on the Mountain Home AFR No. 3? | <ul> <li>A letter from Headquarters 9th Air Base Group, dated 24 November 1953, refers to a 23 October 1946 inspection of the range for live or unexploded ordnance, which concluded with the statement that the range had not been used for any purpose which might result in its being contaminated by live bombs or other explosives since 23 October 1946 (9th Air Base Group, Headquarters 1953).</li> <li>Revised Inventory Project Report (USACE, 2003)</li> <li>Preliminary Assessment Report (USACE, 2005)</li> </ul> |
| Have munitions been found in the area?                        | Site inspections conducted on September 11, 1986 and August 24, 2004 did not find any physical evidence of practice bombs on the former Mountain Home AFR No. 3 (USACE 1988, 2004). There is no historical documentation or visual physical evidence of the use of general purpose (GP) high explosive (HE) bombs on the FUDS (USACE 2004b)  |
| What will the Corps be inspecting?                            | The Corps' contractor will be taking samples of soil, surface water and sediment, and groundwater.   |
| Will the Site<br>Inspection involve<br>heavy equipment?       | 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.  |
| Where will they get their samples from?                       | The will be getting samples from shallow soils, surface water/sediment and groundwater (existing wells).   |