



## BRAC 2005 - Query Response Manager



### Response to E0474

**Question:**

8. The Department provided Environmental Restoration cost data for each facility recommended for closure. During a review of the data provided we could not confirm that environmental restoration has been completed at Fort Monroe, Virginia. This facility indicates that zero dollars have been spent through FY2003 and no additional funding was needed to complete environmental restoration. In addition, the Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts indicates "UXO in the moat", which is included under Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP). Please verify the environmental restoration cost to complete data and provide cost to complete data for the MMRP.

10. The Department provided Environmental Restoration cost data for each facility recommended for closure. The Department also provides cost to complete data for some facilities indicating Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) was required. However, Fort Gillem, Fort Monmouth, Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant and Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant did not have MMRP cost to complete data shown. The Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts indicated both have ranges that may require closure. Please provide cost to complete data for the MMRP.

11. The Department provided Environmental Restoration cost data for each facility recommended for closure. The Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts for the Newport Chemical Depot indicated there are buried VX munitions and the cost are not programmed. The environmental cost to complete is shown as \$1.224M, is this the correct amount and does this include the cost to remediate the buried VX munitions?

**Answer:**

8. Both the FY03 Defense Environmental Restoration Program – Annual Report to Congress (DERPARC) and the BRAC Data Call, which contains FY03 data, show that no Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) funds were programmed to complete any additional environmental restoration activities, including MMRP activities. The FY02 DERPARC reports that through FY02, only \$1.38M had been spent on DERA-funded environmental restoration efforts at Fort Monroe. The Department did not report this figure in the Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts since this was older FY02 data and therefore could not be considered.

The statement "UXO in the moat" was included only to highlight the finding that the presence of UXO had been confirmed in the moat surrounding Fort Monroe and

additional UXO removal costs would likely have to be considered. At the time that both the FY03 DERP ARC was released and the BRAC Data Call was being completed, no comprehensive assessments had been performed on the UXO in the moat, so UXO removal and environmental restoration cost estimates were not available and therefore not reported.

10. The Department only provided MMRP cost estimates for closing installations when the data was available in the FY03 Defense Environmental Restoration Program – Annual Report to Congress (DERPARC). For the above-mentioned installations, the FY03 DERP ARC showed that no MMRP sites had been identified, therefore no MMRP cost estimates were provided.

The DOD MMRP addresses primarily closed ranges and other closed/abandoned areas that contain UXO, discarded munitions, and munition constituents, but it specifically does not address future restoration efforts at operational ranges. For additional information on the MMRP and the types of activities under the program's purview, see <http://www.dtic.mil/envirodod/CProgram/CPMilitaryMu.htm>. An active installation may have operational ranges but no MMRP sites or activities. During FY03, the MMRP program was still in its infancy and installation assessments/investigations to identify MMRP sites had not yet been completed at many installations. It is possible that MMRP sites have been identified since FY03 and cost data for these new sites may be found in the FY04 DERP ARC. However, this data was not considered in the SSEI since FY03 data was used as a baseline.

11. The \$1.224M environmental cost-to-complete reported for Newport Chemical Depot does not include the costs for addressing the buried VX munitions, since at the time the FY03 cost-to-complete estimates were being developed, this particular site had not yet been fully assessed so costs could not be provided. Information on this site was provided in the Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts to highlight the fact that additional UXO removal costs would likely have to be considered. More up-to-date cost to complete can be found in the FY04 DERP ARC, but this data was not considered since FY03 data was used as a baseline.

**References:**

**Approved By:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. M. [unclear]", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

**Date:** 26-Jul-05