

Munitions Response Projects From a State Technical Adviser's Perspective

Presented to:

**Military Munitions Support Services -
Case Studies and Lessons Learned**

August 29, 2013

Presented by: Jim Pastorick

President, UXO Pro, Inc.

Presenter's Perspective

Who am I?

- Worked in MEC field since 1989
- Former Navy diver and EOD officer
- Certified ASQ CMQ/OE
- Project Manager for:
 - UXB International (1989 - 1992)
 - IT Corporation (1992 – 1999)
- President of UXO Pro, Inc. (1999 – today)

UXO Pro

What does UXO Pro do?

- Technical consultants to state regulators
- Review plans and reports, develop technical comments
- Attend technical meetings
- Perform field observational visits

In general: We provide technical support to state environmental regulators in MEC project planning and execution

What Is Important to State Regulators?

State regulators are concerned that:

- Remedial investigations achieve adequate site characterization to support decision making
- Removal actions are performed adequately to achieve the removal action objectives and safe intended reuse of the site
- The key to achieving these goals is the work plan

MR Work Plan

- The MR work plan represents the state's main point of technical input to the project
- As a member of the MR Project Team the regulator reviews, comments and, hopefully, concurs
- Once finalized it is expected that the work plan will be implemented



What Goes Wrong on Some Projects?

- Work and QC plan requirements are not implemented
- No documentation of three-phase inspection process
- No on-site access to the project database
- Incorrect geophysical instruments are used



What Goes Wrong (Cont.)?

- Surface removal completed and passed QC with the area littered with MD and vehicle parts (Jeep gas tank, seat, battery)
- 6-in. analog removal completed with numerous uninvestigated anomalies



What Goes Wrong (Cont.)?

- Required data is not recorded
- QC failures noted but not reported and no follow-up or corrective action documented
- Required forms and checklists not being used



What Goes Wrong (Cont.)?

- Required blind seeding not performed
- Personnel unable to use required equipment
- Site managers are not familiar with the work plan requirements



The Importance of Confidence

Site visits either build or degrade confidence in project quality

- Two organizations control project quality
 - The contractor
 - The USACE



Contractor Confidence Builders

- Develop an implementable work plan
- Understand and implement the work plan
- Identify requirements and document their performance



Contractor Confidence Builders (Cont.)

- Identify deficiencies, document and correct them
- Identify needed changes to the work plan and document them with required approvals



USACE Confidence Builders

- Regulators can rarely spend a great amount of time on-site
- They depend on two substitutes for on-site presence
 - Contractor documentation
 - USACE on-site representative (OESS)



USACE Confidence Builders (Cont.)

- Chapter 13 of EM 1110-1-4009 requires a QASP, project team involvement and includes a QASP checklist
- On-site OESS observing work and contractor compliance with contract requirements is critical to building confidence that minimum requirements are met



Thank You

UXOPro

Jim Pastorick

811 Duke St.

Alexandria VA 22314

(703) 548-5300

jim@uxopro.com

www.uxopro.com