# U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS PERSPECTIVE: ADVANCED GEOPHYSICAL CLASSIFICATION (AGC)

Nick Stolte (presented by John Jackson)
Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise
U.S. Army Engineering and Support Center, Huntsville
27 March 2018

"The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation."





# **TOPICS**

- Why AGC?
- 24 April 2017 AGC guidance memo
- Policy Requirements
- Current AGC projects
- Contracting with USACE
- Example Project Cost Analysis
- USACE Military Munitions Geophysicist Group





## WHY AGC?



- Defensible environmental data
- More robust MRS characterization
- Cost savings in the remedial action
- Bounding and understanding uncertainty





### **FUDS IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR AGC**

- Developed by the Military
   Munitions Design Centers and
   EM CX
- Standardizes use of AGC for RI and RA
- Requires Accreditation and USACE expertise
- Requires the FS to include at least one remedial alternative with AGC
- Provides standardized PWS language for AGC to ensure consistency



REPLY TO

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS 441 G STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20314-1000

CEMP-CED (200-1a)

APR 2 4 2017

#### MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Advanced Geophysical Classification (AGC) Implementation at Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Projects

- PURPOSE: This guidance memo and enclosures provide instructions on how to Implement AGC technology in all phases of the munitions response process.
- 2. BACKGROUND: Munitions response activities involve detection and inspection of buried metallic objects (i.e., geophysical anomalies) that may be Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC). Traditional munitions response actions utilizing single loop sensors require a significant amount of digging to determine if they are MEC or other metallic debris. Often, less than 1% of the detected anomalies are actual MEC; thus, this method expends a huge amount of resources digging up items that turn out not to be hazardous. New geophysical sensors capable of detecting and classifying anomalies as MEC or other metallic debris are available for use in munitions response activities. This process, known as Advance Geophysical Classification (AGC), fits physics-based models to the observed sensor responses to determine physical characteristics such as geometry and wall thickness. The physical properties are compared to a library of known MEC items to classify them based on the closest match. The library forms the basis for determining if anomalies are potentially MEC or other metallic debris. Classification using advanced electromagnetic induction sensors has been shown to significantly reduce the cost of a munitions response.

On April 11, 2016, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Energy, Installations, and Environment (ASDEI&E) issued a policy memorandum Subject: Department of Defense Advanced Geophysical Classification Accreditation Program (DAGCAP). ASD (EL&E) established the DAGCAP to accredit organizations that use AGC at Munition Response Sites (MRSs). The DAGCAP provides a unified program for organizations performing AGC to demonstrate competency and document conformance to minimum quality systems requirements based on the International Organization for Standardization and the International Electrotechnical Commission standards.

 APPLICABILITY: This guidance is applicable to all USACE organizations engaged in FUDS MMRP projects.

#### 4. REFERENCES:

(a) Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Memorandum, Subject: Department of Defense Geophysical Classification Accreditation Program, April, 11, 2016.





# **AGC IS THE PREFERRED METHOD**

- Prior to beginning a munitions response project, the MMDC evaluates the site and develops preliminary design.
- Cost to completes (CTCs) and Independent Government Estimates (IGEs) assume AGC when it can be implemented.
  - > Hybrid model approach
- For most MRSs, use of AGC will provide the best value for the life of the project.





#### **CONTRACTORS MUST BE ACCREDITED**

#### 9 Accredited Firms:

- AcornSI and NAEVA Joint Venture, LLC (AN JV)
- Aptim Federal Services, LLC
- Arcadis U.S., Inc.
- Black Tusk Geophysics
- CH2M Hill, Inc.
- Parsons Corporation
- Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
- Weston Solutions, Inc.
- TPMC White River, LLC



http://www.denix.osd.mil/mmrp/advanced-geophysical-classification-accreditation-and-other-tools/





### PWS SHALL INCLUDE STANDARDIZED TEXT

- AGC-specific text was developed by the USACE geophysicists at the MM DCs and EM CX.
- Separate templates for investigations and remedial/removal actions.
- Text is included in each RFP for a MR project.
- Training is provided for PDTs in the AGC business process, to include proposal evaluation. (FUDS 208)





## PDT TO INCLUDE EXPERIENCED GEOPHYSICIST

- Each AGC project will include a geophysicist that is a SME in classification processes and procedures.
- Internal training plan is in place to grow AGC expertise.
- USACE geophysics group meets monthly to discuss issues and share ideas and lessons learned.





## **FS TO INCLUDE AGC-SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE**

- Remedial Action Objectives shall be clearly defined in the FS.
- Benefits of AGC in achieving the Remedial Action
   Objective are evaluated and compared to other MEC remedial alternatives.
- Accurate probability of detection rates must be stated and evaluated as part of the analysis.
- Acceptable end states are identified.
- If AGC is not considered effective, the reasons must be documented in the context of the detailed analysis of the alternative in the FS.





US Army Corps of Engineers.

# **CURRENT FUDS AGC PROJECTS (24)**

Project	Phase
Camp Breckinridge	RI
Camp Ellis	RA
Camp Sherman Artillery Range	RI
Fort Custer	RI
Lockbourne AFB	RI
Spring Valley	RA
Fort Jay	RI
FLBGR	RA
He'eia	Pilot Study
Ordnance Plan	RI
Waikaloa	RA
Pacific Jungle Combat Training Center	RI
Bostwick	RI
Camp Blanding	RA
Culebra	TCRA
Fort Pierce	RI/Treatability Study
Fort Pickens	Treatability Study
Fort Taylor	RI
Motlow Range	RA
Mt Owen	RI
Camp Beale	RI
Camp San Louis Obispo	FS
Camp Bowie	RI EM
Camp Fannin	RA PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF

## **CONTRACTING WITH USACE**

Majority of Contracts will be through one of 4 Military Munitions Design Centers:

Huntsville, Baltimore, Omaha, Range Support Center

"Best Value" is the preferred evaluation criteria

- Low cost doesn't always win
- Clear preference for AGC
  - AGC can cost more in the RI but...
  - > AGC can save millions in the RA





# 12 **EXAMPLE PROJECT: CAMP SAMPLE RANGE COMPLEX** 2,000-acre MRS No mention of AGC in the FS Alternative for Surface and Subsurface Clearance ultimately chosen, FS cost estimate ~ \$44,000,000 RA scoped prior to AGC policy and did not specify AGC Government Estimate was ~ \$75,000,000 Winning contractor included AGC in their proposal, which resulted in up to 45% cost savings

# **MILITARY MUNITIONS GEOPHYSICISTS GROUP (M2G2)**

#### **EM CX**

- Andy Schwartz
- John Jackson
- Mike Madcharo
- Nick Stolte

#### HNC

- Amy Walker
- Bob Selfridge
- Debra Edwards
- Erin Wallin
- Kelly Enriquez
- Richard Grabowski
- Richard Perry

#### **NAB**

- David King
- Thomas Colozza
- Douglas Rissing

#### SPK

- Cheryl Webster
- Kyle Lindsay
- Lew Hunter
- Teresa Rodgers

#### **SWF**

Eric Kirwan



