

RESTORATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES (FUDS)
PROJECT FACT SHEET
DECEMBER 1997

HNC REVISION: 3 APRIL 1998
TAG REVIEW DATE: 20 May 1998

1. **SITE NAME:** Baker Target

SITE NUMBER: I04FL089400

LOCATION:
City: Macclenny
County: Baker County
State: Florida

PROJECT NUMBER: I04FL089401

CATEGORY: OE

INPR RAC: 4

ASR RAC: 4

TAG RAC: 4

2. **POC'S:**

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT:
Name: Claude Leake
Office: CESAM-PM-SP
Phone: 334-690-2604

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION:
Name: Sharon Taylor
Office: CESAD-PM-M
Phone: 404-331-2495

HEADQUARTERS:
Name: Sara Goodwin
Office: CEMP-RF
Phone: 202-761-5223

ASR/INPR TEAM LEADER:
Name: Richard L. Pike
Office: CEHNC-OE-DC
Phone: 256-895-1559

ASR SUPPORT DISTRICT:
Name: Michael D. Patterson
Office: SIOAC-ESL
Phone: 815-273-8763

ASR TECHNICAL REVIEWER:
Name: Thomas M. Meekma
Office: SIOAC-ESL
Phone: 815-273-8739

3. **SITE DESCRIPTION:** The former Baker Target consisted of 640 acres located in Baker County, four miles southeast of Macclenny, Florida, and 25 miles west of Jacksonville in sections 11 through 14 of Township 3 south and Range 22 east. The latitude and longitude as stated in document F-1 of the ASR is 30° 14' 50" and

82° 03' 50", respectively: document F-2 differs in that it indicates that the latitude is 30° 14' 40". The site is accessed by going south three miles on highway 228 from Macclenny and then going east through a locked gate maintained by Georgia Pacific Lumber. The access road runs through the site from south to north and just to the west of the bull's-eye area. Hunter trails run throughout the bull's-eye area. The land is now owned by the Cummer Land Trust and leased by the Georgia Pacific Corporation. The acreage is used for timber production, pasture, and hunting.

Site terrain is very flat with a branch of the Yellow Water Creek traversing the western and central part. The site is predominately covered with scrub brush, pine trees, and Palmetto trees. The soil is sandy. The site is overgrown with a crop of trees planted in 1985. Climate is moderate with mild winters. The average winter temperature is 55° F and the average daily minimum is 43. In the summer season, the average temperature is 80° F and the average daily maximum is 91. Records for temperature extremes were 10° F and 105° F.

4. **SITE HISTORY:** The former 640 acre Baker Target was leased from Cummer Line and Manufacturing Company, lease number Noy(R) 33235, constructed in early 1943, and utilized as a dive and glide practice bomb target for Navy flight trainees flying planes from Cecil Field through 1951/1952. The site came under the cognizance of Cecil Field. Higher headquarters was the Naval Air Advanced training Command and Jacksonville Naval Air Station.

Documents indicate that the only bombs dropped on the site were Mk 5, Mk 19, Mk 23, and Mk 43 miniature practice bombs. The target consisted of three concentric circles made of limestone with radii of 100, 200, and 500 feet situated in the center of the square mile site. The center was located in section 12.

A document dated 1 June 1948 indicates that the site lease would be canceled upon the activation of Camp Blanding Targets 1 and 2. A document dated 20 February 1950 shows Baker Target to be active. A listing of real estate controlled by NAS Jacksonville for 1952 does not list Baker Target. It is assumed that termination of the lease occurred sometime in 1951/1952.

5. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

AREA A

Size, Acres:	40
Former Use:	Target Area
Present Use:	Lumber Production/hunting
Probable End Use:	Lumber Production/hunting

Ordnance Presence: **Potential**
Type: Practice bombs, 3 lb.(MK 5 and MK 23), 4.5 lb.(MK 43), 13 lb.(MK 19)- all with spotting signal MK 4

AREA B

Size, Acres: 600
Former Use: Buffer Zone
Present Use: Lumber Production/hunting
Probable End Use: Lumber Production/hunting
Ordnance Presence: **Potential**
Type: Practice bombs, 3 lb.(MK 5 and MK 23), 4.5 lb.(MK 43), 13 lb.(MK 19)- all with spotting signal MK 4

6. **CURRENT STATUS:** The draft Archives Search Report (ASR) for Baker Target was completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District, in December 1997.

7. **STRATEGY:** RAC 4;EE/CA

8. **ISSUES AND CONCERNS:** The Huntsville Center Technical Advisory Group (TAG) reviewed this ASR on 20 May 98 and based on historical documentation that the site was used as a practice bombing range for miniature practice bombs only, the TAG agreed with the ASR recommended strategy of RAC 4, EE/CA. However, the probability of finding OE at this site seems remote because: (1) HNC safety states that the land was plowed, trees were planted and harvested, and tree debris was burned. (2) HNC safety states that during planting and harvesting of trees twice, no OE had been reported found. (3) The site survey team did not see any evidence of OE at the site. (4) No live OE has been reported since site closure. (5) The only energetic material in the practice bombs dropped at the site is the Mk 4 spotting signal, which is equivalent to a ten gage shotgun shell. (6) Bombs used were designed for reuse and most were likely recovered during the active period of military use. (7) Expended practice bombs and remnants were found in the past, but none have been found recently. (8) In planting of trees, plows dug to a depth of 18 to 24 inches and it is believed that any ordnance present would have surfaced years ago.

HNC Safety Comments: Concurs that the ASR RAC of 4 is the proper score but does not necessarily agree that EE/CA would be the best strategy for this site. Recommends that the TAG take into consideration the particular circumstances regarding the site before developing the final strategy to be employed. The TAG decided on a strategy of RAC 4, EE/CA.

CWM: Evidence of CWM is not mentioned in the ASR.

Other Projects: None

Natural Resources: There is no evidence of Federally or State threatened species occurring within the site area (See ASR Findings, page 7, para 3f). An on-site inspection by appropriate State and Federal personnel may still be necessary to verify the presence, absence or location of listed species, or natural communities.

Historical Resources: No areas of the site were identified as having any historical or cultural significance, but the ASR also states that the site has not been surveyed. Any intrusive measures taken within the area will require oversight by the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) and/or other like organizations.

9. SCHEDULE SUMMARY: EE/CA

10. FUNDING/BUDGET SUMMARY: