



THE MEMPHIS DEPOT TENNESSEE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 198

PRC Environment
1593 Spring Hill Road
Suite 300
Vienna, VA 22182
703-287-8880
Fax 703-287-8910

C.G.

198 1

198

PRC

December 16, 1996

Mr. Michael Dobbs
Defense Depot Memphis, Tennessee [DE]
2163 Airways Boulevard
Memphis, TN 38114

Dear Mr. Dobbs:

Please find enclosed, the portion of the transcript of the September 1996 meeting of the Defense Environmental Response Task Force (DERTF) that you requested. If you require any additional information please call me at (703) 287-8897.

Sincerely,

Andrea B. Thies

Andrea B. Thies

cc: DERTF File

Enclosure

198 2

1 by Colonel Mike Kennedy, the Installation Commander, and a
2 presentation by the depot's BRAC Cleanup Team and Memphis
3 Redevelopment Agency. This will be followed by a visit to
4 the depot, dinner at the community center and attendance at
5 the installation's Restoration Advisory Board meeting.

6 We will be leaving -- or the buses for the depot will
7 be leaving the hotel at 3:10 p.m. sharp. The installation
8 tour is intended for the DERTF members and other meeting
9 participants. Members of the public are welcome to attend
10 as long as seats are available on the bus. Our schedule is
11 tight, so we do need to leave by 3:10.

12 After the tour of the depot, we will be eating dinner
13 at the depot's community center prior to the RAB meeting.
14 The cost for the dinner is \$11 per person and will be
15 collected by the community center staff, who will appreciate
16 having exact change. Both buses will return to the hotel
17 after the meeting.

18 That concludes the administrative remarks.

19 MS. RIVERS: Thank you, Shah. I'd like to
20 invite Colonel Mike Kennedy, then, to come up and begin the
21 presentation.

22 Welcome.

23 → *START*

COL. KENNEDY: Thank you. Good afternoon.
24 Ms. Rivers and members of the DERTF board, on behalf of our
25 employees at Defense Depot Memphis, Tennessee, I welcome you
26 to Memphis.

1 I want to thank you for the opportunity to give you
2 this short briefing of the overview of the depot -- and,
3 then, I will turn it over to Chris Kartman, our
4 environmental officer, and, then, Ms. Buchanan will be
5 speaking for the MDRA. As Shah has mentioned, we will also
6 be doing a tour of the depot. We will be stopping in one of
7 our buildings, No. 835, that houses our hazardous material,
8 then we'll be eating dinner and then attending the
9 Restoration Advisory Board at 1800.

10 My name is Mike Kennedy and I'm a Marine, working for
11 DOA in the properties owned by the Army. So, we're
12 definitely joint here. Our mission at the depot is one
13 that's been ongoing since 1942. It has been to receive,
14 store and ship materials to our customers, which is the
15 military of the United States of America. Recently, we've
16 been getting a second commission and that's to close the
17 installation on 30 September, 1997.

18 Our goal -- goals -- are two -- and that -- the first
19 one has been one that's been with the Army and, then, DOA
20 over the last 50 years -- and that's to provide the supplies
21 and materials to our service people -- those supplies, on
22 time, every time, and the right item. Our second goal is a
23 goal that's only been in existence for a year, and that is
24 to transition our workforce after the depot closes.

25 A short history of the depot. We opened in January,
26 1942 -- again, it was an Army depot. We've had a series of

198 4

1 name changes over the years. It first started out as the
2 Memphis General Depot, Memphis Quartermaster Depot and,
3 then, in the '64 time period we were taken over by DOA and
4 our name changed to the Defense Distribution Memphis Depot
5 in '91.

6 Over the years, we have been known as the GI's depot.
7 We have stored material that the service member wears, eats,
8 consumes and uses. We have not been an armament or a war
9 fighting depot as other depots have been. In September of
10 '95, we were officially approved to be on the BRAC list and
11 our scheduled date, as I mentioned before, is 30 September,
12 1997.

13 The reason for closure is one of simple -- simply the
14 DOA being -- having more capacity in the system with the
15 draw-down of the military services with the end of Cold War.
16 As our armed services have come down, the need to stock
17 material has decreased -- and, so, thus, the reason we were
18 chose for closure.

19 Behind you in -- and in your folders -- are a map of
20 our installation -- an aerial shot of a couple years old --
21 and just to orientate you -- when you look at that picture
22 -- it is east to west -- and north is to your right -- and
23 it's framed by Airways Boulevard in front of the depot, Dunn
24 Field to the right, Dunn Avenue to the right, Perry Road to
25 the west -- and on the southern border framed by Ball Road;
26 642 acres, about five miles from Mississippi, about a mile

1 from the airport, about a half mile from the freeway;
2 approximately 110 buildings, about 26 miles of rail, about
3 500 -- or 5.5 million covered storage area and about 6
4 million square feet of uncovered storage area.

5 Denise, if you could just put the picture back up --
6 just for a minute. I just want to point out where Dunn
7 Field, that you'll be seeing today, also. It's in the
8 northwest corner. It would actually make the shape of an
9 "L" just off the main installation -- and that's about 72
10 separate acres -- and we'll see that this afternoon.

11 Okay, Denise. I want to give you a schematic of the
12 depot, really, from a facility standpoint and what we stored
13 in the past. This afternoon, we're going to come in from
14 Airways and as we come in the front gate of the depot,
15 we're going to turn left and go counterclockwise around the
16 depot stopping in Building 835, which is our hazardous
17 material storage area -- and then go out through the --
18 which would be the top portion of your picture -- right near
19 the vessel storage, cross over to Dunn Field and then back
20 onto the depot.

21 Now, the depot is really broken into three major areas.
22 You'll see an area to your top that has 20 rectangular
23 buildings. Those are what we call our 20 typicals, built in
24 the
25 World War II time frame -- about 110,000 square feet a
26 piece. To your lower center is our six building -- six

198 6

1 typicals -- built in Korea that are interconnected. It's
2 where we have our benomyl material and also our
3 transportation area. To your left of that schematic is our
4 open shed open area and open storage lot and those sheds are
5 about 240,000 square feet apiece.

6 Now, what have we done for the last 50 years, as far as
7 a supply and distribution depot? I have a couple of
8 examples of the type of materials that you'll see in our
9 warehouses if we stop today -- and as I mentioned before,
10 we'll be stopping in Building 835 to see where we store our
11 hazardous material. I'd just like to show those types of
12 material to you, but first -- and very quite simply -- what
13 the general is wearing and what I'm wearing is what we do at
14 Memphis. We have textiles. We have subsistence -- food
15 material. We have repair parts, general commodity items
16 that the military services need.

17 Now, I just have a couple of examples that I would like
18 to show you. Besides what I wear and the general wears, we
19 have lots of uniforms -- both the material that makes the
20 uniforms and the individual items, themselves. We have nuts,
21 bolts and screws. This is one of our smaller nuts -- bolts.
22 We have the stockage of metals and ribbons that the military
23 services use. We have food, tomato juice in large
24 quantities -- and we have garlic. We stock the utensils to
25 eat that food. We have devices and badges so people in the
26 military -- Army and

198 7

1 Air Force -- can tell the differences between a general and
2 a sergeant major and an airman.

3 We have material that comes already prepackaged from
4 the manufacturer. This is an O-ring and it comes -- it's a
5 rubber product -- and it's an O-ring. We have medical
6 items, fillings for your teeth, medical supplies, litters,
7 surgical covers. We have fuel filters for vehicles and
8 trucks -- and, yes, we have some material that's hazardous.
9 This is aircraft grease. It goes in a grease gun. We shoot
10 it in the airplanes -- in the struts and other things so
11 they don't squeak and make noise. Those are the type of
12 things that we could bring down here in a small box to show
13 you what we have done from a storage standpoint in
14 supporting our military since 1942.

15 In summary, we will close the depot September 30th,
16 1997. We are very optimistic and we have a great
17 Redevelopment Authority run by Ms. Buchanan that I'm sure
18 will have that 642 acres rise like a phoenix in the future.
19 There will be a caretakership here -- a caretaker force --
20 by our headquarters in Colonial Park (phonetic),
21 Pennsylvania -- and by DOA -- and that will continue through
22 restoration -- and, as you-all know, DoD is committed to
23 clean up the facility.

24 With that, I'd like to turn it over to Chris Kartman,
25 my environmental officer. Thank you.

26 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

1 MS. KARTMAN: Thank you, Colonel. It's a
2 pleasure to be here -- like the opportunity. First of all,
3 I'd like to introduce the rest of the BRAC Cleanup Team.
4 Over to my right is Dann Spariosu from
5 Region 4 EPA and Jordan English from the Tennessee Division
6 of Environment and Conservation. I couldn't do my job
7 without them -- that's how well the BRAC Cleanup Team
8 concept works and that's how well we work together.

9 First, I'd like to talk about the philosophy of the
10 BRAC Cleanup Team and the project team that goes with it.
11 First, we tried to put everybody in one puddle. Everybody
12 had an opinion. Everybody wanted to do it their way. We
13 had about 20 people involved and we thought, "Oh, we'll just
14 do this by consensus." Well, there was no way with 20
15 people. So, Dann and Jordan and I talked about it and we
16 said, "Well, we will make the decisions, just the three us.
17 We're authorized to do it. Let's just do it, but let's get
18 everybody's input," and that's how we operate now. But we
19 operate with our project managers from the
20 Corps of Engineers as the project team. So, our whole group
21 is about six people and it works very, very well. We have a
22 very high trust and very high respect for one another.

23 The cleanup priorities: Very important to us, very
24 important to the installation, probably very important to
25 you-all. Number one is public health and the environment --
26 that's number one priority. It rises above everything else.

198 9

1 Number two priority is the reuses. Whatever Ms. Buchanan
2 and the MDRA say are their priorities, we go with their
3 order -- but they're number two. The next bullet is early
4 removal -- and it's actually early removal cleanup approach
5 -- it's all one bullet -- and what I'd like to say about
6 that is, it's a way that the team has devised to expedite
7 getting things into the cleanup role -- into design, into
8 cleanup actions -- as opposed to studying it to death. So,
9 it minimizes the need for RODs and it's more into a
10 two-phase approach, investigate and clean it up as you're
11 there -- as opposed to investigate everything, then start
12 cleaning up, individually -- and what's not on this slide,
13 but I need to talk about because it seems to be a very hot
14 topic -- is the relationship that we have -- our openness
15 with the public -- and from what I've seen so far, that is
16 not what's been portrayed. We have a very open
17 relationship. We tell everything; we have presentations at
18 our Restoration Advisory Board meetings. We've had those
19 meetings every month. They are open to the public. We have
20 presentations. We have question and answers. It's open for
21 everybody there to ask questions. We also have four
22 information repositories, two at public libraries that are
23 the closest ones to the depot. We have one at the Shelby
24 County -- the Memphis/Shelby County Health Department and we
25 have one at the local environmental activists' office, which
26 is called Mid-South Peace & Justice Center. We also have

198 10

1 all of those books and documents at our facility -- and
2 numerous offerings have been made for folks to come in and
3 review documents, copy documents at -- you know, they copy
4 -- but they use our copy machine and our paper -- and also
5 the BRAC Cleanup Team members -- all three of us -- have
6 offered to give presentations at any of the neighborhood
7 groups, but we just need some notice so that we can be
8 prepared to go give the presentation. That has been offered
9 many, many times.

10 Also, in the last two years, we've had at least six
11 public meetings. Some are town hall meetings with the City
12 Council folks. We're out there a lot. We also have a
13 quarterly newsletter that we do. We have mailings that goes
14 out to over 700 people. We put advertisements in the paper
15 -- not in the legal section -- advertisements for the
16 Restoration Advisory Board meetings -- not just in the
17 Commercial Appeal local newspaper, but also some of the
18 smaller newspapers like the Tri-State Defender and the
19 Silver Star. So, I feel like we've done an adequate job.
20 I'm sure we can always do more and I think that we should do
21 more if there are good ideas. We offered to put a
22 repository in a church or the schools and we talked to the
23 folks, we called them and they didn't want it. Now, we have
24 asked other folks that have said, "Put it in a church." We
25 said, "Fine. Tell us where and who wants it and we'll put
26 it there." We've gotten no response. So, we're very, very

198 11

1 open to it, but somebody has got to give us a place -- and
2 it does have to be a place that can be public where people
3 can have access to the documents. Anyway, I just wanted to
4 share that with everyone.

5 Briefly, this afternoon, I just want to go over the
6 environmental cleanup -- the history, the current issues and
7 our future concerns. The environmental history -- You can
8 go ahead and flip, Denise. The environmental history is
9 quite lengthy. The first study was done in 1981, where what
10 used to be called as the Army Environmental Hygiene Agency
11 did a study to identify if there were environmental problems
12 and they did identify some. They didn't identify to any
13 extent, but they let us know that there was a problem. So,
14 in 1988, there was a remedial investigation feasibility
15 study initiated and completed in 1990. That involved 22
16 monitoring wells and 50 soil borings at different depths to
17 discover what was the extent. It did not tell the complete
18 extent as an RI/FS is supposed to, so a follow-along work
19 plan started in '91 to continue the study, because they
20 didn't have enough information. They didn't know the
21 delineation of the plume, for instance. They knew there was
22 a plume. They had no idea where it was going and how big it
23 was. So, they had to do more work.

24 In 1992, we were placed on the NPL and -- mostly
25 because our HRS scoring was very high because of the
26 potential to contaminate the public drinking water supply.

198 12

1 It's a two-aquifer system and I'm going to show you a slide
2 of that a little bit later on. But the contamination that
3 we have in the groundwater is in the upper aquifer and
4 there's a clay layer that separates the two -- serves as a
5 barrier, but potentially is there, and all of Memphis, you
6 know, gets its water from that lower aquifer.

7 In 1994, we established a TRC -- and also that same
8 year, it was converted to a RAB -- and Jordan English is
9 going to speak about the history of the RAB in his
10 presentation. So, I'm not going to get into that now.

11 In 1995, we signed the Federal Facilities Agreement
12 with EPA and TDEC -- and, basically, CERCLA rules is what's
13 in the Federal Facilities Agreement. It says we do have a
14 RCRA Part B permit on one building and it will have to be
15 closed out under those provisions, but everything else is
16 ruled under CERCLA.

17 In 1996, we did delineate the groundwater plume coming
18 from Dunn Field. Dunn Field has been mentioned, because
19 that's where all the burials took place. They're all
20 covered. It's not an open dump. It's covered and it's been
21 covered for years. Also, in '96, the ROD was signed for and
22 interim action for that groundwater -- and, basically, it's
23 to create a barrier so that that groundwater plume cannot
24 travel any further west towards the Allen Well Field, which
25 is the drinking water well. We started remedial designs
26 this year, not only on the groundwater issue, but also lead

1 paint and soil issues around the housing areas that we have
2 -- and we'll drive by there this afternoon.

3 '97 -- Early '97, we expect to have a contract awarded
4 for the groundwater, actually doing the pump-and-treat and
5 have the construction start on that -- and the lead paint
6 issue will probably -- the contract will be let this year,
7 but construction may not begin until January. Overall
8 restoration should be complete by 2005.

9 Current issues that we have: The environmental
10 baseline survey is to be complete by the 30th of September
11 -- so, another week or so and it should be completed. Also,
12 because of the EBS and the sampling and analysis report
13 recommendations that came out from the EBS, all interior and
14 exterior sampling -- what I mean by that is soil samples
15 outside -- interior wipe samples will be done to look for
16 past contamination -- and the sampling effort should be
17 completed by the end of the calendar year and the report
18 should be done by March of '97. But, as soon as we get
19 results back, we're going to put them in new categories and
20 expedite -- if we need to do a cleanup, then we'll go
21 straight to design and get that started.

22 The draft BRAC cleanup plan will be done
23 1 October -- and we'll leave the finals to be done by the
24 end of November -- and, then, the -- we already talked about
25 the contracts -- getting those awarded. Next -- and you
26 don't have two of these slides in your presentation -- but,

198 14

1 after the discussions yesterday, I felt like we should
2 explain more -- at least have a little bit more pictures
3 available, because I think it's worth more than words. This
4 is a picture of the upper aquifer -- it's an actual water
5 table showing the movement of the water. So, the general
6 regional flow is to west, which is going to be the left.
7 North is to the top of the screen. There is a huge trough
8 over on the left-hand side that you can see. It's basically
9 like an underground waterfall. It just dives right off of
10 there. Dunn Field is up on the northern part of the picture
11 and that's where all the burials were. So, you can see
12 where the flow and contamination can move. Also, in the
13 southwest corner -- lower left -- until this study that we
14 did this year about all of the results back on the
15 monitoring wells, we thought that water was coming onto the
16 site down there. It's going off site -- and we do have a
17 lower level, but it's still contamination of TCE in that
18 corner -- and, now, we know it's leaving the site. We just
19 don't have it delineated, yet -- so that's our next thing
20 to work on -- just figure out how far has it gone.

21 I brought this map -- There are other plume maps, but
22 this is the largest plume that we have -- and the other
23 plumes fit inside of these plumes. So, this one really
24 shows the overall picture. This is TCE in the upper aquifer
25 coming off of Dunn Field -- and the burials in Dunn Field
26 were in the northwest side -- quadrant, if you will -- of

198 15

1 that piece of property -- and there are over 20 burial
2 sites, trenches, pits -- and what's buried there -- medical
3 items, hazardous materials that were expired shelf life --
4 an airplane from 1985 that crashed into our building is
5 buried over there, construction debris -- you name it, it's
6 over there. So, that's why we have the problems that we
7 have.

8 Just a cross-section. This runs north/south, parallels
9 Dunn Field. This runs through Dunn Field -- so that you can
10 get an idea. The upper aquifer is the goldish-colored one.
11 You can see where the water table is in that and you can see
12 where the plume is at -- and that's the waterfall I spoke of
13 where it falls off. The clay layer -- the barrier between
14 the two aquifers -- it's very thick. It's like 100-feet
15 thick over towards the north, but, to the south, it gets
16 very thin. It's 15-feet thick at its thinnest state.

17 Now, previous studies indicated there were windows,
18 openings, leakages -- and to date, the new study that we
19 based on the new well information said, no, there is no
20 opening -- at least not on our property or off the property
21 where we put wells. So, to date, this is the best
22 information we have. It doesn't mean that it's, you know,
23 in concrete. It means this is the best information that we
24 have to date. But you can see why the potential is there --
25 and the Memphis Sand Aquifer is the public drinking water
26 aquifer -- that is the supply aquifer -- and we're are all

1 very protective of it, because we live here and we drink
2 that water, also.

3 Future concerns: Chemical warfare materials. In 1946,
4 there was a train headed for Pine Bluff, Arkansas. It had
5 left a port in Mobile. It had mustard gas bombs on it that
6 they had retrieved from overseas from the Germans and the
7 bombs were leaking. So, they had to stop somewhere -- at
8 the closest DoD facility between here and there -- well, we
9 just happened to be the lucky ones. So, they pulled in our
10 back gate at Dunn Field and they off-loaded these leaking
11 bombs. They took the bomb bursters off. They exploded
12 those. They shot holes in them to drain them. They drained
13 it into a pit. It was a slurry with bleach. It was just --
14 That's what they did with it back in 1946. Then, they took
15 the casings -- they lit the pin on fire and then they took
16 the casings and they buried them in Dunn Field -- so that is
17 a real serious issue for us.

18 Also, we stocked chemical agent I.D. kits that soldiers
19 would take out to the field to check if planes had dropped
20 gases -- nerve gases or whatever -- on them. So, we stored
21 the vials in cylinders that we would ship out to different
22 bases for their needs -- and nine kits -- nine of these
23 cylinders, I should say -- about this large -- were buried
24 over in Dunn Field. We do have fairly good records on a map
25 showing what trench they were buried in. So, we have a very
26 good idea of where they are, but it brings up a couple of

198 17

1 different issues. We were told that we could not transport
2 it -- we couldn't dig it up and transport it to
3 Pine Bluff, because Pine Bluff didn't want anybody else's
4 goods -- because they had enough problems of their own,
5 frankly, to tell us. So, what we've been told from these
6 ASTDR folks -- now, they've got a new name -- but,
7 basically, the folks out in Aberdeene Proving-Ground -- is
8 that we had to wait for the mobile technology units to show
9 up at Memphis. So, we thought that was our only alternative
10 and -- They have two different units that do -- one does the
11 I.D. kits and one does the bombs -- and they would not be
12 ready to be to Memphis until 2001. Well, that didn't make
13 anybody happy -- not the community, not the reuse folks --
14 who are trying to get business in -- and we're going to be
15 setting out, you know, a chemical warfare material
16 restoration effort -- and, also, we have neighbors right
17 across the street from Dunn Field. None of it was good.
18 None of it. So, we've been doing some homework the last few
19 days actually to find out: Can we please get past this
20 thing with Pine Bluff? Can they please take this? It's not
21 like we were a major -- We're not an arsenal. We never
22 were. I mean, we have a few things here because of
23 circumstances -- and can they please help us -- and the
24 latest is that, yes, they will help. So, our intent is to
25 dig it up and transport it off site so that the whole
26 operation will go much quicker. So, that speeds up -- that

198 18

1 moves up our investigation to next year -- and, then, in
2 '98, we'll dig it and transport it and it will be gone. So,
3 that's actually a plus that we didn't know before this. But
4 it's a big concern because the technologies are just not
5 ready.

6 Other issue: Restoration funding. We've always
7 received the money that we've needed. So, I'm really -- I'm
8 not up here saying, you know, please, but -- it's just that
9 now we're going from a 20-year program to an
10 eight-to-ten-year program. So, it compresses that time
11 frame in half. So, that just means we're going to need that
12 money this much sooner. So, it's just a concern that we
13 have. We know there's a lot of competing BRAC dollars and we
14 know it's expensive cleaning up sites.

15 RAB funding is a concern for us, because they had put
16 a cap on the RABs -- and our RAB was not in favor of this.
17 Our RAB appreciates the information. It's really one of the
18 few ways that they can get all the details of information
19 and there is no other way. Public meetings -- you can give
20 general discussions, but the hands-on nitty-gritty part
21 comes from being on the RAB and being present at the RAB
22 meetings. That's where you can ask every question you ever
23 wanted to know. So, we're just saying, please, if there's
24 anything you can do there, we would appreciate it.

25 In summary, the BRAC Cleanup Team concept works and it
26 works very, very well. I don't think we could do it without

198 19

1 each other. It's just -- It's a good partnership. The
2 cleanup is going to take about to eight to ten years.
3 Scratch the need for support. I think we're covered on the
4 chemical warfare -- and send money, but -- just keep sending
5 money. We really appreciate it.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. SPARIOSU: My name is
8 Dann Spariosu. I'm an environmental scientist from EPA
9 Region 4, based in Atlanta -- and I'm the remedial project
10 manager for the cleanup here at the Defense Depot in Memphis
11 -- and if I say some of the -- if I repeat some of the same
12 things that Chris said, it's because I think they're
13 important from the EPA perspective, as well -- and I do want
14 to talk about how, in my view, that the BRAC cleanup works
15 together to accomplish our goals here.

16 We've done a lot of work with forming partnerships and
17 cleanup teams with Department of Defense and Department of
18 Energy Facilities in our region and we found out that, as
19 you come together with your DoD counterparts -- or whatever
20 -- and state regulators, one of the things that you need to
21 do are establish your common goals for your project and
22 bring in your resources as a member of the team to help the
23 team accomplish these common goals -- and one of the things
24 that we started early on -- as Chris said, we identified the
25 BRAC Cleanup Team as the primary decision-making body at
26 DDMT -- and we organized other DOA region -- our various

198 20

1 contractors, the Army Corps of Engineers -- would serve to
2 support the decisions made to that team and contribute
3 information towards the decisions -- and this has worked
4 quite well.

5 From the beginning, our team has operated with the
6 philosophy that because the depot is an NPL site and subject
7 to CERCLA cleanup standards, being on the BRAC list and
8 being subject to Fast-Track Cleanup does not change any of
9 the CERCLA requirements. We have not backed off from any of
10 our goals to protect human health and the environment and to
11 have a complete Superfund cleanup at the site. That being
12 said, you have recognized that the depot is scheduled to
13 close on September 30th of next year. That makes the
14 Fast-Track Cleanup process -- if we're going to get as much
15 cleanup as we can done by that date, that makes it very fast
16 indeed.

17 So, how do we work at the depot? How does our cleanup
18 team work to help accelerate this process? One of the
19 things we do is partnering. We emphasize our common goals
20 and we work towards trusting each other that -- we -- we all
21 have those common goals -- and that goes a long way towards
22 being able to work with each other -- and that is a new way
23 for EPA and DoD to work together.

24 The other thing that's important on the BRAC Cleanup
25 Team is empowerment. The three members that come to the
26 table to make decisions have to have the power to make

1 decisions right there at the table at that moment. I've
2 been on teams where one member kept having to go back to
3 consult with his management or with his engineers or his
4 toxicologist, and it just doesn't work very well. You can't
5 get the work done in a very fast way. To this end,
6 Colonel Kennedy has to be commended for allowing Ms. Kartman
7 to have the decision-making power for all the environmental
8 issues at the depot. My management and Region 4 has
9 empowered the RPMs who work on BRAC to make a lot of the
10 decisions, as long as we keep them informed -- and the
11 Tennessee Department of Environmental Conservation has -- on
12 its BRAC sites -- has brought managers to the table who have
13 decision-making authority. So, it's worked well from that
14 standpoint. There are very few issues that I've had to go
15 back and consult with my management on before coming through
16 with a decision.

17 The third thing that we need on the cleanup team to
18 work well and to accomplish Fast-Track is innovative
19 thinking -- a new way of doing things that's more efficient
20 -- that gets us out of the old kind of linear path through
21 CERCLA that in the past has been criticized for taking so
22 long -- and one of the ways we do that is when we come into
23 the room together, we leave the regulations, guidances and
24 budget considerations outside the door when we first sit
25 down. We talk about and try and decide what makes the most
26 sense to accomplish our cleanup goals, first, then we pick

1 up the regulations, then we look at the budget
2 considerations and the practical sides and see, "Can we
3 accomplish this?" And, if so, "How can we get this through
4 the regulatory maze? How can we get the funding to
5 accomplish this task?" And I think that's a new way of
6 doing things and it keeps us from sitting back, sitting on
7 the regulations, posturing or exclaiming, "Well, we can't do
8 that because there's not enough money." Well, first we
9 decide what do we want to do, then we see if we can do it.
10 To me, that's a wonderful way of working. I'm able to sit
11 there -- I'm able to think about -- about what is the best
12 way to do the cleanup, first.

13 Some of the examples and the results of this kind of
14 teamwork and what we've been able to do to accelerate the
15 process: One, we've combined review sessions to get
16 documents through faster. It means everybody has to travel
17 here to the depot and sit down for two days and go over
18 every comment in detail, but it saves the contractor from
19 having to do one additional draft, saves a couple of months
20 of time -- and any disputes -- any conflicts in some of the
21 comments can be settled right there at the table.

22 We've started the NEPA process earlier. That's a
23 process that takes a year to a year and a half -- and,
24 generally, you really can't start the NEPA process until you
25 know what the reuse is going to be, but the Army Corps of
26 Engineers has come up with an innovative way of doing a --

1 sort of a theoretical reuse categories -- calculating what
2 the environmental impact is -- and, then, when the reuse
3 plan comes out, some fine tuning -- some adjustment to the
4 calculations to accommodate what the actual reuse that's
5 intended in the plan. So, that will save us a considerable
6 amount of time.

7 We use -- As Chris said, we're using removal actions
8 where they're appropriate to accomplish a faster cleanup,
9 although, eventually that's certainly to the same standards
10 as any classic remedial action will be, and we're trying to
11 incorporate innovative technology where we can. One example
12 might be in Lake Danielson to use a clay cap on
13 pesticide-contaminated sediments at the bottom of the lake,
14 instead of stirring them up in a removal and dredging and
15 subjecting base runoff to further contamination of
16 pesticides.

17 We work closely with the Memphis Depot Redevelopment
18 Authority on priorities on reuse -- on some of their reuse
19 goals. I think it's important -- The statement was made
20 during some debate yesterday that really the redevelopment
21 authority comes up with the reuse plan and, then, all DoD
22 does is respond to that with their cleanups -- and I would
23 submit to you that that might look fine on paper, but that's
24 no way to accomplish Fast-Track Cleanup in reality. In
25 fact, I think that the redevelopment authority has to be
26 sensitive to the environmental condition of the property or

198 24

1 they're going to come up with unrealistic reuses and -- and,
2 adversely, the BCT is going to prioritize a cleanup sequence
3 in any event and you might as well allow that to have
4 something to do with the reuse plans as long as there are no
5 health or environmental hazard considerations involved --
6 and, so, we've done that. I don't know how many other bases
7 work this way, but at DDMT, the redevelopment authority has
8 its permanent staff office just down the hall -- about 150
9 feet from the environmental offices. So, the communication
10 has been terrific.

11 The redevelopment authority really hit the ground
12 running when they were appointed in the fall and there has
13 been terrific interchange between the two -- and, except for
14 Dunn Field, which the redevelopment authority is interested
15 in and which is the top priority for the cleanup team --
16 because of the environmental hazards -- our priorities on
17 the main installation of cleaning up parcels have pretty
18 much closely matched what the redevelopment authority has
19 established as priorities for reuse, because there's no
20 reason it shouldn't -- and in working together like that, I
21 think it will be more effective in both transferring and
22 reusing property and in accomplishing Fast-Track Cleanup.

23 Occasionally, since we're both trying to transfer clean
24 property, the DMDRA puts a little more emphasis on the word
25 "transfer." We put a little more emphasis on the word
26 "cleanup." So there is some inherent conflict there. But

198 25

1 so far as the communication and the ability to work out
2 disputes between the two -- has been -- has worked quite
3 well -- and we'll see where it goes from here.

4 And, again, we try to work with the community. Jordan
5 is going to talk a little more about that -- to the RAB --
6 and I would say one thing, the community, although it is 90
7 percent black -- and, as we heard last night, it's not all a
8 single opinion -- and there certainly is some diverse
9 interest there. But one thing that I -- one message that's
10 come through clearly to me during the process of town hall
11 meetings and RAB meetings is that almost -- as a single
12 person, the community considers the human health aspects and
13 the environmental cleanup at the depot to be a much higher
14 priority than -- than rapid reuse -- and even where the jobs
15 issue brought up, yes, they do want jobs in the
16 neighborhood, but there is no doubt that they don't want the
17 Fast-Track process to compromise the environmental -- the
18 effect of environmental cleanup of the base.

19 And, having said all that, I'd be remiss if I sat down
20 before I recognized, for the DERTF, the contributions of
21 Chris Kartman to the project here. She's leaving to go to
22 what's hopefully a less stressful job and -- she's one of
23 the most effective people I've ever worked with in this
24 field. She has real talent for pulling together whatever
25 resources are needed to get the job done and -- Ms. Rivers
26 pointed out to me yesterday, "Well, DoD is not losing her

1 talents," but we will miss her here at Memphis.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. ENGLISH: I'm Jordan English. I'm with
4 the Tennessee Division of Superfund, which is part of the
5 Department of Environment and Conservation. I am the BRAC
6 Cleanup Team representative for the State of Tennessee.

7 Before we get started on what's on the overhead there,
8 I want to make a real brief statement about the discussion
9 this morning with regard to ICs. The state is concerned
10 terrifically about institutional controls. I think we see
11 correctly that we may be the barrier that burned in the
12 long-run. Mr. Yaroschak, I think you're correct in your
13 statement. I think the only -- the real serious implication
14 of it is, I fought this battle long and hard on regular
15 state work and it's always been amazing to me that even my
16 own people in Nashville will very quickly say, "Oh,
17 institutional control, easy to do. Yeah, we can move on.
18 Count that deed and let's go." It's going to come back on
19 us, I believe, one day and I'm concerned about it. I want
20 to make sure that we think through this thing carefully and
21 look at it in a reasonable way and be involved as the
22 partnering discussions proceeded this morning from the front
23 end with everybody talking in a reasonable way. I think
24 that's a very important thing to do.

25 Now, back to the discussion. I want to -- on the
26 front end -- say I hate to see Chris leave. I think it's

198 27

1 already been brought up that -- by a member of audience --
2 that the BECs turnover is a real big problem. It is a big
3 concern for us and I hear everybody talking about it, but I
4 don't see anything happening -- and maybe we need to form a
5 working group for BEC retention. I think it's important to
6 consider. I think we need to consider it very strongly.
7 We're not going to lose Chris to the Department of Defense,
8 but I'm going to lose her here. Although, we have many
9 talented people that can fill in the space, the continuity
10 may be a problem and I think that's where the real problem
11 lies.

12 Okay. Now, to the prepared or planned or unplanned --
13 I don't have a box here that I can pull things out of here.
14 I wish I did. I'm not a real good speaker, so bear with me.
15 I'll probably go in fits and starts and stops. The first
16 topic I'd like to discuss is DSMOA and in the same breath
17 the Federal Facilities Agreement the State has with the
18 Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection
19 Agency. Early on in the process -- this is at a time when
20 there was not a lot of knowledge about how this process
21 would work for Department of Defense -- there was a little
22 bit of distrust of big brother there -- the badges and
23 stripes and everything and -- and as we got into the process
24 of negotiating the Federal Facilities Agreement, I think we
25 very quickly had some loggerhead situations where DoD was
26 saying, "Well, this is the way it is and here's how you do

198 28

1 it," and the state was saying, "Well, we see all your
2 edicts, but we're the State of Tennessee and we have our own
3 set of rules that we also go by." Needless to say, we got
4 through the entire process without a lot of bumps and
5 bruises and scrapes, although, it did take some time. DSMOA
6 is the funding mechanism, of course. We had to see that
7 through or we couldn't pay me to be here and other people on
8 my staff to be here -- and the same thing for EPA, I
9 suppose.

10 The Federal Facilities Agreement did accomplish a lot.
11 The people who worked long and hard on it are to be
12 complemented -- Jim Carr, Dennis Lillo -- the Defense
13 Logistics Agency are to be complemented. We were in several
14 discussions early on in the process, but when it was all
15 over with, we were very happy with the document -- and, in
16 retrospect, the BRAC closure being the watchword now -- it
17 would appear on the outside that these things were not
18 needed. I will argue very quickly that, yes, it is needed.
19 The present function now is largely, "Give us dollars. Keep
20 us paid so we can do our work here," but I think it sort of
21 sets the basis for BRAC, which was the partnering effort
22 from the very beginning -- and it just kind of floated over
23 into that and we sort of took our lessons as we learned --
24 all of us did -- and moved into BRAC, eagerly in a sense,
25 because it was really a friendlier environment than the FFA
26 process. The FFA itself -- Negotiations for the FFA began

198 29

1 in the fall of 1994 -- Well, actually longer ago than that
2 -- but serious negotiations were involved in the fall of
3 1994 and, then, in early 1995 the Federal Facilities
4 Agreement was signed -- and that's all I have to say about
5 that.

6 EBS and the base cleanup plan -- that's not a typo on
7 the overhead there. This signifies my ranking of those two
8 items or documents in relation to their importance. The EBS
9 a very important document and all of its revisions are also
10 very important documents. The accuracy of the information
11 that goes into the environmental baseline survey is very
12 important in terms of transferring parcels, in terms of us
13 identifying the areas that need further investigation or
14 that need cleanups, early action removals or whatever.
15 That's the most critical part of what we do. The base
16 cleanup plan to me is -- this is just my personal opinion
17 now -- I can't say I'm speaking for the State of Tennessee
18 on this issue -- but it seems like that the base cleanup
19 plan is a measure you have to go through -- a hoop you to
20 have to jump through -- to document to someone, somewhere,
21 that you're doing things according to some plan. I think if
22 you're involved with the process, though, as the community
23 is, as the depot is, as the DLA is, as the State of
24 Tennessee, as EPA is, you will see very quickly that we
25 don't need a plan. We've got the appropriate plan that
26 everybody follows, but we are the process and the plan by

198 30

1 which things are getting done.

2 I'm going to say this to embarrass you one last time,
3 Chris, before you leave -- but at that naval air station
4 just north of here, where we also had a similar process
5 involved, the base cleanup plan quickly reduced to a
6 business plan -- which is basically nothing more than
7 identification of -- and parcels -- and a schedule -- and I
8 think the identification of those parcels and a schedule are
9 the critical items of the base cleanup plan.

10 Okay. Now, this is where I will spend most my time,
11 but -- it's already been discussed somewhat already and I'd
12 like to discuss a few points about the Restoration Advisory
13 Board. When the depot work really got started and the state
14 really got involved, we established -- there was a --
15 established a technical review committee. This technical
16 review committee began in about February of 1994 -- I think
17 the first meeting occurred then. On this technical review
18 committee were, supposedly -- I say "supposedly," I'll
19 qualify that -- 11 members -- composed of the Environmental
20 Protection Agency, Tennessee Department of Environment and
21 Conservation, Memphis/Shelby County Health Department, City
22 Council, both mayors of the city and the county or
23 representatives thereof, the County Commission -- and I
24 might add that the County Commission and the City Council
25 were going to have two members -- it was decided at some
26 point -- a member from the depot -- or depot -- and a

198 31

1 representative from the environmental community, a person
2 who represented environmental groups in the area.

3 Several months went by and in July of 1994, as
4 understanding and guidance came out about RABs and what they
5 were and what they were to include and what they were to
6 involve -- and partially from some of the experiences we had
7 at the naval air station, we realized the community was a
8 very big stakeholder in the process. So, we rolled it over
9 to a RAB. I might add, also, that the City Council and the
10 County Commission reduced their needs from two to one. They
11 just felt like one person was enough. When we rolled over
12 to the RAB, we decided to add people from the local
13 community to be on this board. We decided we would add not
14 more than ten and -- let's see -- what did I say here -- and
15 not less than eight. So, we added nine -- and what we
16 decided, then, was we were going to have to develop some
17 sort of an application process so that we could be fair and
18 consistent, so that we understand that the people
19 represented the community, local concern under different
20 environmental groups -- whatever. We devised an
21 application. We reviewed the application carefully before
22 we decided to make it official. On this application, there
23 is your name, address and ZIP code so that we know where you
24 live. It gives you demographic info -- and this was an
25 optional section that raised other information there you
26 might want to include. We don't want to exclude anyone and

1 that's the reason that was added. The membership terms --
2 in other words, how long a period you were expected to be
3 involved working on the RAB. I think we indicated on the
4 application it was about two years, but I think we see now
5 it's going to be a little longer than that. And, of course,
6 we also added in there information about a time and travel
7 commitment, that there might be some training, there might
8 be some travel to locations to observe other facilities or
9 to attend training and that there was going to be a
10 considerable amount of time that was going to be involved
11 with -- these RAB members being involved -- and these are
12 non-paid positions, by the way.

13 We, then, asked the question whether they would be
14 interested in attending consensus-building skills training
15 to recognize where differences occur and to learn how to
16 slowly and carefully come to some consensus when you have a
17 very different and varied background involved. And, then,
18 one important section -- I think it's one of the most
19 important sections on the form -- is representation. We
20 asked for them to check as many boxes as they thought
21 applied -- and I think we requested that they check only
22 one, but many checked more -- what group or community they
23 represent -- and I want to read these off here:
24 Representation would be public officials -- and that would
25 be either elected or affiliated or appointed -- minority --
26 through either academic or education -- environmental

1 groups, general public, business, former employee, legal --
2 we had to give the lawyers a place in there, didn't we --
3 and, then, another category: Other, please specify --
4 because there might have been somebody we overlooked --
5 some group we didn't understand or know about -- then we
6 added a section where you could put additional information
7 about yourself so that we might consider that person more
8 strongly or whatever and, then, we also added -- and we
9 think this is the correct thing to do -- a
10 conflict-of-interest statement that basically said, "I'm not
11 in here to seek personal" -- "or" -- "or gain for my
12 business and that I'm interested in doing the right thing
13 for no pay for the right reason." And, then, we required a
14 signature. So, this is the process that we went through.
15 We got it -- what is it -- 60-some-odd applications returned
16 to us. This was advertised widely. We got that many
17 applications back. I think that is an indication that it
18 was well received -- and we had to, then, make the very
19 tough choices of deciding who would be on this or not.

20 The technical review committee, which was the previous
21 members I described to you, basically made the decisions
22 about who were going to be involved. I've got to read my
23 fine scratch here. Out of the -- Of all the people that we
24 chose -- we chose nine -- and I might add, although, it's
25 not critical to my way of thinking -- but all these people
26 are black, all the community people that we added to the RAB

1 were black citizens -- and I think, in large part, we tried
2 to represent areas around the depot in proximity in all
3 directions. So, some of these people are not right next to
4 the depot. But most of these people are within two to three
5 miles of the depot.

6 And, then, in about January of this -- of '95, we had a
7 problem where we didn't have the attendance that we wanted
8 on -- I'm not following this thing very well here -- I don't
9 -- We couldn't get people to continue to come that were
10 appointed either at the official level -- in other words,
11 the LTRC -- or the local community that came. A lot of
12 people did attend. There was a lot of good attendance, but
13 there were a few people that just didn't come and we felt it
14 was very important for the RAB to work that people had to be
15 involved -- and we did have people that were coming and
16 attending these meetings on the private side just to be
17 involved. So, we felt we ought to consider some of these
18 people and we re-extended applications again. Actually,
19 what we did was, we revisited some of the previous
20 applications -- we had a lot left over -- and we had two RAB
21 members that we decided we need to fill their places up --
22 these -- these RAB members -- one of them is a city official
23 that never seemed to have the time to show up, another
24 person was just a -- another RAB member that didn't show up,
25 I don't think, ever. So, we decided we wanted to, at least,
26 fill those two slots. Well, we had three -- three good

198 35

1 applicants that we narrowed it down to and we just decided,
2 "Well, we'll just let them all be on the RAB." We didn't
3 feel like we were having any problems with this working
4 group getting too large, so we took all the people in.

5 We meet generally on a monthly basis. We've missed a
6 few months here and there. We've missed a December once in
7 a while for obvious reasons. We've missed a July once, I
8 think, in '95, and we missed a November in '95. But,
9 generally, we meet every month and we continue to pose the
10 question, "Do you need to meet more often or less often,"
11 and we all agree that at some point -- we understand that
12 there may be a need to go twice -- I mean, once every two
13 months or some other schedule.

14 Open format: I want to say that the RAB meetings
15 themselves are very open. We invite the community to
16 attend. We also invite comment and discussions and
17 questions from the community during the process. Attendance
18 has been varied and it's been mixed. It's been mixed and
19 varied. It's mostly from the official RAB and from the
20 community. But, overall, I think the RAB has worked very
21 well for us.

22 As I said before, attendance was on a -- emphasis was
23 on attendance and involvement -- and I think we continue to
24 feel that way. And, then, we just recently opened the RAB
25 up again. We sent out another request for applications. We
26 chose, I think, four -- four from that group. We got 25

1 applications in and we added another four persons. Mondell
2 Williams, the person who spoke yesterday afternoon, was one
3 of the persons that was selected at that process.

4 The concerns that I have: I've said all this good
5 about RAB. There are a few concerns I have. I think, in
6 general, the large part of the RAB members are doing their
7 job very well when you consider that they're unpaid, they're
8 basically volunteers and are concerned about the things and
9 that is why they are there. The only concern that I do have
10 is that possibly some of the RAB members are not taking the
11 full agenda of the RAB back to the public. I have a feeling
12 that, in general, the general public does know about what's
13 going on, but we do continue to hear that the public is
14 not being involved. So -- If the public is not being
15 involved, I think it's possibly a failure of the RAB process
16 and, in that respect, it may be a failure of the individual
17 RAB members to meet the public.

18 I will reiterate what has been said before time and
19 time again. I've held out my hand with my business card in
20 it and said, "Here's my address. Here's my phone number.
21 You can write me or call me. I'll show up at your place to
22 describe things, to explain things." I have yet to get one
23 call. So, I'm a little concerned about whether the
24 community is getting the information they need or not. But
25 I don't think it's because it's not being offered.

26 I think that's all I have. Thank you.

198 37

1 MS. RIVERS: Thank you. I know that the Task
2 Force members have a number of questions they'd like to ask.
3 Let me -- I am concerned, though, about allowing enough time
4 for Ms. Buchanan to give her presentation.

5 MR. CHOUDHURY: The agenda calls for a
6 presentation by -- in a combined question and answer form
7 presentation.

8 MS. RIVERS: Let's go ahead and do that.

9 Ms. Buchanan?

10 MS. BUCHANAN: Good afternoon. I want to
11 thank you for the invitation to speak to a group such as
12 this and I think your meeting at various BRAC sites is
13 exactly what you need to be doing -- a group whose purpose
14 is to expedite and approve the environmental response at
15 BRAC cleanup sites. This makes a lot of sense. If you
16 don't come out and see what's really happening and hear from
17 the people who are actually experiencing it, I think you may
18 be only hearing from some of the parties.

19 I'd like to talk about Fast-Track closure a little bit
20 before we actually get into the presentation. At a
21 Fast-Track closure, every step in the process must be
22 expedited in order so that delay in reuse does not occur. A
23 delay in reuse means buildings are empty, that means
24 buildings deteriorate, that means reuse is less possible or
25 more expensive. So, just with that thought in mind -- when
26 I came on as director back in October -- I really had not a

198 38

1 lot of background in BRAC, like many others. I really
2 didn't know that we were somewhat of a guinea pig in terms
3 of being a two-year closure. I don't want to say that is a
4 negative. It's actually got a lot of positives, too. The
5 quicker you can get through the traumatic experience of
6 losing jobs and replacing them is better for the community.
7 The faster you get buildings reused, the less maintenance
8 cost on them. The faster you get the reuse, less
9 deterioration. So, there's a lot of positive there. But
10 what it does, is it makes us -- it's imperative that we all
11 work together a little bit closer than maybe we did on some
12 of the four- and six-year and nine-year closures that have
13 occurred in other places.

14 Next slide. I want to talk to you a little bit about
15 the Memphis Depot Redevelopment Agency -- sort of who we
16 are. We are a city and county agency. That's fairly common
17 in this community -- and we have a city and county
18 government that works pretty well together on many, many
19 different operations, including things like the Health
20 Department, the libraries and whatnot. So, this was fairly
21 standard, but we were very pleased to see that the county
22 was as interested as city government in ensuring that this
23 project not become another abandoned inner city industrial
24 park. We have a couple of those and we don't want to see
25 that happen to this community.

26 This is an 18-member board. We have two mayors, which

1 is a little unusual. We have a city mayor and a county
2 mayor. The 18 members were appointed half by each mayor and
3 approved by the City Council and County Commission. Those
4 two mayors sit on the board, as well. They appointed
5 themselves, I guess, because they thought it was that
6 important. What I wanted to mention about this board is its
7 diversity. It reflects the composition of the Memphis
8 community, which is about 55 percent African-American, 45
9 percent white. The board reflects that. It also reflects
10 diversity in terms of political, neighborhood, as well as
11 business representation. We think we have a very broad base
12 forum. That was one of our initial concerns and we think
13 we've accomplished that.

14 Also, on that 18 members, three members are also RAB
15 members. So, we have an overlap with our board and the RAB.
16 In addition, we have four committees that were established
17 to look at specific areas and interests that we knew we
18 would need to have expertise in. The Personal Property
19 Committee sort of speaks for itself -- and we'll be looking
20 at all of the things that are tied to them and whether we
21 need to keep any of those for reuse. The Economic
22 Development Committee -- Each of these committees is made up
23 of two to six board members -- and, then, a number of -- up
24 to 20 outside community experts, if you will, or interested
25 parties, who help us develop the plan and develop our
26 strategies. So, the Economic Development Committee has a

1 number of business people on it -- Chamber of Commerce --
2 and various other experts in the business field.

3 The Environmental Committee is made up of three board
4 members and a number of environmental -- local environmental
5 experts, who have helped us a great deal in reviewing on
6 environmental baseline study -- or survey -- and the other
7 environmental documents that we -- that we believe the
8 community needs to monitor to ensure that they are being
9 prepared in the correct way.

10 The Housing Community Committee is an important
11 committee because it includes every representative of an
12 organized neighborhood association in the area around the
13 depot. We have a local group called the Center for
14 Neighborhoods, who basically puts out a directory of
15 neighborhood organizations -- and that's how we identified
16 all these representatives. We've also added some, since we
17 first formed this committee, when we found new organizations
18 -- or new organizations formed, we added them, as well.
19 These committees will be working with us through the process
20 to develop the plan -- and I may talk about that on the next
21 slide -- maybe the next slide.

22 Go ahead. I want to tell you a little bit about what
23 the strategic goals of the board are. First and more
24 foremost is to maximize community employment. We're losing
25 jobs. We want to replace those jobs. We think we can
26 replace them two for one. We also are not just counting the

1 number of jobs, but the quality of jobs is highly important
2 to the board -- and that means we want to raise the per
3 capita income, as well as just get a certain number of jobs.
4 To do that, we feel like we need to place priority on
5 attracting new or expanding businesses. As one of the board
6 members says, "We don't want to just move around deck chairs
7 on the Titanic, we want to actually have growth." So, we
8 also want to encourage the new businesses to hire depot
9 employees and local employees -- neighbors of the depot, if
10 you will.

11 The second strategic goal was to improve the local
12 quality of life through utilizing depot facilities to the
13 community needs as well as ensuring that any redevelopment
14 is compatible with the surrounding community. Our intention
15 is not to bring in dirty and heavy industry right across
16 the street from houses. That was one of the first things
17 that -- when I drove around the depot, I was somewhat
18 surprised -- that has a space into the depot -- that's not
19 the way we try to design developments at this day and age --
20 and we need to follow current standards in putting back some
21 barriers and buffers for the new redevelopment.

22 The third item is to generate cash flow early on -- and
23 that's, obviously, something that will make the
24 redevelopment effective -- make us able to do the
25 redevelopment -- and last is the -- community public health
26 is the number one priority in environmental and remediation

1 work -- and we put that one in there because we felt we
2 needed to say, "Reuse is important, but public health is
3 number one." The board all lives here, too -- and there was
4 -- there was no way that we were going to say, "Reuse is
5 more important than a public health issue, such as Dunn
6 Field water contamination." So, we wanted to make that very
7 clear on the front end.

8 Next slide. I'll talk a little bit about the
9 redevelopment schedule. We're now in the planning phase.
10 We have a redevelopment plan underway. We've hired a
11 consultant called Pathfinders and they will be complete in
12 January. The business and marketing plan will be an
13 extension of that and will be completed in March. We have
14 decided if we're going to expedite the redevelopment that we
15 would have to pursue a master lease and, so, we've requested
16 a master lease back in March of this year to be in place in
17 January. Obviously, we can't lease buildings that are still
18 in use by the depot, but we're working very closely to
19 identify those buildings that will be available for reuse.

20 The reuse actions, then, are, of course, interim
21 leasing -- hopefully, starting in January -- property sale,
22 we estimate the beginning of property sale would be in early
23 1998 -- and last on this item is the board policy -- that we
24 have no intention of taking title to any property before
25 it's clean. That's something that we stated early on and we
26 still feel very -- very sure that that is what our intention

1 is. The new law that is apparently coming forward, we have
2 concerns on. We think it might be beneficial, but we also
3 have concerns -- and I'll talk about that a little later.

4 I also wanted to clarify something that Dann said
5 earlier about the board not being interested in Dunn Field
6 -- and I think what he probably intended to say was that
7 we're not interested in taking title to Dunn Field until
8 it's cleaned up -- and we don't intend to make it sort of
9 the centerpiece of the reuse. We have concerns on what the
10 heck should Dunn Field ever be used for again, if anything.
11 We've had discussions about Dunn Field, in fact, with the
12 community and there's everything from put a park on it,
13 which I find very uncomfortable, to put a fence around it
14 and keep everybody out. So, there is not consensus on how
15 Dunn Field should be reused. At this point, I'm not sure
16 that we ever will reach 100 percent consensus. But the
17 bottom line is safety of the community first.

18 I want to go on to reuse experience. We've been doing
19 this for less than a year, so we don't have the full range
20 of experience, obviously. But we have found some things to
21 be helpful and some things to be detrimental to the reuse
22 experience. First, on the positive side is the President's
23 five-point program. I can't tell you how much I'm pleased
24 that we were -- if we have to be closed that we're a '95
25 closure, because there's a lot of things that have been
26 learned in the previous rounds that we can benefit from.

1 The Fast-Track Cleanup, of course, being number one on that
2 list. I would also like to add the BCTs -- base transition
3 coordinators -- are instrumental in that process. They can
4 alert us to what is going on that may be detrimental and
5 help us through this process. They're really an ombudsman
6 that are -- you know, are well worth the few dollars that
7 DoD spends on them.

8 Second is the Army's early initiation of both the
9 environmental baseline survey -- which was begun, I think,
10 almost within minutes of the decision coming down on the
11 closure. Before we got very far into this process, we found
12 out the Army had already had a contractor under -- under
13 contract to do the EBS. So, we are pleased with that.
14 Also, the NEPA process was kicked off. I was surprised -- I
15 couldn't believe they were kicking off NEPA before we had
16 even started our redevelopment plan, but when they came in
17 and we talked about it, the scheduling actually seemed to
18 make some sense and they were actually -- they were trying
19 to get a jump on it so that they could finish it so that we
20 could move on fairly quickly. I do have a concern on that
21 and I'll mention that on the next slide.

22 The next positive was really the excellent working
23 relationship that we've had with the installation commander,
24 with the BEC, with the BTC and with the RAB -- and I can't
25 stress that enough. Dann also mentioned, we are located at
26 the depot. I don't see how a redevelopment agency can work

1 without being at the installation. I think that's critical
2 to making it a success.

3 The installation commander has made this a team
4 approach from day one. When we came out, he invited us to
5 every staff meeting. He has BRAC cleanup -- or a BRAC
6 update every two weeks and those meetings have been
7 instrumental in keeping the communication going. Some
8 things that have been very positive is that we've been
9 invited to make -- not only come to the RAB meetings -- but
10 make presentations at the RAB meetings on our goals -- on
11 our plans -- to keep them informed of what's going on.
12 Also, we've been invited to review the EBS. We've
13 commented. Those comments have been taken and incorporated
14 into the report.

15 Interim leasing: We had a workshop early on on interim
16 leasing to find out what the heck this animal was, how do
17 you do it, what all's involved. We were told by some of the
18 Army folks that it was a three-month process. Oh, no
19 problem. Three months? We sat down with them -- with the
20 DLA folks, with Army folks, with the Corps of Engineers and
21 some folks from Washington. We scoped it out, you know,
22 with their knowledge, obviously, and came out with a
23 nine-and-a-half-month process. Slightly more than three
24 months. I'm sure you've heard some of the -- some of the
25 other comments from other places where they've had -- the
26 one that's always the incredible story is the 12-month lease

1 that took 13 months to approve and -- you know,
2 unfortunately, that's more the rule than the exception --
3 and, so, we wanted to get a jump on that and the
4 installation commander and the BTC posted that interim
5 leasing workshop, brought all the people together and that's
6 -- that's the kind of thing that has been happening here
7 and has been extremely helpful -- and, in fact, that's why
8 we jumped to request the master lease back in March. Our
9 board had set their goals and said, "Move on. We've got to
10 get this thing in place, especially if it takes nine and a
11 half months."

12 A master lease, you might think, "Oh, it's a real
13 estate thing." It's not. It's an environmental thing. The
14 three documents that are required in order to do interim
15 leasing are all environmental -- the EBS summary, an
16 environmental assessment for leasing -- and the one I'm
17 forgetting -- the FOSL. How could I forget the FOSL? So,
18 interim leasing is an integral part of the environmental
19 cleanup. So, the fast-tracking of environmental helps the
20 reuse very directly in those ways.

21 The new law allowing transfer prior to cleanup: We
22 understand that in some instances we might want that. If we
23 have a company bringing in three to 500 new jobs and the
24 cleanup is minimal, maybe, or just can't happen right now
25 for whatever reason, maybe we'll want that. But that
26 concerns us. We do not want to take title to property

1 before it's cleaned up. We just don't see any reason to put
2 a business in that situation where, later on down the road,
3 they may have to change their operation, move out, whatever.
4 That just doesn't set well with reuse and we would rather
5 have it cleaned up quickly and move on. It just makes
6 sense.

7 Next slide. These are some of the issues that we think
8 we are going to need to deal with on the environmental
9 arena. The first one is the NPL designation of the entire
10 installation. We feel that that's a real damper on reuse and
11 marketing. We feel that this base should be looked at as
12 two distinct bases. Dunn Field is physically separated and
13 fenced from the rest of the campus. We feel that it needs
14 to be reassessed. If both pieces, you know, meet the
15 criteria of Superfund, that's fine. But if Dunn Field is
16 the reason that the rest of the depot is listed, that
17 doesn't make any sense to us. We feel that that should be be
18 revisited and recalculated.

19 Continuing neighborhood concerns: Both on and off-site
20 contamination, you've heard -- you've heard that already.
21 That concerns us. We don't think until those issues are
22 answered that the reuse is going to be as successful as it
23 can be. So, we think that there should be some action here,
24 whether it takes another health study -- something in depth
25 that the community gets to be a part of and can trust.
26 That's worthy of doing.

1 Funding limits: They're always a concern. Because of
2 the number of bases that are closing -- you know, we've
3 heard -- we've heard of this from day one, coming on board,
4 that environmental funding is going to be a problem because
5 of the number of bases. Hopefully, because we're a
6 Fast-Track, maybe we'll get a priority and some of the
7 longer ones won't. I don't know. But that's a concern --
8 and, certainly, we'd like you, if you can, to lobby for
9 additional funding. That's always helpful.

10 Delay in chemical warfare disposal:

11 Chris Kartman did mention that there's apparently a
12 breakthrough in moving the small amount of warfare that's
13 buried at Dunn Field to Pine Bluff. We can't encourage that
14 any higher, but we do -- we are concerned that with Chris
15 leaving -- we don't want things to fall through the cracks.
16 So, that's something that we just feel needs to be taken
17 care of now. We don't want to be bringing new businesses in
18 and then have some -- you know, who knows what happens on
19 site where they might have to leave or be disrupted. It's
20 just not a good situation for reuse -- for private reuse.

21 And, lastly, I have a number of the things there that
22 are examples of what I consider a situation that every reuse
23 authority has to deal with -- and that's sort of a DoD
24 continuity of policy and procedures -- and sort of a lack of
25 continuity sometimes -- and trained personnel -- and I think
26 that's a problem whatever business you're in. But you can't

1 do enough training for the staff that you put out there to
2 work on these issues and we have found -- sometimes we feel
3 like we're training the DoD personnel. Strangely enough, we
4 know more than they do -- and, so, that's a concern we've
5 got and we can't encourage you any more, you know, to get
6 that training out there and to give them policy support so
7 that they know and they have the answers and -- and, like
8 Dann said, they're empowered to make the decisions.

9 The master lease, as I mentioned earlier: This is
10 actually as much of an environmental as a real estate
11 action. It's incredible to us to see the Air Force doing
12 master leases and leasing very quickly and the Army taking
13 nine -- twelve months to do the same kind of thing. That
14 just -- you know, here you've got good examples in one
15 service and they're not translated to another service.
16 That's very frustrating to us and we're concerned that --
17 you know, we find this over and over again.

18 The EBS was prepared by the Army. It was prepared
19 quickly. That was very good. But the way it was prepared,
20 it was organized as a site and as a whole rather than by
21 parcel. In the Navy it's done by parcel. It's very useful
22 data when it's done by parcel, because you can sell it. You
23 can have this information when a buyer comes in and give it
24 to them. When it's all in one site, you have to look at
25 five or six different chapters to pull out the information
26 on that site. It just makes it harder. The Navy has

1 already figured that out. The others may be coming along.
2 But we would recommend that that be done.

3 The NEPA process: We had a communication slip, I
4 guess. They started very quickly and early and included
5 everybody and we were all happy -- and, then, we found out
6 the decision was made to change it from an EIS to an EA
7 without any community input -- without any notice of the
8 decision having been made. That's just not the kind of
9 communication we were expecting and believe it's critical to
10 having a good process. So, it's just, you know, something
11 that needs to be stressed continuously, I guess.

12 Personnel: Obviously, the environmental personnel at
13 the depot is a problem. There's been a complete turnover in
14 the technical staff. This is an area that we have a concern
15 with. When you have turnover, there's a lack of continuity.
16 As much as the staff at DLA is there and is trying to fill
17 in the gaps, it's just not a good situation and there can't
18 -- you can't run a group such as this and not have delays
19 when you have staff turnover. It's just a fact of the life.
20 The personnel -- My understanding was in other areas,
21 personnel was put into some sort of protective status from
22 the closure because the environmental personnel would have
23 to stay through cleanup and, for whatever reason, that
24 wasn't done here. We think that's -- There's a concern
25 there.

26 Short-term cleanup actions: This is something that we

1 think in the cleanup, the action needs to be looking toward
2 the long-term reuse, not just what can we do to get away
3 with meeting the law and checking off the box -- and we've
4 got some asbestos that we think needs to be removed in a
5 demolished building that we think is probably going to be
6 encapsulated instead, even though the Department of Defense
7 may end up coming back and demolishing it. It's a
8 short-term fix instead of the long-term -- The building is
9 going to be demolished, take out the asbestos. It's one of
10 those -- you know, what's the goal? Are we looking to
11 short-term or are we looking toward reuse?

12 Those are the issues -- the major ones -- and some of
13 just the minor frustrations that we've got to deal with that
14 I wanted to give you a little -- a little information on --
15 and if you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer those
16 -- and I want to thank you for the opportunity -- because I
17 think just your presence makes people focus on the issues
18 and probably do a better job -- us included.

19 We thank you.

20 MS. RIVERS: I'd like to go ahead and open it
21 up to the Task Force members for discussion.

22 Don?

23 MR. GRAY: First, I'd just like to say I
24 found that presentation very refreshing compared to some of
25 the ones we've heard from some redevelopment authorities.
26 It was a lot more thoughtful. It seems to me there are some

1 -- some fairly wise people on that Redevelopment Authority,
2 in terms of their decisions about -- instead of pushing to
3 get property before it's really ready to be transferred --
4 that they'd be willing to do it in a way where they get
5 property that they don't have to worry about putting
6 restrictions on the use of the property and then instituting
7 institutional controls and enforcing the institutional
8 controls and so on -- and I must say that the picture that I
9 got from that presentation was very different from what I
10 was hearing at the last DERTF meeting and the kind of stuff
11 that was talked about in order to get this provision in the
12 Defense Authorization Act this year. It appears that, in
13 fact -- with the exception of the length of time it took the
14 Army compared to the Air Force to draw up the lease -- that
15 leasing, in fact, has been a help and not a hindrance in
16 redevelopment efforts at this facility -- and I just wanted
17 to confirm that that has been the case and then I was
18 concerned about the question of concern over the new -- the
19 new law -- and I think the specific question on that is
20 whether you've had some concern that, because of the
21 pressure to close this base in two years, that you may be
22 confronted with a situation where you're given a
23 take-or-leave-it and you're told that, at the end of two
24 years, you have to take the property under whatever
25 conditions they attach to it, whether it's cleaned up or
26 not, whether they will proceed to dispose of it to somebody

1 else. Is that a part of your concern?

2 MR. SPARIOSU: I can address that. Are you
3 addressing --

4 MR. GRAY: I'm asking the reuse authority
5 people, but I'd be happy to hear your comments, as well.

6 MS. BUCHANAN: Appreciate you picking up on
7 that, because our initial -- when we first heard about the
8 law, we said absolutely not. We do not want to let the
9 military out of their requirements to make good on cleaning
10 it up. I mean, that was our gut reaction -- and we were
11 concerned that in allowing this extension, if you will, of
12 the required cleanup, that it would -- in our rush to bring
13 in jobs and to redevelop -- that it would put environmental
14 cleanup at a lower priority and that maybe it would never
15 happen. So, that is a concern we have.

16 Now, I know that a number of amendments have been
17 approved on that law -- that makes us feel better. But when
18 you're dealing with businesses in the private sector -- any
19 time you tell them that there is some sort of restriction --
20 that they're going to have to provide access, that they're
21 going to have some sort of cleanup -- man, you just wave
22 goodbye. There are other opportunities for them out there.
23 They don't need that kind of hassle. We have a hard enough
24 time marketing an inner city Brownfields site -- an NPL
25 designation. We don't need any more down sides -- and, so,
26 we are looking to have it cleaned up pronto, get that

1 question out of the -- out of the discussion and move on --
2 and we are concerned that we would get dumped on, to be
3 perfectly honest.

4 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

5 MS. RIVERS: Mr. Spariosu, did you want to
6 add a comment?

7 MR. SPARIOSU: I would say that the
8 redevelopment agency's position gives me greater comfort as
9 the EPA representative that I can worry about the cleanup
10 without having to get mired in some transfer issues warning
11 the buyer that there are environmental issues that he may be
12 responsible for in the future.

13 MR. GRAY: Thank you. It seems to me that
14 there are several examples now -- and, David, maybe you
15 could correct me if I'm wrong -- but I understand the same
16 kind of decision was made at the Sacramento Army depot and
17 -- where the local reuse authority has sort of taken that
18 position -- and it seems to me that there's been less
19 problems than where there's been such a rush to get the
20 property with all kinds of conditions attached that, in fact
21 -- that may end up no longer in being counterproductive in
22 terms of the reuse of the property.

23 MS. RIVERS: I'll just add a footnote and say
24 that the heated debate that occurred in the DERTF over a
25 year ago about the appropriateness of leasing as a tool --
26 certainly, as time has evolved and that tool has been used,

1 from what I hear, in an appropriate fashion and used to
2 mutual benefit, our discussion and debate about leasing has
3 dramatically changed. I'm hoping that if we implement this
4 additional provision in the same way that, in another year
5 or two, the debate may also change.

6 MR. GOODHOPE: I think, again, we need to
7 look at the march of events. When we talked about the
8 leasing issue, there was a much different 120(h)(3), a much
9 different assumption that there be cleanup in five to seven
10 years. As those two things changed, I think the discussion
11 on the leasing also changed.

12 MR. GRAY: Well, I think --

13 MR. GOODHOPE: So, I mean, I would not say
14 that -- that there --

15 MS. RIVERS: So, Sam, you're saying that
16 leasing became attractive --

17 MR. GOODHOPE: In light of the proposed
18 changes to 120(h)(3) that were coming up and in light of the
19 retreat from the commitment to have these cleanups done in
20 five to seven years.

21 MR. GRAY: It's another one of these debates
22 that evolved over a period of time. Sam and I were on the
23 '91 Task Force. The leasing was being portrayed in kind of a
24 way to get around such Section 120(h)(3), which we had some
25 concern about.

26 MS. RIVERS: You're talking about --

198 56

1 MR. GRAY: I am the first to say and have
2 said publicly on a number of occasions that I have come 180
3 degrees on leasing since that time, because I've come to
4 realize that, in many respects, you will get things done
5 faster, I think, if the federal government maintains
6 ownership of the property while the cleanup proceeds -- and,
7 especially, since the changes in the law made clear the
8 authority to do long-term leasing -- which was the original
9 problem -- it had to be very short term -- and, so, I think,
10 Sam was a more recent convert but I think he also became a
11 convert of that position.

12 MS. RIVERS: From my seat, clearly, my view
13 is different, but I'd like to point out that rather than
14 discussing our views -- this is a very short opportunity
15 that we have left to ask questions of the BRAC Cleanup Team
16 -- especially since today is Chris' -- or this week is
17 Chris' last week for Redevelopment Authority. So --

18 Paul?

19 MR. REIMER: Ms. Kartman, may I ask you: How
20 long have you been the cleanup coordinator here?

21 MS. KARTMAN: I've been with the depot for
22 three-and-a-half years and we were put on last summer. We
23 were put on the '95 closure. So, I was the environmental
24 manager as well as the safety and fire protection office
25 manager.

26 MR. REIMER: I was hopeful that would be the

198 57

1 answer -- and, of course, that makes it every bit more
2 apparent why your colleagues are against you're going
3 somewhere else, obviously.

4 As the base appeared, then, on the NPL in '92, that
5 being -- and you came on board, then, just a little while
6 after that.

7 MS. KARTMAN: February of the '93 -- that's
8 why they hired me.

9 MR. REIMER: In '96, the groundwater plume
10 remediation occurred. What happened in the four years
11 between? Was that a cleanup crack that developed here or
12 was that just the normal time frame of getting to the issue?

13 MS. KARTMAN: We could say that the
14 relationship between the depot, EPA, and TDEC was not what
15 it is today -- and, yeah, things had fallen into the crack,
16 work plans were not being approved --

17 MR. REIMER: So, it was just a
18 non-progressive time turnover for their efforts?

19 MS. KARTMAN: Right -- and the Federal
20 Facilities Agreement was in negotiation, so nobody wanted to
21 commit to anything until that got settled.

22 MR. REIMER: I see. And during that time --
23 and even up to now -- the cleanup effort is coming from the
24 DERA account. When did you start cleanup under the ground?

25 MS. KARTMAN: Just this year -- just '96.

26 MR. REIMER: You just started in that sense?

198 53

1 MS. KARTMAN: Right.

2 MR. REIMER: And your comment was that, in
3 fact -- I guess it was Mr. English -- that that represented
4 a little easier arrangement?

5 MR. ENGLISH: Well, it's a little more
6 complicated than that. I'd like to go back to what was just
7 said about the relationship between the state and EPA and
8 the depot -- is that the state became involved with the
9 depot problems just sort of by accident. We were invited to
10 attend and we saw a real problem with the information
11 presented to us by a consultant at the time indicating that
12 there may be a groundwater contamination problem possibility
13 related to a window that's already been discussed. So, the
14 light went on upstairs and we said we need to be involved
15 here. Someone needs to be involved. We need to move
16 proactively in this correct direction to deal with this
17 problem -- and from there, things started snowballing.

18 We were sort of embraced that, "Hey, yeah, these guys
19 know what they're doing and" -- and EPA was involved
20 intimately -- more intimately -- and once that happened, at
21 least we all started to sort of work together even before we
22 got any kind of agreement together. We were working together
23 as individuals and then the FFA was sort of a process that
24 occurred alongside that sort of cemented and -- and resolved
25 some minor problems as we went along. The problems weren't
26 at the local level. The problems were with DLRA, the Army,

1 and DoD hierarchy and their method of doing business. It was
2 continuing as if there was -- "We are the Army and this is
3 the way we do things," or, "We are DoD and you can't tell us
4 what to do," and, then, we were, at the same time, saying,
5 "Well, we're the state and we do things this way in
6 Tennessee," and it was a little of that posturing that went
7 on over and over -- and, finally, it took an FFA agreement
8 -- where we literally battled each other to death over it --
9 for us to come to a conclusion and realize through a tough
10 process the same thing that many of us learned through the
11 partnering process that we all have common goals and that we
12 all need to resolve those things that we have some
13 difficulties over, agree on the things where we have
14 consensus and move forward -- and I think that finally was
15 resolved -- and I think part -- and this is my -- this is my
16 perspective and not somebody else -- but I do believe that
17 there were some problems with regards to the contracting
18 that involved the initial investigations with regard to the
19 depot. I think they were flawed in the first place, flawed
20 in the second place and flawed in the third place. I don't
21 think there was a lot of attention to detail that needed to
22 be there when concerns were brought forward. Well, I think,
23 the way I remember it best, is that the first consultant we
24 were involved with was -- we were brought in right at the
25 time one contract was ending, so they put together a real
26 quick dog-and-pony show and says, "Here it is. We've done

1 what we're supposed to do." And what we saw at the state
2 was that, "Well, what you presented here is real quick and
3 dirty that attempts to show problems are resolved, but what
4 you've really got is, is the tip of the iceberg. You've
5 really not even started looking, yet." And, so, another
6 round of contracting and consulting ensued in which another
7 attempt was made and -- and in many ways -- and another
8 feeble attempt -- and, then, finally, we had the situation
9 that we have now. We have relatively good contractors,
10 although, there is still difficulty with contractors. But
11 we're certainly working together as a team now as far as the
12 BCT is concerned -- and I think that cooperation was there
13 long before the contracting ever caught up with it. That's
14 my personal opinion.

15 MR. REIMER: Do you still have concerns about
16 the characterizations -- at least to this extent? I take it
17 from tracking this -- and certainly the NPL designation
18 comes from the groundwater plume out of the Dunn property --
19 Dunn Field.

20 MR. ENGLISH: That's correct.

21 MR. REIMER: What we've heard in the public
22 session last evening -- although, maybe it's my
23 interpretation -- but that that concern had to do with
24 surface water and the potential -- just the relationship of
25 the site and the drainage -- off-site drainage patterns onto
26 neighboring properties. Is that still a characterization

1 that has yet to be done -- or -- or, from your standpoint at
2 the state, is there an adequate total definition of the --
3 of the environmental hazard here?

4 MR. ENGLISH: Well, this is my version -- the
5 State of Tennessee BCT representative's impression -- is
6 that there are several issues. There is a surface water
7 concern and problems and there's a groundwater concern and
8 problems and there's probably some confusion on the part of
9 the public as to the degree to which they are separated from
10 one another.

11 The other issue can be considered time sensitive. In
12 other words, the investigation that was done out there was
13 based on conditions right now. Investigation was done in
14 the ditches and there was also a -- indicating what's in
15 the ditches right now. We don't know what was in the
16 ditches 20 years, 30 years, 40 years ago. We don't know
17 what the health effects are from 20, 30 and 40 years ago --
18 I don't believe. I don't know that we'll ever know
19 concretely what those health effects might be.

20 Discussion was had last night about -- that, at one
21 time in the past, there were hand-pump wells in the area.
22 Were those hand-pump wells there when the depot was there or
23 before the depot was there? Were those wells ever used for
24 drinking water? I mean, there's a lot of things that we
25 don't know the answers to and I don't know how we're going
26 to get a lot of those answers. So, I think the concerns

198 62

1 about the depot could be boiled down to basically two now:
2 What the problems are with the turnover now; what the health
3 effects are to people now and what's been done in the past.
4 What has happened in the past that has created potential
5 problems? Is there a way to know those answers? The
6 Tennessee Department of Health has done a health assessment
7 and they've attempted to do more of a health assessment
8 than they've done, but when they go to the public to try to
9 find out answers, no one wants to talk about their health
10 situation of their family. A lot of that takes a lot of
11 probing to get sensitive questions answered about those
12 particular types of concerns.

13 I think basically that two types of cancers were found
14 that show slightly higher than average incident rates -- and
15 it's not concrete that those particular types of cancer can
16 be attributable to the environmental or toxicological
17 causes. Of course, our information is expanding every year.
18 We always find out that there are new things that -- "Well,
19 we didn't know caused that," or whatever -- and think the --
20 we're all in the strong learning curve of it. I just don't
21 know what the answer for these people are.

22 I share some of the same concerns that they do. But as
23 that relates to the depot now, conditions at the depot right
24 now, for reuse now, for cleanup now -- they are two
25 questions, in my opinion.

26 MR. REIMER: And the last question, if I

1 may: Do you also manage, through your local offices, the
2 NEPA process?

3 MR. ENGLISH: We are oversight on that. We
4 are involved with NEPA in an oversight role.

5 MR. REIMER: But, Ms. Kartman, you're not
6 involved in that? It's a separate contract running on
7 another track -- or how --

8 MS. KARTMAN: Right. It's a separate
9 contract through the Corps of Engineers through the Army and
10 we are -- the property is Army-owned. So, we have review,
11 but that's about it.

12 MR. REIMER: I see. I wonder if the -- if
13 that also offers some response to the question that -- In
14 other words, are you going to find things addressed in the
15 NEPA process and the EIS that will be helpful to you in
16 that? Regard, in other words, would you gain advantage from
17 some interface there? But even more importantly, because
18 the EIS has to run in front of the record of decision to
19 close the base, I'm wondering a little bit about how the
20 environmental process involving the best base reuse plan and
21 the master lease that's being proposed. I guess I'm a
22 little bit -- I wonder how you're going to pull off that
23 sort of -- of keeping everything -- tracking together. That
24 seems like a real challenge.

25 MS. KARTMAN: I'm wondering, too. I don't
26 mean to be flip, but we -- Cindy eluded to that they were

198 64

1 not notified that the change had happened from an EIS to an
2 EA -- that a decision had been made. Guess what? We
3 didn't, either. DLA had no idea. That was an Army
4 decision. And, so, when you're into a situation like we
5 are, where we're DLA-operated and Army-owned, it really gets
6 confusing. But that decision was made without us -- and I
7 don't know what can be done about it or what needs to be
8 done. But we have no input. We can look at the document
9 for accuracy sake, make sure that they put the right address
10 on it and things like that, but we're really not major
11 players.

12 MR. REIMER: Thank you.

13 MS. RIVERS: David?

14 MR. WANG: If I may --

15 MR. CHOUDHURY: We are about 3:00 o'clock and
16 --

17 MS. RIVERS: I have about ten minutes to
18 3:00, so we're either going to need a synchronization -- I
19 was intending to go for at least another ten minutes and,
20 then, at that point get ready to break to load the buses.

21 MR. CHOUDHURY: All right, ma'am.

22 MR. WANG: We have seen that the groundwater
23 contamination plume and also we have heard about the concern
24 of NPL listing from fence line to fence line. I'd like to
25 ask my question in two parts. The first question -- the
26 BCT. On the Memphis depot, do you have much information

1 regarding the releases of hazardous materials substance that
2 -- occurring on the main depot or solid waste management
3 unit -- ASTSWMO, RCRA action -- those type of things -- that
4 were occurring on the main depot and that may impact the
5 interim lease of the main depot at this time? And my
6 second-part question is that I would like to ask
7 Redevelopment Agency: Are you aware of those kind of
8 contamination that may impact your interim leasing?

9 MS. KARTMAN: I will attempt to answer the
10 first part. Are you talking about current operational
11 procedures?

12 MR. WANG: Well, you're currently known
13 environmental conditions.

14 MS. RIVERS: In other words, do you have a
15 set -- do you have information about the main depot that
16 there were disposal sites or SWMUs that contributed to
17 scoring that caused that portion to be --

18 MS. KARTMAN: Yes. We have all of that
19 information and that's all been incorporated into the EBS
20 and the cleanup work plans and documents. So, all those
21 sites have been identified already -- and, then, we have
22 current permits, like storm water permits where we could do
23 quarterly sampling. We have a spill team. We have reports.
24 If there is a spill, they're cleaned up immediately. So, we
25 have all of those air permits -- anything that's current --
26 that we operate -- we have -- and that's all right there on

198 66

1 --

2 MR. WANG: Is there somehow that you can
3 present this type of information to us? Because, so far,
4 we've only seen the groundwater contamination and I think
5 there are probably other types of contamination to the soil
6 or facility contamination that may impact the interim --

7 MS. KARTMAN: Yes.

8 MS. RIVERS: A real short summary of any
9 items that might affect the interim leasing opportunities
10 that the city might want.

11 MS. KARTMAN: I understand. Okay. Tonight at
12 the RAB meeting, we're going to do an update of the EBS,
13 which may help reflect some on that information. But, yes,
14 that information has been provided to the MDRA already and
15 that's why, when they looked at their priorities, they came
16 to us and said, "Help" -- you know, "Help us with this,
17 because we do not want to have a priority that's not even
18 feasible because of the environmental concerns."

19 MS. BUCHANAN: That's a good question and
20 that's why it's so important for us to work so closely
21 together and our offices to be down the hall from each. I
22 have a map from the EBS -- while it's just a draft -- I have
23 a working map that shows -- that I have written on exactly
24 where all the contamination that is in the EBS -- that's
25 been documented -- is located -- and, so, with that
26 information, we set some priorities for reuse based on what

198 67

1 we knew was contaminated and what we had a feel for might
2 be clean.

3 There's one new building that's never been used. It
4 was just finished a few months into 1996. We know it's
5 clean. We can use it. The outside of that building -- you
6 know, the ground around it is still a question, but the
7 building itself is clean. There have been 30 buildings,
8 some of which are very small and some of which are very
9 usable that have been identified by the cleanup team as
10 being clean. So, we're working very closely -- and those 30
11 buildings will be the ones in the master lease.

12 MS. RIVERS: I will point out that most of --
13 a large part of the area at the facility has been -- has
14 buildings on it -- has had buildings on it for a number of
15 years, so there are a lot -- and most of the operations in
16 the facility have to do with transporting materials,
17 packing, storing, repacking and issuing. So, it's not the
18 kind of operations that we've seen at times when we visited
19 other kinds of facilities.

20 MR. WANG: My second question: Should the
21 reuse entity -- was that -- when you know there's
22 contamination in that building or around the facility,
23 during the course of negotiating to bring in the reuse
24 entities, are they also concerned about those contaminations
25 or in their leasing of activities, they might contribute to
26 additional contamination -- are those the kind of issues

1 that you deal with?

2 MS. BUCHANAN: Yeah. In fact, we have had
3 some people who are interested in using the hazardous
4 material storage building for the same use and that's
5 prohibited by -- by law through interim leasing -- and
6 they're very unhappy, but -- you know, those are some of the
7 things that we bring out right at the beginning when
8 somebody comes in and wants a lease. It is these, "What are
9 you going to put in this building? What's your operation?"
10 And, then, we also tell them about the condition of the
11 building -- as much as we're aware. But, again, the -- the
12 EBS was very helpful -- although, it's not thorough and it's
13 not comprehensive -- where we fill in the gaps on that and
14 so -- you know, at this time, we're trying to be as flexible
15 as we can. That's the only way this will work and -- you
16 know, we're trying to -- and the folks that are leasing --
17 you know, we've got 20 buildings that are identical. So --
18 you know, if you have to move them from one to another, it's
19 probably not going to be a major problem.

20 MS. RIVERS: I'd like to -- I'm going to take
21 the privilege of the chair and ask two questions of the BRAC
22 cleanup, one regarding retention of personnel and the other
23 regarding DSMOA -- since, Jordan, you raised that issue.
24 Retention of personnel, can I ask Dann and Jordan how long
25 you've been in your particular positions working with
26 Memphis.

198 69

1 MR. SPARIOSU: Well, in Region 4, we keep our
2 BRAC program separate from the rest of the federal
3 facilities program just to account for DoD funds a little
4 bit better -- just the way we approach it -- so, I came on
5 in -- really, December of '95, when the funds from DoD were
6 cleared and DDMT was on the BRAC list.

7 MS. RIVERS: Okay. Jordan?

8 MR. ENGLISH: I guess I've been involved in a
9 marginal way since the Memphis field office for the division
10 of Superfund opened up -- and that was in late '92, early
11 '93 -- just been involved in sort of a non-official way. As
12 soon as the site became an NPL site, it became a state
13 Superfund site -- or it was -- maybe it was even a state
14 Superfund site before then -- but the irony is, it is no
15 longer a state Superfund site because of a state RCRA law
16 that was passed that basically says the state permit -- RCRA
17 permit holder is not to be on the state promulgated --
18 district state NPL list -- but, essentially, the Superfund
19 people are still involved with it, because we started it --
20 it is a federal NPL and we know -- and everything -- and
21 we've been involved off and on since about '92 -- '93.

22 MS. RIVERS: And you talked about -- You have
23 the staff -- Do either of your agencies have a policy about
24 retention of your staff for continuity purposes?

25 MR. ENGLISH: Well, we have a policy that we
26 want to keep our people as long as we can. But and as far

198 70

1 as keeping people on this project, yes, we'd like to. At
2 the state level -- I'll just answer this from the state side
3 of it. We are under funding problems like everyone is
4 right now. I want to say this very delicately. Maybe I
5 shouldn't say it at all. We're very careful to keep our
6 people that have the experience levels in the projects and
7 programs where they do the most good. But we do have some
8 very new, young -- coin the phrase -- "green people" in
9 certain roles. Luckily, we don't have any, you know,
10 greenness here at the depot project. But it is a concern
11 for us that, in a moment's notice -- if the freeze occurs,
12 that -- in fact, we're under a freeze -- a hiring freeze
13 right now with the Department of Environment and
14 Conservation. If the freeze were to stay in place and
15 people were to drift away to other jobs, we'd have to make
16 some hard and fast decisions.

17 Now, the beautiful thing is that we have a Federal
18 Facilities Agreement that says, "We're going to have you a
19 man-year of effort here." That was based on a maximum need
20 of one-man year at -- and, basically, we don't get a
21 full-man year, if it's not needed. But we are committed to
22 giving a full-man year -- and I'm going to wave that piece
23 of paper in Nashville's face if they try to keep it away
24 from me -- and, unfortunately, other projects will fall
25 before this project does. But that's the nature of the
26 beast.

198 71

1 MS. RIVERS: You talked about DSMOA and the
2 value of DSMOA. I wanted to ask: Do you act as a single
3 coordinator for Texas talking about regulatory issues? You
4 said -- You just mentioned the fact that you're from the
5 Superfund site. Can you deal with RCRA issues regarding the
6 hazardous material storage facility or other issues that
7 come up? Do you act as an agent for other representatives
8 within the state government?

9 MR. ENGLISH: I can talk about a lot of
10 issues in Texas, but we're in Tennessee -- and you have --

11 MS. RIVERS: I'm sorry. Definitely.

12 MR. GOODHOPE: Welcome to Memphis.

13 MR. ENGLISH: I can talk about a lot of
14 issues in Tennessee, too, but to be honest with you, we tend
15 to leave the RCRA portions -- the permits and those items --
16 to the RCRA people here in the local area, just as we leave
17 the UST problems to UST people here. We believe in leaving
18 the experience -- the authority with the experience. We are
19 the state representative for CERCLA-related problems -- and,
20 through the Federal Facilities Agreement, we've agreed that
21 we're going to talk CERCLA here, not RCRA, for the purposes
22 of investigation and cleanup. That's -- That's good and
23 it's working out great. All other items are handled by
24 those agencies, either state or local, that have the
25 authorities for those particular things and we sort of
26 coordinate -- and we're also involved in the BRAC process

198 72

1 with the cleanup and the actual closing process of the
2 state.

3 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

4 Sam, I'm going to again -- Quick. You're going to be
5 the end, so make it worthwhile.

6 MR. GOODHOPE: It's for Mrs. Buchanan -- on
7 the asbestos, have you received any indication, if the
8 buildings are demolished, whether or not the LRA will have
9 to pay for the demolition and taking care of the asbestos?

10 MS. BUCHANAN: Actually, that's a question
11 that's, I think, being -- or investigated right now. We
12 have a couple of buildings that have been condemned by a
13 depot facility engineer prior to the BRAC decision for
14 closure -- and, so, it's our position that the Defense
15 Department bears the responsibility for demolishing those
16 structures. And, so, we've asked our congressional
17 representatives to take that question up and get a -- get a
18 good answer -- hopefully, the one that we want -- but we
19 don't know, at this point, who is going to be responsible
20 for the demolition. Obviously, if we are, we're probably
21 going to try to take it off the price that we pay for the
22 land, among other things.

23 MR. GOODHOPE: On the environmental
24 subcommittee -- I'm unclear -- what are the issues that the
25 environmental subcommittee of the LRA -- what issues do they
26 look at and is there any overlap between those issues and

1 what the RAB is looking at?

2 MS. BUCHANAN: I think they really have
3 somewhat different functions, although, certainly, the LRA
4 environmental committee is concerned that the contamination
5 be cleaned up. I mean, that's their main concern. But
6 their -- their focus is for reuse. The RAB's focus, I
7 think, is more for the community as a whole. So, the issues
8 may actually be similar, but the perspective is different.
9 So, what we have been doing and what the environmental
10 committee has been doing is looking at the EBS, the sampling
11 recommendations -- all of the data -- and now -- you know,
12 the schedule for cleanup -- and looking at it in terms of
13 its thoroughness. Did the EBS look at sites -- contaminated
14 sites off the depot? Did they thoroughly review and find
15 all of the other sites that are surrounding the depot that
16 could also be -- you know, providing contamination in the
17 community? Did they -- Did they talk to the appropriate
18 employees to make sure that they covered as much information
19 as they possibly could? Many of the employees have moved on
20 to other places at this point -- you know, just those kinds
21 of details to -- to just sort of monitor what the process is
22 and make sure that the consultant is looking at all of the
23 things that need to be reviewed. But our perspective is
24 cleanup for reuse -- and, so, we're looking at it in terms
25 of, you know, priorities and -- and making sure it's
26 thorough, because -- I have to be perfectly honest, we have

198 74

1 a couple of bankers on our -- on our board and -- you know,
2 they have been -- they've had some bad experiences with
3 dirty sites -- and, so, they are particularly interested in
4 ensuring that it's clean.

5 MR. GOODHOPE: I'd just like to end up by
6 saying I commend you for the right thinking and your
7 authority for right thinking on the acceptance of transfer
8 of contaminated property.

9 MS. BUCHANAN: Thank you.

10 MS. RIVERS: Thank you to
11 Colonel Kennedy and the BRAC Cleanup Team -- and to you, Ms.
12 Buchanan -- appreciate your time and the information today.

13 Where do we meet for the buses, Shah, in five minutes?

14 MR. CHOUDHURY: Out front in the lobby. We
15 hope to board as quickly as possible and be out of here.

16 A few reminders, though. The room will be locked, but
17 please take your valuables. Dinner is \$11 and the
18 community center staff will appreciate having \$11 from you.
19 We will be reconvening at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning and
20 if the members want to give me some additional topics for
21 '97, any time during the tour will be appreciated.

22 MS. RIVERS: Thank you.

23
24 * * * * *

198 75

STATE OF TEXAS *

COUNTY OF BEXAR *

I, JULIE A. SEAL, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contain a true and correct transcription of all proceedings, all of which occurred and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY HAND, this the 7th day of October, A.D. 1996.

Cert. No. 5160

Expires: Dec. '97
(210) 377-3027

JULIE A. SEAL
Certified Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public in and for
the State of Texas

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE