



THE MEMPHIS DEPOT TENNESSEE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 287

MEETING MINUTES
Restoration Advisory Board
February 19, 1998
Defense Distribution Depot, Memphis, TN
Corry Junior High School

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held in conjunction with the Defense Distribution Depot's Community Information Session on February 19, 1998 at Corry Junior High School, Memphis, TN. The attendance list is attached.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Mr. Mondell Williams, Community Co-Chairman, welcomed members of the Board and the community to the RAB meeting and to the Information Session. He asked that members of the public observe the RAB procedures and hold their questions until the public comment period at the end of the meeting. Mr. Williams noted that the Community Information Session, held concurrently in the school cafeteria, offered an opportunity to extend the comment and question period beyond the RAB meeting. He added that, if desired, questions posed to RAB members later in the evening could become part of the record of the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Elizabeth Young moved to accept the January 22, 1998 meeting minutes. Mr. Carter Gray seconded the motion. Motion approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Review of October 16, 1997 RAB meeting minutes
Glenn Kaden, Facility Co-Chairman

Mr. Glenn Kaden, Facility Co-Chair, explained that there was a question about the accuracy of the minutes for the meeting held on October 16, 1997 in relation to an oral report given by Ms. Young. In order to address the concern, Mr. Kaden reviewed the audio tape from that meeting and had Ms. Young's remarks transcribed. Mr. Kaden stated that after reviewing the transcript he believed the minutes were accurate, but that Ms. Young should determine how the record will stand. Ms. Young was provided a transcript of her October remarks.

Ms. Doris Bradshaw, who originally raised the issue at the previous meeting, stated that details of Ms. Young's Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) oral report were missing from the minutes. Specifically, details about Ms. Young's feelings were not described. Ms. Young opted to defer her decision until the next RAB meeting so she could compare the transcript to the minutes.

Mr. Kevin Clay announced his intention to remain active on the RAB despite a work commitment in Nashville. He asked the RAB to continue to extend to Ms. Bradshaw the courtesy to attend in his place when he was unavailable. Mr. Clay said he believed she had the interest of the entire community at heart and was a good representative for him when he could not attend meetings.

Mr. Kaden reiterated that Mr. Clay had made these arrangements with the Depot and asked other RAB members to remember to arrange for alternate representation if they could not attend meetings. Mr. Kaden reminded RAB members of the requirements of missing no more than three consecutive meetings without representation. He also stated that Mr. Clay's suggestion appeared to be acceptable as long as it did not violate the RAB charter.

Mr. Jordan English concluded that the RAB policy was intended to ensure continued interest and involvement on the part of Board members and that the community was widely represented at each meeting.

Announcements

Glenn Kaden, Facility Co-Chairman

Charter Review Committee

Mr. Kaden opened the floor for a discussion about the creation of a RAB charter and/or election committee(s). He asked the Board if they had a preference for the number of committees and the priority of issues such committees would address.

Mr. Gray asked if the election procedures would be outlined in the charter. Mr. Kaden stated that was correct. Mr. Jordan suggested a charter committee be struck to revise the charter before any other committee looked at the election procedures.

Mr. Williams asked Ms. Janet Hooks if she would volunteer for the Charter Committee and provide her expertise in procedural order as a community councilor to the group.

Ms. Willie Mae Willett moved that a charter committee be developed to review RAB procedures and report to the whole Board, with a second committee to be established at a later date. Seconded by Mr. Williams. Carried.

Mr. Kaden asked for volunteers for the charter committee. Mr. Kaden suggested the committee review the existing charter, update it with any procedural decisions made by the RAB throughout the previous few years, and make recommendations for a stronger charter. He noted that the Depot's community relations team would obtain sample charters from other RABs across the country for review by the Memphis Depot RAB.

Mr. English suggested that he, Mr. Kaden, and Mr. Ramon Torres remain apart from this committee in order to provide guidance from a government perspective. In addition, he recommended the committee establish and elect their own chairperson.

Ms. Hooks, Ms. Young, and Mr. John Garrison volunteered to serve on the committee. Mr. Williams suggested they share telephone numbers with Ms. Hooks to begin their committee meeting arrangements.

NEW BUSINESS

Memphis Redevelopment Corporation Update

Mr. Kaden introduced Mr. Jim Covington, Executive Director of the Depot Redevelopment Corporation (DRC) and Mr. Gene Burr, DRC Program Manager, who gave a presentation on the achievements and the future activities of the DRC.

Mr. Burr stated that the DRC was created by the City of Memphis and Shelby County and that the redevelopment activities were accomplished on behalf of the two local governments. The DRC has had significant contact with the community through a series of well attended public meetings as well as contact with numerous community organizations, block clubs, and local associations.

Mr. Burr described the geography of the Depot property. He explained that the challenge of redevelopment was to effectively reuse the buildings that are on site, some of which were built specifically for rail access in 1942. Mr. Burr said this posed certain limitations on access by truck traffic. Some buildings became obsolete and were deteriorating due to the nature of their construction. Other structures built during the 1950s or later were more marketable in terms of current industrial standards. He stated that the Depot staff had done an excellent job maintaining the structures and that the DRC believed the Depot was a marketable complex.

Since the Depot was established in 1942, large scale residential neighborhoods had developed on the north, west, and south sides of the facility. Mr. Burr acknowledged that the Depot, as an industrial complex, did not provide the best view for the neighbors. He said the DRC had proposed substantial landscaping along the edges of the facility.

Mr. Burr said the DRC intended to incorporate a mix of public uses in the redevelopment, as indicated by the interest of the Memphis Park Commission, the City Police Department, and State Technical Institute. He said that both the neighbors around the site and the tenant companies were very positive about the addition of local public agencies.

Mr. Burr added that one of the most significant additions was the new southeast precinct of the Memphis Police Department located at the entrance to the Depot. A small unit was operating there now.

Mr. Burr explained the process to transfer property from the Army to the community. The process to transfer recreational space to the community free of charge was through the Park Commission. The Federal agency with a functional relationship to the local agency would be the vehicle of transfer:

- the Police Department facilities would be transferred through the U. S. Department of Justice;
- the golf course and northeast section of Dunn Field would be transferred to the Memphis Park Commission through the National Park Service; and
- State Technical Institute would relocate their Whitehaven campus to the Depot through the U.S. Department of Education.

These property interests had been formally and directly expressed to the Federal agencies.

Mr. Burr explained that the Depot, having a small number of housing facilities, was required by Federal legislation to solicit proposals from local homeless service agencies. The four duplex housing units on the east end of the Depot would be transferred directly to the Memphis Inner-Faith Association (MIFA) for use by their clients. Another facility would be leased to the Memphis Leadership Foundation in order to expand their pallet factory operation and hire homeless adults for jobs to which they might not otherwise have access.

Mr. Burr outlined the DRC's plan to concentrate new companies in the warehouses and eliminate some warehouses for better truck access and employee parking. The first major construction project would be the establishment of a center boulevard entrance through the middle of the installation. The expected completion date was within two years. The new entrance would improve the appearance of the front of the facility and encourage more interest from new businesses.

Mr. Burr recalled that many people at the public meetings expressed concern about demolishing on-site structures. Four of the 1942 buildings would be removed to allow trucks to maneuver in the area and for parking. The sheds at the west end of the Depot would be demolished within five years to open the area up for new, customized facilities. Building 209 would be demolished this year. Building 210, where the fiber optic facilities were, was scheduled for demolition, but the decision would be reevaluated if the DRC found a productive reuse for the building.

Mr. Burr explained the future plans for Dunn Field. He said the environmental cleanup would push the potential reuse of this part of the Depot well into the future. However, there was an area without environmental impacts in which the Park Commission was interested. The Park Commission requested that, as part of their public benefit transfer for community park space, the remainder of Dunn Field be retained by the Army until it was remediated. When it was cleaned to acceptable standards, the DRC would make it available through a competitive public sale.

Mr. Burr encouraged people to contact him at the DRC office to ask questions.

Mr. Burr added that the DRC anticipated 3,000-3,500 jobs would be generated at the site within the first five years. McAuley's Potpourri was the first sublease. They moved on-site with 300 jobs and were expected to add another 50-100 production line jobs.

Mr. Burr stated that 90 per cent of all former Depot employees lived within a 10-mile radius of the Depot. The DRC was working to repeat this pattern in the recruitment from the surrounding community for the potential jobs. He said the DRC anticipated a total of 4,500 future jobs for the site.

Mr. Burr said that community concerns were a priority in the planning process. In response to a concern regarding truck traffic, the DRC board required truck traffic access to be limited on both Perry Road and Ball Road, where most of the residences face the property. At this point, Mr. Burr concluded his formal presentation.

Mr. Williams asked if the Depot was under a master lease. Mr. Covington responded positively. Mr. Covington added that the implementation phase of the Redevelopment Plan was beginning. A development corporation must be in place to take ownership of the property and to negotiate the sale price with the Federal government.

Mr. Covington noted that the capital improvement budget involved Federal grant money, city bond money, and county bond money to start improvements to the facility. The Redevelopment Plan called for more than \$40 million in improvements throughout the next 15 years. The first phase would begin in summer 1998 with a road project and utility improvements at a cost of approximately \$4.5 million.

Mr. Covington added that marketing was to continue during the improvements. Early lease arrangements with the Federal government would be possible for State Technical Institute, the Police Department, and the Parks Commission. These agencies would lease the property and eventually buy it from the government.

The Police Department intended to occupy the site within two months and operate a full precinct with approximately 100 officers on staff. Mr. Covington considered this an example of how fast the Redevelopment Corporation was responding to leasing opportunities.

During the next phase of marketing, the DRC would contact companies that desire business property zoned light industrial with easy access to the airport and Interstate 240. Mr. Covington said the DRC estimated filling one building in the first year and was already ahead of their estimates for 1998, as MacAuley's Potpourri already occupied three buildings.

Mr. Williams asked if, under the master lease, the Federal government would monitor the property for the first five years. Mr. Covington responded that the Federal government would monitor for five years with an option to monitor for three five-year terms, up to a total of 20 years.

Mr. Williams asked who would incur the expense of demolishing the buildings and removing the rails. He also asked if any companies were offering employment to former Depot employees and if there were incentives offered to these companies for re-hiring former employees. Mr. Covington answered that the Redevelopment Plan called for the rails to be removed. It was possible that the planners would leave a spur line to service some light industry business that would benefit from this availability. The site would be zoned light industrial to allow for warehousing and light manufacturing. The Federal government had control of that activity through the lease.

Mr. Burr responded to Mr. Williams' question regarding hiring practices in favor of former Depot employees by stating that the Private Industry Council received a Federal grant for retraining former Depot employees. It was a significant incentive to help redirect Federal employees into the new jobs that would be available.

Mr. Williams asked if there were incentives offered to attract businesses to move onto the Depot property rather than other locations in the community.

Mr. Covington said he had received phone calls and had shown the facility every day. There was tremendous interest in the facility because of the proximity to the airport and the interstate as well as the gate guards/camera security. Also, as a government-owned property, the Depot did not pay property taxes and would not pass this expense onto the business through the lease. A business would pay less at the Depot than at other locations.

Mr. Williams asked if there was an inner-city tax break for companies to move into the city. Mr. Covington replied that incentives available through the Industrial Development Board were universal throughout the community.

Mr. Kaden said that meant the DRC would not have to lower prices to interest businesses to move on-site. Mr. Covington agreed. He said the goal was not to move jobs around the city but to bring new jobs and business expansions to the community.

Mr. Gray inquired about the monitored car-access security to the site and mentioned that he had noticed new access gates around the site. He asked if it was still possible to maintain this level of security. He noted that there had always been much mystery surrounding the facility because of 50 years of guard security. Mr. Burr said a new gate would be erected behind the police precinct and that the park/golf course area would have its own fencing. The perimeter of the industrial portion of the site would be altered.

Mr. Gray asked if all gates would be monitored 24-hours a day. Mr. Burr stated that the tenants seemed to want the security. Mr. Covington said the area of the police precinct would become a ward and that the gate and perimeter fencing would be maintained. He added that the streets and other improvements would be designed to city standards.

Mr. Clay asked for clarification on how the DRC generated money. He said he understood from Mr. Burr's presentation that property would be sold to the U.S. Department of Parks and Recreation. Mr. Covington replied that the Federal government dealt with each area individually and that the purchase would be negotiated between each agency. The DRC would buy the remainder. The sale price would be reduced by the worth of the property purchased through the other Federal agencies.

Mr. Clay summarized that the DRC was to make money based on the leasing of the remaining property. Mr. Covington agreed.

Mr. Clay asked if the city would provide money for landscaping and when would it be available. Mr. Covington said the money would come from the city. He said landscaping would be an ongoing activity over the next 15 years. Specific landscaping would depend on the order of other improvement projects at the site. He said it would not be useful to landscape an area that required future roadway or other capital improvements.

Mr. Clay said that the neighbors near the Depot should have an immediate visual improvement. Mr. Covington agreed that this was a priority. Some landscaping would be done in the first two years, while other improvements would be made on a five-year timeline.

Mr. Clay said he noticed on Mr. Burr's map of Dunn Field that the area slated to become parkland included a portion of the contaminated land. Mr. Burr responded that the northeast corner of the property was not the location of the burial sites. Mr. Kaden agreed. Mr. Clay stated that, according to other maps he had viewed, he believed the plume crossed into that area. Mr. Kaden said that Dunn Field was not yet clean and there was work still to be done. He said the plume contamination was not in area referred to by Mr. Clay, but in a lower area of Dunn Field.

Mr. Jordan explained that the contamination was in subsurface groundwater, 40-80 feet deep, and would not affect any surface activity. Mr. Clay asked if the Depot would undertake any remediation of the contamination prior to the land being transferred. Mr. Kaden said the groundwater pump and cleanup project was already in progress and was established down gradient from the proposed parkland area.

Mr. Eugene Brayon asked if the fencing would be maintained at the installation. Mr. Covington replied that fencing, gatehouses, and camera monitoring would continue.

Ms. Hooks said that she was an ex-officio (non-voting) member of the Depot Redevelopment Corporation. She said that she would ensure the DRC provided the RAB with regular updates. She also gave her assurance that the city would budget for landscaping to be accomplished in the fiscal year beginning in July 1998.

Ms. Hooks mentioned that the city engineer and City of Memphis were not eager to take over any property for public open space until they were certain there was not a contamination problem. She noted that the golf course remained a key concern for cleanup. She said her position on the DRC was a factor in her involvement on the RAB.

Mr. Kaden noted that Mr. Covington and Mr. Burr would be available at the Depot Redevelopment Corporation booth at the Information Session and would address further questions after the RAB meeting.

Mr. Kaden asked members of the public to sign in on the sign-in sheet. The Depot would mail minutes from the meeting and future information notices to each person on the list.

Environmental Program Update

Mr. Kaden introduced Mr. Shawn Phillips who presented a brief update on the Depot's environmental program.

Mr. Phillips circulated copies of a glossary of acronyms for reference during his presentation. He noted that the Depot's display in the Information Session outlined the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process -- the step-by-step process guiding the environmental program. An information sheet was also available at the display.

Program History

Mr. Phillips said the Depot's environmental program began with an installation assessment in 1981. Scientists from the U.S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHMA) conducted a detailed investigation that consisted of interviews with former employees, review of site records, and an examination of aerial photography to identify the locations where waste may have been disposed, buried, or spilled. Throughout the 1980s, several studies were conducted that were smaller in scope, such as hydrogeologic studies and groundwater monitoring.

Mr. Brayon asked why the Depot began the studies. He asked if there was an emergency that required the studies. Mr. Phillips explained that on a national level the Department of Defense (DOD) began the Installation Restoration Program in response to the EPA's Superfund Program. Under that mandate, the Federal government was required to conduct an initial environmental assessment of each DOD facility. The initial evaluation indicated environmental conditions that warranted further investigation. In October 1992, the EPA added the Depot to the National Priorities List (NPL) to ensure completion of the cleanup program at the Depot.

Mr. Brayon suggested the government would not usually move in such a way unless something fatalistic happened. Mr. Kaden responded that the government 'woke up' to environmental issues at that time.

Mr. Jordan suggested that the government became more aware of their own environmental impact at the same time the entire nation was appreciating that activities had a greater impact than expected.

Ms. Peters added that the government used to dispose surplus or waste material rather than selling it. She cited appliances and paint as examples of disposed materials.

Mr. Phillips continued to review the historical perspective of the environmental program:

- 1990 - The EPA's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Assessment (RFA) reviewed the solid waste management units on the facility. The RFA provided the environmental staff information on sites that were to be reviewed.
- 1990 - An initial Remedial Investigation (RI) included limited sampling. Mr. Phillips said he considered this the Site Investigation (SI) in which research data and anecdotal evidence were reviewed and samples taken to confirm if the sites existed.
- 1991 - EPA scored the Depot using the Hazard Ranking System. The Depot's score was over the threshold limits, and the Depot was placed on the NPL.
- 1994 - The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was established. A technical review committee had been meeting for approximately six months before being converted into a RAB by the addition of community members from the surrounding neighborhoods.
- 1995 - A Chemical Warfare Materials Archives Search Report was produced.
- 1995 - The Federal Facilities Agreement was signed by the State of Tennessee, the EPA, and the Depot.
- 1995 - The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) announcement was made public.
- 1995 - The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) workplans were completed and approved by the EPA and TDEC.
- October 1995 - Background sampling was conducted.
- November 1995 - ATSDR conducted a Public Health Assessment.
- December 1995 - A BRAC Cleanup Team was formed for the facility, including representatives from the EPA, TDEC, and the Depot. This team was formed to review the cleanup and potential reuse of the Depot property.
- May 1996 - The Record of Decision (ROD) for the groundwater recovery system at Dunn Field was signed.

- January 1997 - Sampling on the main installation at remedial investigation, screening, and BRAC sites was completed.

Current Activities

Mr. Phillips said that draft soil sampling data was received in the Spring 1997. The BCT reviewed the data to determine which parcels of property were clean, which would be redeveloped earlier than originally anticipated, and which were required to stay within the cleanup program for further remedial investigation.

A contract to perform a Preliminary Risk Evaluation was awarded to CH2M Hill in December 1997 and work had begun.

Mr. Phillips said the first seven recovery wells of the groundwater collection system at Dunn Field were currently being installed.

He said the compound Dieldrin was discovered during sampling on the eastern portion of the main installation. The results were not available for this meeting, but TDEC and the Tennessee Department of Health were working to resolve the environmental issues in the impacted area. The Depot was working with toxicologists from EPA and TDEC to determine the cleanup standards for Dieldrin.

MIFA indicated that their need for housing was urgent and that they did not wish to wait for the overall Dieldrin issue to be resolved by the EPA toxicologist. As an interim solution, the Depot initiated a shallow soil removal project to skim off the top six to 12 inches of soil and take out landscaping in the housing area. A chainlink fence would be installed around this area so MIFA's residents could not enter the other areas where Dieldrin was an issue.

1998 Execution Plan

Mr. Phillips described actions for the current program year:

- A preliminary risk evaluation was underway as the first step of evaluating compound levels that would require cleanup.
 - The remedial investigation for the main installation was under contract.
 - A Dieldrin specific risk evaluation with TDEC and EPA was initiated.
 - The Dunn Field interim remedial action for the groundwater was underway.
- Mr. Phillips suggested that RAB members and the public talk with Mr. Steve Offner, OHM Remediation Services project manager and geologist, who would explain how water behaved underground.

- Parsons Engineering Sciences began the chemical warfare materiel site characterization and was in the field last week conducting a non-invasive geotechnical survey looking for buried metal. The results of their work were expected to confirm if removal of any identified chemical warfare materiel from Dunn Field was necessary before initiating the remedial investigation for Dunn Field.
- The RI/FS for Dunn Field was planned (pending chemical warfare materiel site characterization).
- The pre-construction activities for the early removal action for Dieldrin at the housing area were underway.
- Early removals for up to three additional sites were planned and candidates were being considered.
- Contract actions to remove the two underground storage tanks at the fueling station on the main installation had begun. The tanks must be removed before the Memphis Police Department would take occupancy of the property.

Mr. Phillips noted that the Depot Environmental Team began their 1998 project year on October 1, 1997. Two-thirds of the above items had been awarded to a contractor. Mr. Phillips said the remedial investigation of Dunn Field would occur toward the end of the project year, in August or September. Ms. Dorothy Richards clarified that it had been moved up to March 1998, but that residents would not see field workers right away. The cleanup team needed to revise and update the workplans that had been approved in 1995.

Ms. Peters asked if the soil to be removed at the houses was contaminated and if six inches would be enough to remove the problem. Mr. Phillips explained that the Depot's sampling showed levels of Dieldrin around the housing units that was more than the EPA's allowable levels for residential areas. He said that an effective and expedient solution was to remove a uniform six inch layer of soil including bushes and shrubs. Sampling would determine if enough soil was removed or if another six inches of soil should be removed.

Ms. Peters asked how the soil would be disposed. Mr. Phillips replied that there were hazardous waste landfills that accepted pesticide contaminated soil. He added that a regulated landfill would contain the soil.

Ms. Peters asked if six inches would be enough. Mr. Kaden responded that they would start with six inches and that they would remove more soil if high levels of compounds were found below six inches.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Safranski Durr asked if the minor sampling of the water table (as referred to by Mr. Phillips) was really minor. Mr. Phillips confirmed that he meant 'early' sampling and stated the sampling program was extremely important.

Mr. Durr asked if the Depot had considered the contamination to the neighbors' property through airborne pesticides. Mr. Phillips stated that the Depot was being advised by toxicologists and scientific consultants to consider all aspects of potential contamination. He stated that Dieldrin was not common to national Superfund sites and therefore, specific cleanup guidelines were lacking. He said the Depot was seeking scientific information to assist in their cleanup strategy.

Mr. Durr referred to the neighbors outside of the Depot property and asked whether the Depot gave priority to the houses where no one lived or the homes where people currently resided. He said he grew up in the area and remembered chemical spraying on the golf course and material that floated in the air.

Mr. Phillips commented that he would be very interested in getting more information about Mr. Durr's concerns and what he remembered. His recollection would assist the Depot in expanding the remediation program. Mr. Kaden stated that the Depot staff needed to hear what the residents had experienced over the years so the cleanup team could incorporate this knowledge into the program.

Mr. Durr noted that the Federal government should not only clean up what was inside the Depot fence but also what might have come onto the residents' property from the site.

Mr. Kaden stated that the Depot staff had heard rumors about migrating contamination and off-site dumping, but people were hesitant to step forward with real information about what they had seen, experienced, or heard from others. This information was valuable to the Depot staff so that potential contamination could be identified.

Mr. English stated that it should be very obvious if the contamination had spread off-site to the adjoining neighborhood. He said it was unlikely that pesticide contamination had spread very far because its chemical nature was to bind to soil and grass, but if the contamination had migrated off-site, it would be tracked down. Mr. English said he was interested in any information Mr. Durr had that would help them understand and track down the pathways.

Rev. Jessie Briggs asked to what depth would the Depot remove contaminated soil at the houses and what the consequences were if it was never removed. Mr. Torres explained that Dieldrin was a chemical that had undergone significant testing and analysis. Analytical results concluded that the compound had probably remained within the first foot of soil. He noted that the EPA toxicologist had previously spoken to the RAB about Dieldrin.

Mr. Torres offered Rev. Briggs a phone number to call and receive more information about the properties of Dieldrin and other science-based information. Mr. Torres explained that the nature of Dieldrin attracted it to organic matter, specifically soil, and that Dieldrin had limited mobility through the ground. He said the EPA toxicologist and the Depot's environmental engineering consultant, CH2M Hill, recommended that up to six inches of soil be removed. He said they would test the remaining soil, and if unacceptable concentrations still existed, another layer would be removed. If the compounds persisted at lower layers, a new solution would have to be considered.

Mr. Kaden added that this method was just the beginning of the process and that the Dieldrin would be addressed. He said the Depot would pursue the matter until it had been remediated.

Mr. English added his assurances that the state would not allow contamination to exist where people could be exposed to unhealthy levels.

Mr. Durr asked how residents could help track down the contamination if engineers couldn't track it down. Mr. Kaden replied that the Depot had heard stories that former employees had dumped off-site, but the cleanup team had no information about what may have been dumped or where. He said residents could assist by informing the Depot staff of anything they witnessed or heard in the past about bad environmental practices. Mr. Durr noted that because people were generally not knowledgeable about causes and paths of contamination, they did not know how to assist or what kind of information the Depot needed. Mr. Durr said residents needed to be educated about how certain contamination could be spread.

Mr. Kaden said the Depot had already discussed these issues with residents and had held information sessions and public meetings. He said he hoped people would not feel uncomfortable calling the Depot, ATSDR, EPA, TDEC, and other agencies with any question.

Mr. Durr asked how the Depot planned to inform people who could not come to meetings, such as the elderly. He asked if there would be block teams and house-to-house visits. Mr. Kaden commented on the opportunity to meet with block leaders to pass information to them saying the Depot was looking for better ways to circulate new information about the environmental program and get feedback from as many residents as possible.

Ms. Bradshaw introduced herself and said the environmental group, the Concerned Citizen's Committee, could help deliver information to the community. She stated that she believed details of the environmental cleanup were only mildly touched on during the RAB meetings.

Ms. Bradshaw said the CCC had asked that a scientist chosen by the community be funded by DOD, but that the request had been denied. The particular scientist from Atlanta was well known to EPA and other agencies. Mrs. Bradshaw said the community needed someone they trusted. She said that the laboratories doing the testing, CH2M Hill and the Corps of Engineers, could not be trusted by the community. She said the community was alone and suffering because of decisions made in the favor of DOD.

Ms. Bradshaw added that the community expected DOD to be a good neighbor. She asked officials to make decisions alongside members of the community about what the people wanted done in their community.

Ms. Bradshaw asked for the demographic split between black and Caucasian people who were members of the Redevelopment Corporation Board. Mr. Covington replied that the board consisted of 4 black people and 4 white people and added that the chairman was a white man. Ms. Bradshaw said that when she attended a meeting she saw 24 white males. Mr. Covington said that the meeting attended by Ms. Bradshaw was a Planning Board meeting and that the Redevelopment Corporation Board was a different body. He said the Planning Board was a committee for planning, and the Redevelopment Corporation Board was a different group of people. Ms. Bradshaw commented that no one from the impacted area, specifically within a mile radius, was on the Redevelopment Corporation Board.

Ms. Bradshaw asked how many people from the impacted area of a half mile to a mile would be hired by the tenant companies. She disagreed that 10 miles was an appropriate range for considering who had been impacted. Mr. Covington stated that the Private Industry Council, the agency that counseled employees at the Depot, would continue to work with new industries as they came on the site so they would consider former Depot employees for new employment. Ms. Bradshaw asked again for the number of people who would be employed by the companies and wondered if criteria had been established to get the people inside the impacted area employed at the new businesses. Mr. Covington stated that although there was no set number of people to be employed, it was the intention of the Private Industry Council to contact former employees about potential jobs.

Ms. Bradshaw announced that ATSDR and a group of citizens would meet with community health agencies and each agency involved with the Depot cleanup at the Memphis Health Center on February 27, 1998. She invited all members of the public to attend. She noted that the DDMT-CCC would participate and tell the agencies what the community wanted, needed, and expected from the environmental cleanup at the Depot. Ms. Bradshaw said she felt that nothing had been done to help the impacted, poor, black community and that it was an environmental justice issue. She said she felt the community had been overlooked.

Mr. Gray corrected the location of the February 27 meeting and stated that the meeting would be held at the Memphis City School Board auditorium.

Mr. Phillips said that more information would be available at the Information Session from the represented agencies, including the DDMT-CCC.

Mr. Torres stated that if anyone wanted information on the Superfund program and sites, they could speak with representatives at the EPA booth following the meeting.

Ms. Bradshaw said Mr. Torres' words are too long and people did not know what he was talking about. She said people in the community did not know what Superfund was. She said she understood, but asked that the information he presented be broken down into more simple terms for people to understand.

Mr. Kaden closed the meeting by stating that the Depot was a neighbor and that the staff was very concerned about health issues that related to the Depot. He also said the Depot was not the only Superfund site or military site being closed and that the government was spending billions of dollars across the country. He said there were certain rules the government followed to ensure a thorough cleanup was accomplished. He said that, while some members of the community did not trust the results, the Depot followed very strict guidelines on how they sampled and tested and which labs were qualified to analyze samples. Mr. Kaden explained that there was not an avenue where money could be given directly to the community.

Mr. Kaden outlined the agenda items for meetings in March and April. At the March 19 meeting, RAB members would learn about field sampling and quality assurance techniques. Presentations on relative risk and Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) were scheduled for the April 26 meeting.

Mr. Kaden said he would describe a program which might help to address issues of trust at the April meeting. TAPP would provide funds to the RAB, and the RAB members would decide if there was an issue that should be addressed, such as sampling data or document review. An independent contractor hired by the RAB on behalf of the community would be one possible use of the funds. The amount available was \$25,000 per project and up to \$100,000 over the lifetime of the cleanup. Mr. Kaden said community members should express their thoughts on how this money could be applied to the Depot cleanup activities. He stated that an independent review could support the work at the Depot and show that the government was doing things correctly.

Mr. Durr asked how he could contact the members of the RAB. Mr. Kaden noted that the Depot published an information newsletter, sent to approximately 5,000 homes, that included a profile of a RAB member in each issue. A contact list was also available at each Information Repository location.

Ms. Jennifer Hall stated that copies of the RAB member contact list were available at the Information Session. She suggested community members ask for this list as they entered the cafeteria.

Mr. English stated that it was the community representatives on the RAB who would make the decision on how to spend the TAPP money, not the regulators who sat on the RAB. He encouraged members of the public to speak with the community RAB members, attend the presentations at which the program and contamination were reviewed, or call any of the agency offices for additional information on the cleanup program.

Mr. English reminded the RAB to consider the use of the TAPP funds wisely, so the money would do the most good.

Mr. Gray commented that another five or six years were forecast for the cleanup. He noted that there was already a lengthy four-year history for the RAB but that RAB members understood it would be a 10-15 year process. He recognized that it was a frustrating and long process, but he urged people to stay involved throughout the cleanup.

Mr. Kaden noted that the RAB was working well together. He said most RABs met quarterly. He explained that his headquarters had asked if it was necessary that the Memphis Depot RAB meet monthly. He said he believed there was sufficient information to review and that monthly meetings were warranted, but the RAB should determine how often they needed to meet. Community members on the Board considered it worth while to meet on a monthly basis.

Mr. Kaden thanked Mr. Torres for traveling from Atlanta to represent the EPA at RAB meetings and Mr. Clay for deciding to travel from Nashville.

Mr. Ed Bradley asked if there was a timetable for the cleanup of all the Army sites in the country. Mr. Kaden confirmed there was a timetable for the base closures. The Memphis Depot was closed in 1997. However, other sites were closed earlier, and there would probably be more base closures in the future. He said that the cleanup of a base could take five years in some cases but in other instances it could take 15 years, depending on the type of contamination that was present.

Ms. Hooks stated that she was the Memphis City Council representative on the RAB. She said she lacked a technical knowledge of the Depot cleanup, but if community members wanted to contact her council office for assistance in obtaining information about the cleanup, her staff would assist to ensure a written answer was provided. She also stated her staff would help community members contact the agencies with the best information to address their questions.

Meeting Adjourned.

Next Meeting to be held:

Thursday, March 19, 1998

6:00 - 7:30 p.m.

The Depot, Commander's Conference Room

2163 Airways Boulevard, Memphis

Attendance List Restoration Advisory Board Members

Mr. Glenn Kaden	Facility Co-Chair
Mr. Mondell Williams	Community Co-Chair
Mr. Dave Bond	Citizen Representative
Mr. Eugene Brayon	Citizen Representative
Ms. Elizabeth Young	Citizen Representative
Ms. Johnnie Mae Peters	Citizen Representative
Mr. John Garrison	Citizen Representative
Mr. Carter Gray	Memphis/Shelby County Health Department
Ms. Willie Mae Willett	Citizen Representative
Mr. Ramon Torres	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Jordan English	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)
Mr. Kevin Clay	Citizen Representative
Ms. Jacqueline Smith for Dr. Cleo Kirk	Shelby County Commission
Ms. Janet Hooks	Memphis City Council

Others In Attendance

Mr. Russell Ray Anderson	Citizen
Mr. Ed Bradley	Citizen
Ms. Doris Bradshaw	Concerned Citizen's Committee (CCC)
Rev. Jesse Briggs	Citizen
Mr. Gene Burr	Depot Redevelopment Corporation (DRC)
Mr. Jim Covington	Depot Redevelopment Corporation (DRC)
Mr. Safranski Durr	Citizen
Mr. Shawn Phillips	Memphis Depot Caretaker
Ms. Jackie Manuel	TDEC
Mr. Terry Templeton	TDEC
Ms. Pam Gowdy	Memphis Depot Caretaker
Ms. Jennifer Hall	Frontline Corporate Communications, Inc.
Ms. Carolyn Haugebook	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Justin Jones	Citizen
Mr. Mike Lee	Memphis Depot Caretaker
Mr. Benjamin Moore	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)
Mr. Willie Moore Jr.	Citizen
Ms. Dorothy Richards	U.S. Army Engineering - Huntsville Support Center
Ms. Janice Smith	Citizen
Mr. Maurice Smith	Citizen
Ms. Kelly Spearman	U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine (CHPPM)
D.M. Gray	Citizen
Westley James	Citizen

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE