



# THE MEMPHIS DEPOT TENNESSEE

---

## ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 32/

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Restoration Advisory Board**  
**June 18, 1998**  
**Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee**  
**Commander's Conference Room**

**The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on June 18, 1998 at the Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee (DDMT) in the Commander's Conference Room. The attendance list is attached.**

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

1 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Good afternoon, everyone. I guess we are about ready to open the  
2 meeting for the June meeting. We are moving right along, so I hope  
3 everybody had a nice time since the last time that we met. So we will get  
4 started here.

5 **OLD BUSINESS**

6 **MEETING MINUTES REVIEW**

7 **MR. WILLIAMS:** I was wondering if anyone had any problems with the minutes that were  
8 sent to you in the mail and everyone had a chance to read them.

9 **MS. YOUNG:** I just wanted to make a comment. I thought they were terribly lengthy.  
10 You are going to lose people halfway through them. There is going to be  
11 a lot of stuff they are not going to read. You read a few pages, and then  
12 you say, oh, no.

13 **MR. PHILLIPS:** Before we jump into the RAB, I need to make a couple of administrative  
14 comments. Again, if you would mention your name before you start to  
15 speak. One thing I wanted to go into this month's minutes to kind of close  
16 the loop from something that was outstanding from last week. At the very  
17 last part of the meeting during the public comments session, a comment  
18 was raised by Ms. Delois Davis. It was not responded to during the forum  
19 of the meeting. We adjourned before anyone responded to it. I just  
20 wanted to point out that Mr. Benjamin Moore from the Agency for Toxic

Substances and Disease Registry, Ms. Tiki Whitfield from the Environmental Protection Agency and John DeBack and myself from the Depot spent a half an hour with Ms. Davis after the RAB meeting, and we talked to her about her concerns. And ATSDR invited her to their availability session. I just wanted that to go on the record. Again, mention your name, especially if you are not a RAB board member and we might not know who you are, okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Were you through, Ms. Young?

MS. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. ENGLISH: Relative to Ms. Young's comments about the minutes, I understand they are lengthy. And they are lengthy. The problem we had, at least the problem that I perceived with the way the minutes were being recorded, we weren't getting all the information down that was critical. I know it looks painful to review this. But what I do when I look at it, to be honest with you, is I look to what was stated that I said, and I want to verify that that is correct. And then if there are any elements of discussion that are critical that I want to go back and review, I have pretty much verbatim information that describes exactly what happened.

I am not putting a full review on this when I look at it. I am hoping everyone involved looks at their comments to make sure that the minutes are correct. I know it is a painful thing to do it this way, but it seems to me it is the best way to give a complete record. I wouldn't say that any of us have to review all the minutes unless we have problems with every element that occurred. I am just speaking out loud there.

MS. YOUNG: Jordan, I do understand that. But for people who miss a meeting, and I was not here at the last one, I had to read it in order to know what was going on. And, then again, if people don't read the minutes and, you know, to see what is truly in there, how in the world can they motion to accept them with no corrections or anything? So you really need to look at what

everybody is saying to see if that was truly the way it came out. I had to say that. It is just too long. But if that is the way it has got to be, I can certainly live with it. I just wanted somebody to know I thought they were too long.

MR. ENGLISH: I agree they are long, and it is painful. I hope we can work this the way the BCT works, sort of work as a partnership. And we kind of trust each other to look out for each other's comments. I do understand when you miss a meeting, you miss a lot. But a paraphrasing of what went on might not be complete enough for someone who misses a meeting.

MS. YOUNG: It wouldn't be.

MR. ENGLISH: That was the concern I had, some of the information wasn't being recorded accurately and completely. If somebody wants to move to do something different.

MS. YOUNG: No. We don't want to do anything to it. I was just sharing my feelings.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyone else have any comments about the minutes of the meeting? If not, can I get approval of the minutes of the meeting. Everyone approve?

MR. ENGLISH: So moved.

MS. YOUNG: Second.

MR. WILLIAMS: The minutes are approved and seconded. So I turn the meeting over to Shawn so he can carry on.

MR. ENGLISH: Excuse me, was anything ever brought up about the minutes from the last meeting? Remember I made a comment about those at the BCT. I reviewed those more carefully, and I found out that there was a transcription error. I think the reporter may have gotten my word screen mistaken for the word stream. And we were just talking about an underground screen on a well, but the way it was recorded is underground stream. I wanted to make sure that everyone is aware there are not

underground streams as such. There is underground groundwater, but I was referring to the screen on the well for that purpose.

#### DRAFT RAB CHARTER REVIEW

MR. PHILLIPS: Two months ago we discussed revisiting the RAB charter and had a work group for that - Ms. Hooks, Ms. Young and Mr. Garrison. Ms. Young and Mr. Garrison took up, they had several meetings last month. We discussed it at last month's RAB meeting. They received a comment, correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: They received a comment. And they have re-established that. And I think they would like to talk about that and maybe see if the members would like to vote on accepting that tonight.

MS. YOUNG: The concern was about a RAB member appointing someone to come in their stead. The controversy came about of that person, who is being appointed instead to come in the RAB member's place, was appointing somebody to come in their place if they couldn't come, when they should have referred back to the member and said I cannot stand in for you today; you need to appoint someone else. But the person who was being appointed cannot, in turn, appoint somebody. That is covered on page 3, bottom paragraph, which carries over to the next page.

I really wish you would read it. We would like some comments. I hope it is clear enough. But that seemed to have been the only concern. And we hope we included everything else that you had mentioned heretofore concerning the charter. We know it is much longer than it was, but there were so many things that needed to be included, and we did that.

1 MS. PETERS: I think you all did a very good job because people need to have, you know,  
2 something clear so they will know in which direction to go in and this  
3 won't happen again with somebody else appointing somebody else. I think  
4 it is clear about how many meetings you miss before they drop you and like  
5 that. I feel like if you can't come to the meetings, if you are sick or  
6 something, that is a difference. But you shouldn't just be on a board and  
7 never come to a meeting.

8 I think that is clear now where people will understand. People won't say  
9 they put me off. And how you can get on this board, that is clear, where  
10 people won't have to say they won't let me in and I stay right by the  
11 Depot. It is clear how you get on, how you get off, and what you do once  
12 you get on. I think it is real good.

13 MR. BRAYON: There are two things that I would like to comment on, and it may have  
14 been commented on. I got here late last time. On page 2, the third  
15 paragraph, last two sentences, the DLA and Community Co-Chairs will  
16 alternate the responsibility for running each meeting; is that being done?

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Not at this time

18 MS. YOUNG: Not at this time. It was before.

19 MR. BRAYON: Will it be done? Do you want to include this or do you want to modify it  
20 so that you are in the spirit of the draft?

21 MR. WILLIAMS: I have no problem with it.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: I have no problem with that either. I think we are still in a state of flux. I  
23 think Mondell and I have talked maybe twice outside the RAB in the last  
24 two months. It has just been a matter of scheduling. But, no, I think that  
25 should definitely be kept in the charter.

1 MR. BRAYON: I was just thinking, you know, if whatever would work more smoothly  
2 with you, with the two of you. But if it is in here, we should do it. That is  
3 what I am saying. There is something else that I can't find right now.

4 MS. PETERS: I am trying to find out what are you saying, like Mondell opens the meeting  
5 and then who takes over after that.

6 MR. BRAYON: I will read to you. The draft says -- I am not saying it -- the draft is saying  
7 it. "The DLA and Community Co-Chairs will alternate the responsibility  
8 for running each meeting." That is not me. That is the draft.

9 MS. YOUNG: That means like, Ms. Peters, if Mondell runs the meeting today, next month  
10 Shawn will, okay. That means every other month they share the  
11 responsibility of running these meetings. The one person doesn't run them  
12 all the time.

13 MS. PETERS: I think it needs some clarification there if that is what you are saying,  
14 because Mondell could not be able to come to a meeting. And then what  
15 happens?

16 MS. YOUNG: That is different.

17 MS. PETERS: The other chair can't open the meeting?

18 MS. YOUNG: The other chair would have to open the meeting if he is not there. That  
19 goes without saying, that a vice-president and a president, if the president  
20 doesn't show up, the vice automatically takes the chair.

21 MS. PETERS: This is not what it says. This says two individual co-chairs. It doesn't say  
22 one is the chair and one is the co. It says two individual co-chairs, one  
23 appointed by the RAB members and the other one appointed by DLA.  
24 Community Co-Chairs would alternate the responsibility of running each  
25 meeting.

1 MS. YOUNG: What way could we say it to make people understand that if one is not  
2 here, the other automatically steps in his place. One of us wouldn't run the  
3 meeting.

4 MR. TRUITT: Let me just stick this in here, and we can go on. I believe that the broad  
5 range of responsibility for this committee is greater than any one person. I  
6 think they both have to do it. I think all we have to do is delete that line  
7 and say they will alternate because what we have had so far is the co-  
8 chairmen running the meeting as co-operators. So let's just delete that line,  
9 if I could make a motion to that effect, and that simplifies the thing.

10 MS. YOUNG: Delete it for what reason? Because you just said they would alternate and  
11 that is what the sentence says, that they will alternate. We can take it out if  
12 it is causing a problem.

13 MR. TRUITT: I think it is causing problems here. I could understand that they could  
14 alternate on different portions of the meeting, but everyone here seems to  
15 think it means alternate one meeting or the other.

16 MS. YOUNG: But they can co-chair, both of them, all meetings.

17 MR. TRUITT: What I am saying I don't think you need that line. That makes somebody  
18 on the outside, like these people come in, and two different people will  
19 interpret it in two different forms.

20 MS. YOUNG: That is true.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: What is your motion?

22 MR. TRUITT: My motion is just to simply delete that line. It doesn't add to nor take from  
23 that particular paragraph.

24 MR. ENGLISH: I was going to say that this was the work of the subcommittee to draft a  
25 charter. And then it is for everyone else to make comment to. I really  
26 think we can better make comment to the draft charter by writing in our  
27 suggested language or writing in what we think our problems are with it,



and let it go back to the subcommittee for another revision or another version or whatever and let this process work that way. I think everybody has valid points, and I think everybody just wants to make it explicitly clear.

MR. TRUITT: I withdraw my motion.

MR. ENGLISH: I personally believe the way it has worked where the chairs sort of share the responsibility for the meeting has worked. So I will let the community members decide how it will go. My suggestion is to provide a written response or discussion with Ms. Young or the other people on that committee to try to solve that problem.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think that is a good suggestion. So if anyone has any suggestions on anything that needs to be inputted into the charter --

MR. BRAYON: Question for clarification, on page 3, section 4: Community members shall serve for a minimum of twelve months. And I presuppose there is no maximum, right?

MS. YOUNG: Unless you all want it to be.

MR. BRAYON: That is why I brought it up. Do you think we should have a maximum?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't think we should, but, like she said, if you want, you can write in a suggestion. That might be something that you probably need to address.

MR. BRAYON: The language is kind of interesting, minimum of 12-month term, minimum of 12-month term, which means that if you stop before that 12 months, you will have a severe penalty.

MS. YOUNG: The penalty would be that you are just off the board.

MR. ENGLISH: The intent is to provide continuity to the board.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is on page 3, paragraph 4.

1 DR. SPARIOSU: I kind of like that. I think it just, what it does is convey the fact that this is  
2 a serious kind of thing. We want people, when they express interest and  
3 want to be on the board, to recognize that, you know, we expect that kind  
4 of time and dedication.

5 MR. BRAYON: I am clarified.

6 MR. GARRISON: I am looking at the minutes of the former meeting. And I am reading here,  
7 it says: "There must be — these comments." I asked you all to read them  
8 and look at them very carefully. I said, "this is your charter, and this is  
9 going to govern the way the RAB does its business." And the deadline,  
10 maybe y'all, with the holiday took too long or whatever, forgot to  
11 read it. I said they must be in by June 11th. and Mr. Williams was the only  
12 one. But it can be, just like Mr. English said, if anybody wants to, before  
13 we adopt this thing, get them in a week ahead before July the 18th. I don't  
14 know what date it is.

15 MS. PETERS: July the 16th.

16 MS. BRADSHAW: My name is Doris Bradshaw. I am sitting in for Kevin Clay. Something  
17 that Jordan English stated. It has been awhile. Would you clarify what  
18 you were talking about the charter?

19 MR. ENGLISH: I just made the suggestion awhile back that the process usually works,  
20 until the charter is adopted, regardless of whatever suspense date was set  
21 for everyone making comments, until the charter is adopted, I am sure that  
22 everyone could make comment. And I think the best way for it to happen  
23 is to happen in writing so we don't take up our meeting time here and the  
24 things that are on our agenda here with the charter. We can do it in writing  
25 or with one-on-one contact with the subcommittee members that are on the  
26 committee to deal with the charter to make those suggestions to them.  
27 That would be a more efficient way to do it where it won't take up the  
28 entire board's time.

1 MS. BRADSHAW: What you were talking about with the two co-chairs alternating, you  
2 know, I am a community member, but sitting in for Kevin, I think that is  
3 better, because in the last meetings that we had, the facility co-chair ran the  
4 meeting all the time. Mondell just looked at the minutes, approved them  
5 and that was it. It was just like a show. So I think that way, whoever is  
6 the co-chair for the community will have a larger input.

7 MS. YOUNG: As one of the people working on this charter, I would really like, if you all  
8 have anything that you want incorporated in this charter or changes to be  
9 made, please put it in writing and see that Denise or somebody here gets it  
10 so we can work on this again. And we really don't need to keep bouncing  
11 round the table.

12 MR. TRUITT: Exactly.

13 MS. YOUNG: We need to call this to a close and move on to the next agenda.

14 MS. BRADSHAW: One more comment before you close it out. And I also think that on the  
15 RAB's chair and co-chair, this information and the structure should comply  
16 with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and so we need to kind of keep  
17 that in mind, that it must be, it must comply or either it will be illegal.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks for that comment, Ms. Bradshaw. We are going to try to set up a  
19 new deadline to get this information back in again. And we can throw it  
20 around the room one more time. What time frame do you think would be  
21 a feasible time frame?

22 MS. YOUNG: In the next couple of weeks, whatever the date may be. I don't have a  
23 calendar. But the next couple of weeks, whatever information you would  
24 like incorporated.

25 MR. PHILLIPS: The last week of the month begins on the 29th and the 30th. That  
26 following Thursday is the day before, or the following Friday is the day  
27 before 4th of July, July 3rd. Maybe you could set that as the deadline.

MS. YOUNG: This is half the month. They ought to have it in by then.

2 MR. PHILLIPS: By the 30th?

3 MS. YOUNG: Yes.

4 MR. PHILLIPS: That is by the 30th, the last Tuesday of the month.

5 MS. YOUNG: If you just can't get it in by then, call one of us. Call me or call John and  
6 say look on page so and so, pay attention to that, change the wordage or  
7 something. But let us know what you want changed because you have had  
8 them a month. We didn't know. We thought you liked them.

9 MR. BRAYON: I was responding to co-chair. He asked for a comment.

10 MS. YOUNG: That is okay. You need to. You needed to do it and get it in the open and  
11 let people know. There are some concerns, and I appreciate what I have  
12 heard. We are certainly going to work on those that I heard.

#### 13 DUNN FIELD CANISTER REPORT

14 MR. PHILLIPS: I would like to open up the discussion that we began back in March with  
15 canisters that OHM found at Dunn Field. The agenda has it all being with  
16 Ms. Dorothy Richards, but I have a bit of discussion to open the  
17 conversation with I don't know if you noticed, we had technical problems  
18 getting started tonight with the overhead. It looks like they are solved. I  
19 may need the lights out. It probably would help a little bit.

20 What I am doing, Dorothy had done quite a bit of research on this project,  
21 Dorothy Richards from the Huntsville Corps of Engineers. But due to  
22 some significant misunderstandings, as we have heard back, about what  
23 happened with OHM, I thought I would put together a memorandum for  
24 the record. And they are available at the back, and all the RAB members  
25 have copies in front of them. This is roughly a two-page summary of the  
26 investigation, what was done. I wanted to step through it real quick before  
27 Dorothy gets up and relates some of her research.

Before OHM, who was installing the groundwater system at Dunn Field, before they started any intrusive work, they did a geophysical survey at the Northwest corner of Dunn Field along the fence line. This was to locate where their trench was going. And at two separate locations they saw some anomalies in the soil where the soil had been disturbed before. And these, they went in with a back hoe and did test pits to see what the disturbance was. In one of these areas they found concrete, you know, other debris, pieces of wood. But in one of these areas they found these smaller metal canisters, these items here.

Once they found that, they excavated along that part of the trench line and put all of that soil in which these small canisters were laying in the soil. They put that on top of a plastic liner and called TDEC to ask what type of analysis we should do to dispose of these. TDEC directed us what needed to be done. And that analysis is attached to this memorandum, the actual analysis sheet.

There were composite samples taken. And the samples went to two separate labs. One lab called General Physics is a lab that can do specialized environmental work. They did explosive analysis on the soil and canister mix. They also did chemical warfare materiel compound degradation products. The more traditional environmental analysis to determine if it was a hazardous waste or not, that went to an EPA approved lab. The first lab was EPA approved also. That lab was in Gaithersburg, Maryland. The second lab for the normal hazardous waste analysis was in Atlanta. It is also an EPA approved lab. The lab sheets that came back from the labs are attached. I wanted to put up a couple of those as an example.

This is one of the samples that went to Gaithersburg, Maryland. It is called GP Environmental Services. That is the name of the lab. This is one of the analysis sheets for explosives. I might point out this compound here is

2 Trinitrotoluene. You might have heard of it before, TNT. Some of these  
3 others are more exotic explosives, HMX and RDX. We analyzed for all of  
4 this sweep, and we did not detect anything. This is the results. BQL,  
Below Quantitation Level; we didn't see anything.

5 The more traditional, the hazardous waste analysis that was sent to the  
6 Atlanta lab. Here is a photocopy. Both of these sheets are in your  
7 package. The way this reads, these are the compounds on the left-hand  
8 side. This column in the middle is the actual results that we had. Then you  
9 have the detection limit, and then the regulatory value. If we exceeded this  
10 value on the far right, that would be a hazardous waste. We only had two  
11 detections. One was for lead. Let me point up here. Lead, point 8 (0.8).  
12 The regulatory limit is 5. We did not have an adequate amount there. And  
13 Tetrachloroethene, the regulatory limit was 0.7. We had .02.

14 After the analysis was received by the contractor, OHM, we forwarded it  
15 to the state. The state came out to the job site. He looked at the pile of  
16 soil that contained these canisters and sent us a letter. It is the last page of  
17 the attachment. That is the letter that directed us that said it was okay for  
18 us to take it either to the North Shelby Landfill, the BFI Landfill, or the  
19 South Shelby Landfill. We disposed of this. I am not sure at which of the  
20 two landfills we disposed of it.

21 At the end of this road we did this analysis. We knew what these things  
22 weren't, they were not hazardous. We were not sure what they were yet.  
23 So we started research. That research was successful at this point. Ms.  
24 Dorothy Richards did quite an exhaustive effort, and she is going to present  
25 you what she discovered.

26 MS. RICHARDS: Hello. My name is Dorothy Richards, and I am a project manager with the  
27 Huntsville Corps of Engineers. Here is another photograph. One thing  
28 you might be interested to know, these white pieces of paper that you see  
29 right here, they are actual notebook paper that are about this size. So if

1 you can compare this to that, you get an idea about the size of these  
2 canisters. They are slightly larger than a 35 - millimeter film canister. They  
3 are dark green. They are metallic. The only marking on them was:  
4 Discard 1955. And they each contained four small glass bottles with a  
5 black stopper.

6 So, as a result of the March BCT meeting, we initiated an action item to do  
7 a little bit more research to see if we could find out what these were. Here  
8 is another picture which is a little more detailed of what we've got. What I  
9 did as a result of that is I had these photographs scanned electronically, and  
10 I sent them via e-mail to two different agencies, Brooke Army Medical  
11 Center in Texas. Mr. Truitt had suggested that as one possible source. I  
12 also had them forwarded to U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and  
13 Preventive Medicine, otherwise known as USACHPPM near Aberdeen  
14 Proving Ground. I sent that out in April. I received two responses in May.

15 On May 12th I received a response from the Brooke Army Medical Center  
16 that they were not able to identify these. So, therefore, they weren't  
17 medically related. On March the 13th I received a package from  
18 USACHPPM stating that Tech Escort Unit had been able to identify these  
19 canisters as a component of a chemical detector kit for chemical agent.  
20 Nothing to be alarmed because a chemical detector kit itself does not  
21 contain chemical agent. It is just used in battlefield situations where  
22 soldiers who may be exposed to some sort of a gas attack, it would tell  
23 them if there is something they need to be concerned about, and it would  
24 tell them when it is safe for them to remove their gas mask under these  
25 types situations.

26 When I got the information from USACHPPM, there were three different  
27 things they sent to me. One was the technical memorandum from  
28 Edgewood Proving Ground dated October 1951. And this technical  
29 memorandum, if you will look at a fact sheet that was put together, there

1 are a couple of pictures in the back. You all may have this. It was on the  
2 table when you came in. This is an E16 kit, and this is an M9A kit. These  
3 photographs are from this technical manual, and it had some other  
4 information in the manual about these canisters.

5 If you will look on the next page, you can see the picture of the little  
6 canister with the four little bottles that it contains. If you will compare this  
7 to what we have in the photograph, I think it is a very close match. And I  
8 think it is safe to say that we found out what we had out there. In addition  
9 to this technical memorandum, USACHPPM forwarded me two  
10 memorandums. One was dated March 1956. And in this memorandum it  
11 said that headquarters was forwarding 1,080 components of this detector  
12 kit to Defense Depot Memphis because Defense Depot Memphis was the  
13 supply point for these components of this kits. Now, chemical agents were  
14 not tested here at the Depot, but this was just a supply point for those.

15 The second memorandum was dated June 1965. And this memorandum  
16 talks about how detector kits were made obsolete. They were superseded  
17 with a little bit more modern version of those kits. Now what I have got --  
18 one thing I want to mention also. I don't know if I mentioned this at the  
19 beginning. When OHM found these, I actually went out to the field with  
20 someone else from Huntsville Center, a guy by the name of Wilson Walters  
21 who is an expert in ordnance and chemical warfare materiel. We looked  
22 at these in the field, and Wilson made the following statement. He said: "I  
23 am not sure exactly what they are, but I can guarantee you that they are not  
24 chemical warfare materiel." So I wanted to add that.

25 I brought with me, this is a more modern version of what you have from  
26 this technical memorandum. Like I said, this is a kit that a soldier would  
27 take into battle. If there were some sort of an attack, the first thing they  
28 would do would be don their gas mask. Then they would take their air  
29 sampling bulb, what I have here. This is called a detector tube. They



would take one of these tubes. It is scored on either end, and they would break either end of this tube. They would place it in this. Then they would pump this 60 times to get an air sample drawn through. There is a small filter in here. You probably can't see it, but there is.

After they have pumped this for 60 times, they have various bottles that contain reagent. Now, to this reagent they would add this powdered substance. If you see this container I have here, it is about the size of I guess something you might get from the pharmacy, a prescription in. It has a white powder in there. This white powder is what we believe was contained in these little containers here. This has been identified by Missouri River Division of the Corps of Engineers as an oxidizer, something that if anybody has Polydent in their bathroom at home, they clean their dentures, that is an oxidizer. That is what we have here. So this is not considered to be of any possible threat.

But this would be added. And then after that, they add that, and they wait a minute. This detector tube would change a certain color. Depending on the color it changed, it would tell them what possible agent may have been released on the battlefield. Or, if it comes up clear, it tells the soldiers that it is safe for everyone to undon their gas mask. There is a museum near Anniston, Ft. McClellan, Alabama, an Army museum, and they have some of these kits, the older versions. And in the future I plan to go down, make a trip to Anniston, just see some of these kits. That is about all I have. Does anyone have any questions?

MR. ENGLISH: I was just going to say, take a camera.

MS. RICHARDS: Yes, I will take a camera.

MR. WILLIAMS: Any comments from the table?

MS. RICHARDS: If anyone wants to see this, I will be glad to show them to anyone.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: We will take a few minutes to open it up to the floor. Now, normally we  
2 wait until the end of the meeting to do that, but we will open it up now.  
3 Does anyone have any comments?

4 MR. BRADSHAW: My name is Kenneth Bradshaw. And I am on a Federal Advisory Board  
5 that deals with the demiliarization of stockpiled and non-stockpiled and  
6 chemical warfare weapons. And while you portrayed this as harmless and  
7 all of this, I just left Aberdeen Proving Ground where Colonel Libby is in  
8 charge of destroying all the chemical warfare weapons in the United States.  
9 And I disagree with the procedure that the Defense Depot did in handling  
10 this matter.

11 Although Colonel Libby attested to the people in court that the people  
12 were qualified to do this type of work, normally 95 percent of all of this  
13 type of work is done through his office. If it is not harmless, if it is  
14 considered to be non-stockpiled. If it is out on a rack or something like  
15 that at Anniston or Pine Bluff, it is stockpile weapon. And Colonel Libby  
16 is over all, if it is in the ground, he is in charge of installation and  
17 destruction of all the parts to it. I just want this comment for the record.  
18 This whole affair was not handled correctly. And it doesn't comply with  
19 Army guidelines at all. That is because DLA is in charge of this institution,  
20 and the rest of the Army, all other chemical warfare weapons, stockpiled  
21 and non-stockpiled, are handled by Colonel Libby's office. And I am on the  
22 National Advisory Board. I know for a fact it is not as harmless as you  
23 said.

24 MS. RICHARDS: This itself does not contain chemical agent. It is a detector kit to test for  
25 the presence of chemical agent.

26 MR. BRADSHAW: If it is in the ground and buried, it is considered a non-stockpiled weapon.  
27 That is by treaty that the United States has. It may be a matter of opinion  
28 to you or whatever, but U.S. treaty says if it is in the ground and been  
29 disposed of --

1 DR. SPARIOSU: I think, Mr. Bradshaw, that is the case if it contains any chemical agent at  
2 all. We have had the people from Aberdeen here. In fact, they just spoke  
3 to the RAB. We have had a couple of people here. In this case it does not  
4 contain any chemical agent. Technically, it is not a chemical warfare  
5 materiel. So it would be handled as any other potentially hazardous waste  
6 which is what the Depot did.

7 MR. BRADSHAW: Will you qualify that, that that is your opinion? Have you got some  
8 guidelines, or what are you referring to?

9 MS. RICHARDS: This is the technical memorandum.

10 DR. SPARIOSU: These should be distinguished from the chemical, the CAIS, the Chemical  
11 Agent Identification Sets, which do contain dilute solutions of chemical  
12 agents, and this would not be the proper way to handle those.

13 MR. BRADSHAW: Am I correct in assuming this was disposed of by a burial?

14 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

15 DR. SPARIOSU: Yes, it was.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Any other questions?

17 MS. PETERS: I just want to add, back in the 40s and 50s, you know, they buried  
18 everything. Trucks, you know, washing powder, anything that was  
19 considered old. And not necessarily so did it have to be a chemical if it was  
20 used for you to test to find out if something was in that area. At the time  
21 the soldiers were there, they had to have something, didn't they, you know,  
22 to protect themselves? So I am saying everything they had didn't have to  
23 be a chemical, did it? I am asking a question.

24 MR. PHILLIPS: No, it didn't.

25 MS. BRADSHAW: I heard you state that the white powder was an oxidizer.

26 MS. RICHARDS: Yes.

MS. BRADSHAW: Could you go into detail, what type of oxidizer, give a name for it?

MS. RICHARDS: I don't have that information here with me. I can provide that to Shawn so he can distribute that for the RAB. Would that be okay, Shawn?

MR. PHILLIPS: That is fine.

MS. RICHARDS: The use for this is considered denture cleansers, household and laundry detergents and antiseptics.

MS. BRADSHAW: Was this particular kit that was found, was that tested for that also? Did you test to see what type of oxidizer it was since you know what about it is?

MS. RICHARDS: Let me say what was found, what was uncovered at Dunn Field was empty probably because over being buried for 40 years and groundwater or rain water could have seeped through it. It was an oxidizing agent where once it got wet, it would have dissolved basically. So there was nothing there actually to really test. Shawn, if you want to.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just look at the sample results from the analysis OHM did and they detected very, very little.

MS. BRADSHAW: Little what?

MR. PHILLIPS: Did you see what I put up?

MS. BRADSHAW: But you stated that the canisters were intact. And what, it evaporated inside? You are saying it was intact and some of them were in very good condition. And I know the way canisters and things in the Army used years ago was dipped in lead, you know, paint. And you couldn't rust that with anything too much. That is what I am saying, if it was intact, how can it not be -- you know, can you give me some kind of explanation? You are kind of contradicting yourself.

MR. PHILLIPS: They were not intact.

MS. BRADSHAW: You said at one time some of them was in very good condition.

1 MR. PHILLIPS: Very few of them were intact. Most of them -- this is one of the better  
2 condition ones we had.

3 MS. BRADSHAW: But you had some that were definitely intact.

4 MR. PHILLIPS: Show the other photo. The other photos would be the best ones we found,  
5 and we dug through and picked those out. Those were the most intact that  
6 we could find. Most of them had been crushed when they were buried.

7 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Bradshaw.

8 MR. BRADSHAW: The discovery of these things in the ground was completely by surprise.  
9 The archives -- this goes right to the point. The archives are not reliable.  
10 From the environmental point of view whether there was a little in there or  
11 a lot or whatever is not the point. The point is you don't know what is  
12 buried over there, what has seeped into the groundwater and what  
13 potentially might have entered into our drinking water aquifer.

14 The fluvial aquifer is contaminated by DLA's own admission by chemicals  
15 and whatever. Our concern is the drinking water. And they got sand leaks  
16 which permit the flow of chemicals, water and everything into the drinking  
17 water aquifer. Now, we have been here almost three years concerned with  
18 the environment and human health. And all of these issues are minimized,  
19 trivialized and played like they are not important at all. And, just for the  
20 record, I don't think DLA, Defense Depot are complying with the laws in  
21 relation to human health and the environment, because this is an obvious  
22 violation of the law.

23 And the archives are so unreliable that they didn't know until they did  
24 testing over there. And I think the whole operation has been done sloppy  
25 and unprofessional. And I plan to make some kind of written complaint,  
26 especially about the RAB meetings when people can come in here and say  
27 nothing about the environment, nothing about the impact or nothing like  
28 that.

And we got representatives from the Tennessee Department of Environment, and their mission, if I read correctly, was to protect the human health and the environment. We got people from the Environmental Protection Agency here, and they are not advocate for anything for human health or the environment. They are here partial to the Defense Depot that keeps minimizing and trivializing all of these important issues here. I think that is deplorable.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Bradshaw, I think you made some good points there, but I guess we will move right on along. Ms. Richards said she will send the information to Shawn here to let you know exactly what was in the tubes. And we must continue with the agenda, but I think you made some good points.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### BCT REPORT/PROJECT UPDATE

MR. PHILLIPS: New business, that was further discussion on a topic that was brought up at the March meeting. For the rest of our meeting we have new business to discuss. I have two or three different items here to talk about next, and let me just jump right up with it. Today at the regular meeting of the BRAC Cleanup Team, we had a very productive meeting today. I wanted to go over generally some of the topics we discussed.

One, the first thing we did this morning was discuss doing an aerial photographic survey and interpretation report. The Army Terrain, TAC, Army Terrain.

MS. RICHARDS: Topographic.

MR. PHILLIPS: I will find the acronym out for it, but it is an agency of the Army that looks at aerial photographs and interprets soil disturbance, clearing, burrow pits, things like that. They have come up with a history of photographs for the Depot, including Dunn Field, that run from 1945 through 1990. And we are going to task them to put together a photographic survey report. And

1 we talked about a schedule with them today, and we would like to do a  
2 presentation in the October time frame to the RAB of that survey report.  
3 They think they will be done by then.

4 We also spoke about the Dunn Field remedial investigation. This has been  
5 awarded. A little bit later in the presentation I have some of the cost  
6 figures that Mr. Carter Gray was asking about out at Dunn Field last  
7 month. You will see that that remedial investigation for Dunn Field has  
8 been awarded. We also got an update on the site investigation that Parsons  
9 Engineering is going to do for chemical warfare materiel at Dunn Field, and  
10 that field work should begin now in August. That is what the most recent  
11 update of that is.

12 The Housing Removal Action, which is at like zero to 12 inch shallow soil  
13 removal due to pesticide contamination at the housing area, that is going to  
14 start up next week. They are going to do their preliminary sampling and  
15 put up a fence around the site next week. And, possibly, if there is still  
16 work going on at next month's RAB meeting, we might take -- it is directly  
17 adjacent to the building here -- we might take 10 or 15 minutes and walk  
18 down there to look at their work progress next month.

19 Mr. Jordan English discussed, he generally discussed what institutional  
20 controls are, and he discussed a bit of the state perspective about that. If  
21 you have questions about that, you can generally ask him what an  
22 institutional control is, but it is something like a deed restriction. And,  
23 lastly, we discussed the Dunn Field canisters which we have had a  
24 presentation about.

25  
26 Project update: The last three weeks have been very busy at the Depot.  
27 There is a project I want to talk about that we're very happy about. We  
28 had two remaining underground storage tanks that are stationed at our

facility gas station. One was an 18,000 - gallon tank, and one was a 20,000 - gallon tank, and they were gas and diesel. We removed these tanks.

Basically, it was a one-week job. It started last week. Yes, it started Monday of last week. Here you can see the contractor's backhoe there. Here is one of the two tanks, and here is the other one. I just wanted to put up a few slides about the tank pull. Mike Lee from our office was the project manager for this job. Here is one of the tanks coming out. The tank had hooks installed on it, and they literally hooked it up to the crane once they had excavated around it and pulled it out.

MR. TRUTT: Those are the two metal tanks? The fiberglass tanks installed in the 1980s meet the requirements, but I think they have some kind of detector system on it. But the two that we replaced the fiberglass tanks, when we took them, they were just like those. They didn't have any corrosion. We thought they would be leaking, but, somehow, did those have any?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, I got a good picture of that here of once they got it out of ground. Before, these were metal, they were going to scrap the metal, which was going to be disposed, but you have to clean the tanks first. So to clean the tanks, here is a picture of both tanks out of the ground laying on a plastic sheet. You can see the holes at the end of the tanks, these two holes. I wanted to discuss that for just a moment. Here is a closer up. I want to point out a couple of things.

See the gentleman going up in the inside. They had fans working on this to keep it clear of vapors for safety reasons. You can see on the inside there to the other end of the tank where they cut another hole, you can see something between the two. These things literally had ladders inside of them that were inside the tank when it was built. I thought that was interesting. I had never seen that before in a UST, an underground storage tank. But this hole that they could cut in so they could clean the inside of



the tank before they cut it up and disposed of it and scrap. I watched them cut those holes. That was very interesting.

It was a torch cut. But it was something that was basically a shadetree mechanic invention that the contractor that did this who was the Memphis District of the Corps of Engineers. It was a civil service crew that pulled these tanks for us. They had invented this device where it had a magnet that stuck to the side of the tank, and a gear that held an arm out. And the tank was held by the arm. And the gear walked it forward slowly around in a perfect circle. I did not see them do the first tank. I saw the second tank. But the reason I stayed to see them cut the hole in the second tank is I wanted to see what man could sit and cut a hole that perfect. I didn't believe it could happen. Then they stuck this magnet on it. I asked them if they had a patent on it. They said they didn't, but they were considering it.

Oh, something else I wanted to point out on this slide. See the end of the tank. The tanks were packed in sand. It was a white beach-type sand. That is what it looked like. The sand was sampled. You know, we had to sample that according to the state regulations. And we sampled the bottom of the excavation after the tanks were pulled out in six locations. And all the sample results came back clean.

These tanks looked to me, and we took many photographs of this, these tanks looked like the day they might have looked when they put them in the ground. I couldn't believe they were in as good a shape as they were in.

MR. WILLIAMS: They just put them in two years ago.

MR. PHILLIPS: No.

MR. WILLIAMS: Recently they redid those tanks.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, it was recently, but it was still 8 or 10 years ago.

MS. PETERS: I want to ask this question. They said those tanks were obsolete, the reason the police department didn't want to use them because they come

out with some more modern tanks, and that is why those tanks had to be pulled up because they were not the type that the police department wanted to use. So that is why we were having to dispose of them because they don't meet the standards of ten years later.

MR. PHILLIPS: In one more year they would have been obsolete. The standards would become upgraded in 1999, and they wouldn't have met the standards then.

MS. PETERS: That's right.

MR. PHILLIPS: And the police --

MS. PETERS: They didn't want them.

MR. DEBACK: They would have taken the tanks if they met --

MS. PETERS: They didn't meet the standards for the year that is coming up in 1999 or the year 2000.

MR. DEBACK: Exactly. That is why they didn't take them.

MR. WILLIAMS: I have a question. Since the police are going to put some more down, and seeing that the Federal Government is still on this property, who will pay for the tanks to be put down?

MR. PHILLIPS: We will not.

MR. DEBACK: As of today the police have no intentions of putting in underground tanks. And any tanks that are put out there for the police will be at the expense of the city and the county.

MR. PHILLIPS: That is one project that we have recently completed, very recently, earlier this week. Another thing that we did since the last month's RAB meeting was this subcontractor, who is a local subcontractor called Tri-State Testing, they do a lot of underground storage tank work here in the City of Memphis and Shelby County, they came out one morning gratis. There was no charge to the taxpayer to do this. They came out to do something that was direct push sampling where they use the hydraulic push unit to

1 drive about a, what, 7/8th inch diameter hollow rod into the ground to see  
2 if we could push it deep enough to pull up a groundwater sample, which on  
3 this facility is anywhere from 70 to 95 feet.

4 Unfortunately, with this smaller hydraulic unit, it didn't work. We only got  
5 to 53 feet. But we were doing it in an effort to see if we could make some  
6 of these investigations less expensive to the taxpayer. We might try larger  
7 units for this in the future, beefier hydraulic trucks. But this was something  
8 that we wanted to do just before we start the main push of the groundwater  
9 on the main installation to see if there are any ways to avoid peppering the  
10 site with monitoring wells. But it was not successful at this point.

11 I mentioned earlier that out at Dunn Field last month Carter Gray asked the  
12 question about the funding for the cleanup program out at the Depot. We  
13 put together, if I can find my slide, the previous six months project cost.  
14 Everything on here has already been awarded, except this remedial  
15 investigation for the main installation, and that was negotiated. So the  
16 award is expecting within the next two weeks, but we came to an  
17 agreement with the contractor over the price.

18 A couple of very large products, the main installation and the Dunn Field  
19 Remedial Investigation, those two contract actions take out the remedial  
20 investigation all the way through the Record of Decision. It encompasses  
21 the entire program until we are ready to do the remedial design and the  
22 remedial action. That will take it all the way up through public comment  
23 and to the end of the road. A lot of smaller actions, you see the  
24 underground storage tank removal right here, that included \$18,000 for the  
25 design and \$60,000 to pull them out of the ground.

26 MS. PETERS: That is a lot of money.

27 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, it is a lot of money. Upcoming projects, you know, things that if they  
28 haven't been done, they are in the plans, they are on the drawing board  
29 now. That is the chemical warfare removal action at Dunn Field which will

be done after Parsons Engineering does their site investigation. And also we are evaluating, the BCT is evaluating whether or not we need to do a removal action at our cafeteria. And we will probably do a presentation on that within the next two or three RAB meetings. It will not happen that quickly, I don't believe, but I will bring you up to speed on that.

MS. PETERS: While you are there, I want to ask this, you say they are going to find out if they need to remove the warfare materials. Does that include the mustard gas and all of that, the removal you are saying?

MR. PHILLIPS: Of the warfare materials, yes.

MS. PETERS: So what I am saying is when you bring in a report, sometimes people don't understand some of the words because they don't know the meaning of some chemicals, like when you were talking about those little canisters that they found and the powder that was in them, what it really meant.

So in the future I think it would help if you had what Benzene and whatever you said, like you said you clean your teeth or you do this with it, I think if it was broken down just a little more where people would know what that was, where they wouldn't consider a chemical, because chemicals are like we use chlorine in the pools. But, in order to make chlorine, it is a chemical, with chlorox or anything. So sometimes I think it would be better to break it down to where everybody could understand what it really means.

MR. PHILLIPS: That is a very good comment, Ms. Peters. Let me ask a gentleman in the audience a question about that. Mr. Moore, ATSDR fact sheets for chemicals, are they brief in nature?

MR. MOORE: Most of them are.

MR. PHILLIPS: I know you got the tech sheets on them, but the fact sheets.

MR. MOORE: Most are. And that depends if we have one, a fact sheet for that particular chemical.

1 MR. PHILLIPS: That is a good comment, Ms. Peters. I think there is probably a resource  
2 out there through ATSDR that we can use. I had one last item to mention  
3 that I brought this up last month, and I think this month we ought to put up  
4 some hands at the table. A few times in the past a RAB member has come  
5 to the BCT to observe it. We would like to try to make that a regular  
6 habit. Is anyone interested in coming out in July? It will be July 16th I  
7 believe.

8 MS. PETERS: The 18th.

9 MR. PHILLIPS: July the 18th?

10 MS. PETERS: Are you all sure, because I looked at my calendar, and I think the third  
11 Thursday is the 16th. Would somebody use a calendar to find out?  
12 Because on the paper here it said the 18th, and I know that is not true.

13 MS. MOORE: It is the 16th of July.

14 MR. PHILLIPS: We've got two more short items on the agenda, two more five-minute  
15 items and then I will open it up to public comment.

16 MR. ENGLISH: I think there were no hands.

17 MR. PHILLIPS: Let the record show I had one hand. Mr. Truitt may be able to attend, but  
18 he will call us. When we call to invite people or to remind people about  
19 next month's RAB, we will mention something from the BCT if Mr. Truitt  
20 cannot make it. And we will look for a volunteer to come.

21 MR. GARRISON: I will volunteer if he can't come.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: So I will have a second. I would like to try to rotate that through the year.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: She wants to talk to you all a minute about a piece of information that she  
24 left out of your package. She wanted to make sure that you got it.

25 MS. HALL: This afternoon when I was photocopying the thickest portion of the  
26 package that I was giving to you tonight, some of them are missing a page.  
27 I have made copies of that page so that we can give that to you tonight. I

1 can re-staple that for you so that everyone takes home a complete set.  
2 That is - if you want to take a look at that now, it is towards the middle of  
3 the package, at the top right-hand corner, you will see page 8 of 15. That  
4 is the page that is missing. Some of you will have it, and some of you  
5 won't. So I will give it to you now, but I can re-staple your package at the  
6 end of the meeting.

7 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Moore, would you like to--

8 **ATSDR WORK GROUP**

9 MR. MOORE: My name is Benjamin Moore, and I am a regional rep for ATSDR. I was  
10 speaking with Shawn -- well, a little background on this. Back in February  
11 there was an EJ workshop meeting held here in Memphis. From that  
12 workshop there were five subgroups that were initiated to go out and work  
13 on whatever those items were. I don't have the exact names of those  
14 subgroups, but I was appointed to work on a subgroup where the Depot  
15 had the lead. And the basic assignment for that particular subgroup was to  
16 determine and bring back to the EJ work group how decisions were made  
17 at the base concerning all of the environmental activities.

18 It was suggested that we solicit people from the neighborhood or  
19 community to be on these subgroups. What we are going to do is mail  
20 letters to each subgroup chairperson and ask that chairperson to prepare a  
21 report for the next meeting, which right now is scheduled in August. That  
22 is when the update for the PHA will be done. And they will be soliciting  
23 community members to serve on each subgroup. So if, by chance, any of  
24 you get a call, Ms. Bradshaw is the -- are you the Co-Chair?

25 MS. BRADSHAW: Co-Chair.

26 MR. MOORE: Co-Chair of the EJ workgroup. She has members from her organization  
27 who have volunteered to be on each subgroup. So if you are contacted,  
28 please take part in the subgroups such that when we come back and give

1 report, we can show that each subgroup did have community input into the  
2 report that would be given to the large EJ, Memphis EJ work group.

3 Thank you.

4 **VISIT OF TIM FIELDS - Acting Assistant Administrator of the EPA**

5 **MR. PHILLIPS:** At next month's RAB we mentioned last month that we were going to  
6 have a visitor in town that day. I know he has had some schedule  
7 rearrangements, and I am not sure if we know his exact schedule now.

8 **DR. SPARIOSU:** We don't.

9 **MS. BRADSHAW:** No, I have a schedule. We are making a schedule.

10 **DR. SPARIOSU:** We have a tentative one.

11 **MS. BRADSHAW:** We are making a schedule as we speak. The agenda is being made for him.  
12 And the visitor is Mr. Tim Fields over Superfund from Washington D.C.  
13 Isn't that his position?

14 **DR. SPARIOSU:** He is higher than that now. He is like number two man.

15 **MS. BRADSHAW:** Next to Carol Browner. Maybe I will say it like that. He is a very  
16 important man at EPA. The community had gotten a commitment from  
17 Mr. Fields last year, and he wasn't able to make that commitment because  
18 of the budget report. So we did see him again and he committed himself to  
19 come to Memphis. And I think I did make a comment, a suggestion, that  
20 Tim Fields come to the RAB about two or three years ago.

21 But he is coming to be with DDMT - CCC and spend the day in the  
22 community. And we are supposed to start out with an off-site tour, along  
23 with other things for that particular day. And we are asking everyone that  
24 is welcome that wants to participate in a meeting. And also the next day  
25 there will be a workshop held as far as educating the community about  
26 different things that we think that is important for the community to learn  
27 about. So it is going to be a learning experience for both Tim Fields, from  
28 the community standpoint, and anybody else that wants to participate.

1 DR. SPARIOSU: And, as far as I know, he does intend to come to the Restoration Advisory  
2 Board meeting, as well as the rest of the schedule being arranged by the  
3 Concerned Citizens Committee, but he also will be here. So for the other  
4 activities, Mr. and Mrs. Bradshaw are probably your best contacts.

5 And in your normal pre-meeting notification that you receive in the mail the  
6 final agenda will be made more clear. But it will be a good meeting to  
7 attend if you want to get a chance to meet one of the highest people in  
8 EPA. He is aware of this site. He has always been a big promoter of the  
9 environmental justice and environmental justice issues within the agency.  
10 He is aware of the significance of this site with regard to environmental  
11 justice and some of the goings-on here.

12 MR. PHILLIPS: I need to point out that from the agenda, that July 18th date must have  
13 stuck on someone's mind. It is on there for July the 18th. I believe his visit  
14 is the 16th and the 17th.

15 MS. BRADSHAW: 16th and the 17th, all day, both days, facilities everything. It is in the  
16 planning stage, and it should be ready within the next five days.

17 MR. PHILLIPS: Are there any comments?

18 MR. TRUITT: I just have a question. I don't think it should be part of the record. It is  
19 sort of indirect to something you have in here. The Dieldrin soil removal in  
20 the housing area which is I guess estimated at \$483,000, and the housing  
21 area, as I know, it is about four times as big as a regular lawn. Dann, can I  
22 expect two of my neighbors who are here that I know have had their lawns  
23 treated for years, they have to have the same thing that is in the housing  
24 area, can I expect them to have to spend \$100,000 in cleanup? That is all I  
25 have.

26 MS. PETERS: What kind of chemical is this? All they said it is going to take is about 16  
27 inches of soil out and put some more soil on there. That is going to solve



the problem. They say the stuff don't move, so that lady can buy her a load of dirt and forget it.

DR. SPARIOSU: I will comment on that. It is one of the ironies of environmental law that Congress has seen fit to make laws that apply to companies and to federal facilities, such as this one, but do not apply to farmers who are applying things to the grounds.

MR. TRUITT: These guys aren't farmers.

DR. SPARIOSU: And do not apply to household situations. You go on from there and talk to your congressman.

MR. WILLIAMS: Are there anymore comments at the table before we open up the floor for comments? Okay, Mr. Bradshaw.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

MR. BRADSHAW: I've got a comment directly related to the previous comment.

MR. WILLIAMS: Who made that comment?

MR. BRADSHAW: It is about the Dieldrin. It may be a success story or a big joke or whatever. From the RAB board I attended that logarithmic chart on the Dieldrin said it was 4,000 times high as the level EPA said it is safe for it to be. And it might be a laughing matter about the jokes and the people in the neighborhood having their lawn treated, but the Dieldrin, if this wasn't a federal facility, this would be a criminal offense for the chemicals that has been disposed on this place so improperly. This is not a joke or nothing like that.

The second comment I got addresses, I don't know what they called it, but they sent it out to us. I wrote an 11-page reply to the Army Corps of Engineers and everything. But it was the biggest pack of lies that I have ever seen, and it was signed by Mr. Phil Amido. And I don't know where they got -- Glenn Kaden. I don't know where they got the technical or the professional experience to be reviewing any kind of hydrogeological

groundwater or anything. But I think that was astounding that anything like that could even be an official document. And I want to know how many people on the RAB received that document.

MS. BRADSHAW: From Jerry Jones, the Corps of Engineers, did anyone receive a report?

MR. BRADSHAW: Since it is all fun and games and big jokes and one-liners and everything, I want to know who on the RAB got the report and who reviewed the report.

MS. PETERS: They don't half read the stuff when you get it in the mail.

MS. BRADSHAW: This was sent out a month ago and gave us 30 days to reply. This was the same people that --

MR. BRADSHAW: And I know, the success stories are good, but, I believe, in fairness, the RAB should present a true picture of the cleanup going on at this base instead of giving a one-sided presentation showing nothing but the success stories. And I just want to know the people in here that is on the RAB whose duty it is to advise the Defense Depot and everything, I want to know what kind of actual input they have when documents as important as this one can go along unnoticed; nobody has brought it up. It is not on the agenda. It is not in the discussion, people's qualifications or anything.

MR. PHILLIPS: What is the document you are referring to, Mr. Bradshaw?

MR. BRADSHAW: There it is. It has got Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation. He is going to give you the name and everything.

MR. ENGLISH: The name of the document is the Environmental Assessment. And it is the final version of that document. The previous version has already been reviewed.

MS. BRADSHAW: But it gave us 30 days to reply. But what I am saying is who on the RAB got a booklet about a month ago about this particular document?

MS. PETERS: If you get it and don't read it, what good is it?

1 MR. GARRISON: I got one.

2 MS. BRADSHAW: It was a grey booklet. You know, people that don't read it shouldn't even  
3 sit at the board, shouldn't even be on the RAB.

4 MS. PETERS: People don't got time to read all of that.

5 MR. PHILLIPS: One person at a time.

6 MR. BRADSHAW: I think I had the floor.

7 MR. PHILLIPS: Is that your comment?

8 MR. BRADSHAW: If the people on the RAB don't have time to review the documents as  
9 important as these documents, they shouldn't even be on the RAB.

10 MR. BOND: Ms. Peters is not speaking for the entire RAB board.

11 MR. BRADSHAW: Let me qualify it. The people that don't have time to review the documents  
12 that is important and vital to this restoration and cleanup, they don't have  
13 time, that person in particular shouldn't be on the RAB, if it includes one  
14 person or every member on the RAB.

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Good comment. Any more comments?

16 DR. SPARIOSU: Just a brief response on that. Certainly the Environmental Assessment is a  
17 document which is required by law for any federal property that is going to  
18 change hands has to undergo an environmental assessment or an  
19 environmental impact statement, one or the other. And it is really relevant  
20 to the reuse of the property, the eventual reuse of the property, and is not  
21 what governs the cleanup of the property. So that is not the document you  
22 would look for what is going to be done to cleanup.

23 And as far as the Dieldrin goes, I want to make it clear that we do take that  
24 very seriously. It is a harmful chemical that is present in the soil on what  
25 we consider risk levels. And it will be remediated. It will be cleaned up.

26 MS. BRADSHAW: I would like to make the comment that this particular document needs to  
27 be reviewed before it is accepted. We asked for another 30 days to review,

2 but if no one received this document to give an opinion, you know, a valid  
3 opinion about it, I feel like that everybody on here needs a chance to see  
4 this document instead of saying, well, it is there. If it becomes finalized, we  
5 asked for a 30-day extension, so I don't know if we got it or not. We did  
6 not get a reply from Jerry Jones from the Corps of Engineers, because I  
7 asked him personally to send 20 booklets so we could distribute it out  
8 through the community and so that people could give an opinion on it.  
9 And he told me, I can't do that, unless we have it this way or that way,  
10 because I have to account for where the booklets go. I think anything that  
11 a community person asks for, this way, this is going to be unjustly a law.

12 And everybody has stated that this was part of the scope meeting that was  
13 done in December of 1996. And, see, the scope meeting, we were told that  
14 we could not talk about the cleanup, the initial cleanup. And then when we  
15 asked about was a public hearing for the cleanup on the pump, pump and  
16 treat of the water wells, you said, well, that was at the scope meeting. You  
17 see, and that is a conflict that we are hearing two different things. We  
18 wasn't allowed to talk about the initial cleanup at the scope meeting. I was  
19 there. And then when I asked about a public hearing, DLA used the scope  
20 meeting as a date that they used for the explaining the pump and treat.  
21 And that was a falsehood. I think that needs to be cleared up. I think  
22 people on this board need to have time to look at that item fairly and may  
23 need a public hearing on it.

24 MR. PHILLIPS: There are two things that I can do to address that comment. We will see  
25 the distribution list of that environmental assessment document, and we  
26 will have that for you. I have already heard a couple of the RAB members  
27 say that they did receive it. We will make sure that that did get out. If you  
28 didn't get it, it is available at four locations. Our information repositories,  
it is available. So comment noted, good comment. And you haven't heard  
back from the Army yet from Jerry Jones on your comment?

1 MS. BRADSHAW: Not to even know if we got an extension on that. That is the main thing  
2 that we asked for so that people would have time to read this item. So the  
3 only thing I know is that I was told it was in the Federal Register.  
4 Everyone don't have the access of a computer system, or everyone don't  
5 have the access to get out and try to go to these four locations to find these  
6 four books.

7 MR. PHILLIPS: It is actually in five locations. If you can't get out to one of the three  
8 branches or the health department, we have it here. You are welcome to  
9 come in and review the document here.

10 MS. PETERS: Could I ask a question? He said he has it. I want to know from him have  
11 you read it?

12 MR. GARRISON: Yes, I have.

13 MS. PETERS: Did you understand it all?

14 MR. GARRISON: Yes, I did. I worked here 27 years, and I understood everything in it.

15 MS. PETERS: My husband worked here too.

16 MR. GARRISON: I saw some things in it that looked questionable, but I didn't -- I responded  
17 to Jerry Jones.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. DeBack in the corner.

19 MR. DEBACK: In response to Ms. Bradshaw, I personally will call Jerry Jones and ask him  
20 why copies could not be made available. I wasn't aware that anybody was  
21 being denied any copies.

22 MR. PHILLIPS: I was not aware of that either if that is the case.

23 MR. BRAYON: Could you clarify that statement. We are being denied a copy or we  
24 haven't been distributed a copy of this?

25 MR. PHILLIPS: We will find out what is the case.

26 MR. DEBACK: She made a request, is that correct?

MS. BRADSHAW: I made a request for 20 to 30 copies.

MR. DEBACK: And he said absolutely not?

MS. BRADSHAW: No, he didn't say absolutely not. He wanted me to put everything in writing. I was telling him why we needed this over the phone. We didn't have all that time to get this, sending mail back and forth. That was taking up our day.

MR. GARRISON: My copy came Federal Express from Fairfax Virginia from Tetrach and yours did too, because I saw the distribution list. You got yours through Federal Express.

MR. TRUITT: Let me say something about that thing. You know, I read it, and I didn't respond whether I got it or not because I didn't want to get involved in a pissing contest. But when I read that thing, it said that the document specifically was for, the assessment was for the transfer of a federal facility to private use. So what the hell does the community care. The users who are going to gain this facility may require further testing. The users who are going to gain this facility, based on what they are going to use it for, may require further testing. But what I don't understand is what is all the hullabaloo about. The transfer of federal property to private use, it is the user's responsibility to express concerns unless some of us -- I read the thing -- it is a problem for the user if there is a problem.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is his comment. That is not the board's comment. The last person who is going to give a comment was this gentleman here. We have really run out of time here for this meeting.

MR. PHILLIPS: Let me make a closing remark. Depending on what the work over at housing, how that work is looking next month, when we call you, you might want to be prepared that for that meeting we will wear tennis shoes because we will take a walk out in the field.

1 MR. ENGLISH: Can I make a clarification. I don't want this thing to end on an uncertainty  
2 here for everyone's part. The Environment Assessment is designed to  
3 explain and describe what the environmental effects might be from the  
4 intended future use of this property. And the people here do have a right  
5 to understand it and see it and see what it is going to be. They have a right  
6 to make comment about it if they want to. That is why there is a 30-day  
7 comment period. So it is a valid document.

8 It is not about the environmental contamination. It is about the potential  
9 effects on the environment, noise, traffic patterns, all those types of things  
10 that are related to the environment about what the use will be when the  
11 facility is transferred. I just wanted to make that clear. And people here  
12 do have a right to make comment about it if they want to. But, I don't  
13 think, if they have read the document, I don't think they are obligated to  
14 make comments if they don't want to.

15 MS. PETERS: Thank you, sir.

16 MR. ENGLISH: They are happy to just let it lie.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Meeting adjourned.

18 (Whereupon, at 7:30 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

## ATTENDANCE LIST

### Restoration Advisory Board Members

Mr. Shawn Phillips	Facility Co-Chair
Mr. Mondell Williams	Community Co-Chair
Mr. Dave Bond	Citizen Representative
Mr. Eugene Brayon	Citizen Representative
Mr. Jordan English	Tennessee Department of Environmental and Conservation (TDEC)
Mr. John Garrison	Citizen Representative
Ms. Terri Gray	Citizen Representative
Mr. Bob Rogers (sitting in for Mr. Carter Gray)	Memphis/Shelby County Health Department
Ms. Johnnie Mae Peters	Citizen Representative
Dr. Dann Spariosu	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Ulysses Truitt	Citizen Representative
Ms. Margaret Curry (sitting in for Ms. Willie Mae Willett)	Citizen Representative
Ms. Elizabeth Young	Citizen Representative
Ms. Doris Bradshaw (sitting in for Mr. Kevin Clay)	Citizen Representative

### OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms. Alma Black Moore	Frontline
Mr. Phil Anido	Memphis Depot Caretaker
Mr. Greg Underberg	CH2M HILL - Oak Ridge, TN
Ms. Dorothy Richards	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers- Huntsville
Ms. Denise Cooper	Memphis Depot Caretaker
Mr. John DeBack	Base Transition Office
Ms. Jennifer Hall	Frontline
Mr. Terry Flynn	Frontline
Mr. Benjamin Moore	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)
Ms. Georgia Oliver	Citizen
Mr. Bob Rogers	Citizen
Mr. Herman Williams	Citizen
Mr. Russell Ray Anderson	Citizen



Ms. Betti Tack Harvey  
Ms. Shirley Andres  
Mr. J. N. Harvey  
Mr. Kenneth Bradshaw  
Mr. S. Tyler  
Mr. Everett Humphreys

Americorps  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen  
Citizen

**Defense Depot Memphis, Tennessee  
Restoration Advisory Board**

**Agenda  
June 18, 1998**

<b>Welcome and Introduction</b>	<b>5 min.</b>	<b>Mr. Mondell Williams Community Co-Chair</b>
<b>Old Business</b>		
<b>Meeting Minutes Review</b>	<b>5 min.</b>	<b>Mr. Mondell Williams Community Co-Chair</b>
<b>Draft RAB Charter Review</b>	<b>10 min</b>	<b>Mr. John Garrsion Ms. Elizabeth Young</b>
<b>Dunn Field Canister Report</b>	<b>25 min.</b>	<b>Ms. Dorothy Richards U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Support Center - Huntsville</b>
<b>New Business</b>		
<b>BCT Report/Project Update</b> - 6-Month Project Cost Report - Invitation to RAB - BCT Meetings	<b>25 min.</b>	<b>Mr. Shawn Phillips Facility Co-Chair</b>
<b>ATSDR Work Group</b>	<b>5 min.</b>	<b>Mr. Benjamin Moore ATSDR</b>
<b>Visit of Mr. Tim Fields</b> <b>Deputy Administrator, EPA</b> <b>July 18, 1998</b>	<b>5 min.</b>	<b>Dr. Dann Spariosu EPA Region 4</b>
<b>Public Comment Period</b>	<b>15 min.</b>	
<b>Meeting Adjourned</b>		

**FINAL PAGE**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

**FINAL PAGE**

**FINAL PAGE**

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

**FINAL PAGE**