



THE MEMPHIS DEPOT TENNESSEE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 715

NOTE: These minutes were approved at the RAB meeting held February 20, 2003.

File: 190,300.000a
J.D. 715

715 1

**MEETING MINUTES
The Memphis Depot
Restoration Advisory Board
October 17, 2002
South Memphis Senior Citizens Center
1620 Marjorie
Memphis, Tennessee**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held at 6:00 p.m. on October 17, 2002, at the South Memphis Senior Citizens Center located at 1620 Marjorie, Memphis, Tennessee. The attendance list is attached.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

MR. WILLIAMS: I would like to call this meeting to order. I would like to welcome everyone to the October meeting. This will be the last meeting of the year. Our next meeting will be in February. So I just want to make sure everybody understands that. I know you will be patiently waiting for the next meeting. So, please do so.

REVIEW AND APPROVE JUNE MEETING MINUTES

MR. WILLIAMS: All right, I know everyone has read the minutes to the last meeting. So would you like to take a moment and look over them and see if there is ---

MS. MOORE: Minutes for June.

MR. WILLIAMS: June. Okay, that's June. So, if everybody has read the minutes for the June meeting ---

MR. HUNT: Let me just interject this: Mr. Eugene Brayon submitted a letter in reference to the June BCT (Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team) meeting and he has some corrections that he would like to make. So, I will just go ahead and read this letter.

"Dear Mr. Hunt, I will not be able to attend the RAB meeting on October 17th, 2002. I am sending corrections to the minutes of the meeting dated June 20th, 2002. Please be kind enough to insert the corrections for me.

"On Page 5, Line 25: Dr. Mary Guinan, which is G-u-i-a-n-a-n, should be corrected as follows: Dr. Mary Guinan, which is G-u-i-n-a-n.

"On Page 6, Line 28: The unintelligible should be inserted as follows: The threshold that will produce these effects are not made clear by the word minute.

"On Page 7, Lines 11, 12: 'This is why sometimes in that the Millime field where arms' should be corrected as follows: This is why during that period of time when expectant mothers were given thalidomide arms were growing

"On Page 7, Lines 15 and 16: 'At certain key ability' should be corrected as follows: At certain key windows of vulnerability.

"On Page 7, lines 18, 19: 'As New York, applied' should be corrected as follows: As New York, it also applied.

"I thank you. I am still awaiting the answers to my written description of the report summary. Sincerely, Eugene Brayon."
I would like to submit a copy of this, if it's okay, to the court reporter so that she can insert this language

REVIEW AND APPROVE OCTOBER AGENDA

MR. WILLIAMS: All right, we have an agenda in front of us. Are there any changes anyone would like to make, any adjustments to the agenda? If not, can we proceed as the agenda is stated? Okay, we're going with the agenda as printed here. So we will be approving the October agenda. We have looked over the October agenda, and we will go along with the October agenda. So that is approved.

And the June meeting minutes, I don't think we have enough to vote on the minutes as far as the meeting in June. So we will table that to the next meeting.

MR. BOND: Very good

OLD BUSINESS - COMMUNITY RAB HOUSEKEEPING ISSUES

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, for community RAB Housekeeping Issues: Does anyone have any issues to bring to the Board, housekeeping issues, anything like that?

MS. BROOKS: No, I do not.

NEW BUSINESS - ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT 2002

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, well, we will move right along with New Business with Mr. Clyde Hunt.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Once again, I'm Clyde Hunt, Remedial Program Manager at the Memphis Depot. My task on this evening is to make a presentation on the environmental program progress report for this year, 2002. In this presentation I will address the accomplishments in 2002 for the Main Installation and Dunn Field. We will discuss the land transfers, the deeds that were signed this year, as well as an update of the project schedule, a review of the CERCLA process -- that's the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act -- and the goals for 2003.

The beginning of the year, the winter and spring of this year, we had two land transfer deeds that were completed, and this was as a result of a FOST, Finding of Suitability to Transfer, FOST Number 2. Included in FOST Number 2 was Parcel 1. Parcel 1 is the Administration Building 144 and the adjoining north and south parking lots. The Administration Building is presently where the Depot Redevelopment Corporation personnel are housed, as well as John DeBack and myself.

MR. HUNT: Two deeds were issued from the FOST -- one was for the City of Memphis South Police Precinct. That deed was signed off on February 6, 2002. Secondly, was the Depot Redevelopment Corporation. That deed was signed off on May 6, 2002. The first one for the South Police Precinct, which was approximately five acres, and the second one was approximately thirteen acres.

This summer we initiated two cleanup studies. The first on the Main Installation was the enhanced bioremediation treatment pilot test. That study was initiated back in June. Several wells were installed and injections were made. The pilot test involves

monitoring. Approximately seven monitoring events or sampling events will occur. It's not a test that's completed yet. In fact, it's ongoing. We anticipate completion of the sampling events some time in January of 2003.

Dunn Field: The soil vapor extraction pilot test is complete. We anticipate the results or the analysis of the soil vapor extraction to be folded into the Feasibility Study report sometime early next year.

Just to go back to the Main Installation and the enhanced bioremediation treatment pilot test, bioremediation is a treatment process that provides or that uses naturally occurring microorganisms like yeast or fungi or bacteria, and it breaks down or degrades the hazardous substances into less toxic or nontoxic substances. So, the whole purpose of the injection is to provide an environment where the microorganisms can grow and thrive and begin to eat up all of the contaminants in the aquifer.

MR. HUNT: The soil vapor extraction was presented back in the summer. The soil vapor extraction test is a system that pulls air through the soil to remove solvents as vapors. It reduces the volatile organic compounds to safe levels. And once again, the results of that will be folded into the Feasibility Study report.

We have the Main Installation Remedial Design Work Plan. That was completed this summer. In fact, it's available for public reference at the Depot Information Repositories. The work plan basically describes the remedy that is selected for the Main Installation as stated in the Record of Decision. It presents the Remedial Design and the Remediation Action objectives for the

Main Installation. It also presents the Remedial Design task schedule for accomplishing the task, and, finally, identifies the major deliverables and their submittal base. And all this information is available in our three Information Repositories.

Continuing for the summer, we initiated, and it is still in progress, the Five-Year Review. This is in reference to our Dunn Field Interim Record of Decision. This was done in January of 1998 where the pump and treat system was installed. This is the recovery wells that are along the western perimeter of Dunn Field. (Indicating) The whole purpose of that recovery system was to provide a hydraulic barrier to prevent the flow of contaminants from proceeding westward.

MR. HUNT: The Five-Year Review is required by CERCLA, and because of the fact that the pump and treat system was placed, I believe, in January of 1998, five years from there, of course, is 2003. CH2M Hill conducts this Five-Year Review and progress for the Depot. Revision Zero of the report has been submitted to the BCT team, which is the Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team, for review September 2002. So, we are in the process of reviewing that.

Our Dunn Field Feasibility Study is in progress. In fact, the report, which is Revision Zero, has been submitted to the BCT for review. It was submitted August 2002, and just to remind all the RAB members, that you will be receiving Revision 1 of the Feasibility Study. Once the comments are incorporated from our initial review, we will be sending Revision 1 to you, and then, of course, the presentation will be made next year on the Feasibility Study report.

We have five additional monitoring wells that were installed this summer. Two off-site wells, located at the east side of Westmore Street and the southeast corner of Person and Rayner. And then we've had three wells that were installed on the Main Installation. The three wells -- really, we placed two wells that were abandoned, and the whole purpose of the two off-site wells and the three wells on the Main Installation is to provide more clarity on the direction of flow of groundwater. Additionally, the two off-site will be used for long-term monitoring.

This fall we completed the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis. I believe we have a copy of that report with us this evening. In fact, it is also available in the Depot Information Repositories. The EE/CA addresses the Dunn Field former pistol range, Site 60. We had our public comment meeting. The public comment period started July 25 and ended August 23.

MR. HUNT:

And we also have with us this evening this Action Memorandum, which encompasses the Responsiveness Summary. This report has been signed. It was signed on October 8, 2002. We also have for your review on this evening the public comment meeting minutes. They are available tonight, and the comments were incorporated into the Responsiveness Summary, which is part, once again, of the Action Memorandum. We have it available for you tonight on CD.

Let me move on to the updated project schedule. This schedule really reflects latest information and projected time that's required to reach targets. The Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, I'm sure you are all familiar with

that now, is CERCLA, and that is the method or the process that we use. There are certain steps to follow to accomplish the remediation for both the Main Installation and Dunn Field.

This is a diagram that basically defines where we are in the process for our CERCLA. (Indicating) We have Dunn Field and we have the Main Installation. If you look at Dunn Field here, the current status, as I stated earlier, we're in the Five-Year Review for Dunn Field, and primarily we've completed the Remedial Investigation, and we're in this Feasibility Study phase. Right now we're at Revision Zero of the Feasibility Study for Dunn Field, and you can see ahead of us, once we move out of the Feasibility Study, we move on to the Proposed Plan, and then, of course, the Record of Decision, and then from there, Remedial Design, Remedial Action.

MR. HUNT: For the Main Installation we've already accomplished the Record of Decision for the Main Installation. That was in 2001. Right now we're in the Remedial Design phase. You see that covers both 2002, 2003. From there we'll move into the Remedial Action phase, and then from there into the monitoring phase. So this is a good diagram that shows where we are with both Dunn Field and the Main Installation. We're following the CERCLA process for both the Main Installation and Dunn Field, but we're at different steps along that process.

This is a continuation of the CERCLA update. As you can see, for Dunn Field it moves into the Remedial Action, the long-term operations of monitoring the area. We project a final closeout report in 2015. And the same for the Main Installation. When we move into this monitoring phase, it also will send us out into 2015. You can see the Five-Year Review. (Indicating) That comes from

the Record of Decision. Whenever there is a Record of Decision, five years from that point we have a Five-Year Review.

And then finally we have the goals for 2003. For Dunn Field our goals for next year are to complete the Five-Year Review. We anticipate for that to occur in the winter of 2003, and to complete the Feasibility Study in the spring of 2003, to complete the Proposed Plan also in the spring, and then we are hopeful to have the Record of Decision for Dunn Field by the summer of 2003. For the Main Installation we're hopeful for next year to complete the Remedial Design phase in the fall of 2003.

I believe that completes the presentation. At this time, I can address any questions that you have as it relates to our accomplishments for this year.

MR. WILLIAMS: Moving right along. Okay, Mr. Tyler

MR. TYLER: Stanley Tyler. It's good to see everyone come out. I know it's been a trying situation. And, for the record, I apologize for missing the last meeting when we had Ms. Connie Hess here to present all her material. I had to go out of town, and it couldn't be avoided. And I think Ms. Hess did a good job, and hopefully we'll try to use her again if money is available.

Now, all these studies, let's talk money. How much money are we projecting on the Dunn Field Feasibility Study? You're going into the study mode. Is there a limit or a cap on how much money can be spent on the Feasibility Study and the Remedial Action?

MR. HUNT: We have a Cost-to-Complete meeting. In fact, we have a meeting each year. We do not have -- or I should say I don't have any projections for you this evening in terms of the cost for the Feasibility Study, if that's what you're asking.

MR. TYLER: Right, because that determines what kind of tests that you ran, how much you spend for it and who you use, you know, the cost.

MR. HUNT: Right; well, the contractors that we have in place is CH2M Hill for our design and Jacobs Engineering for the construction, but right now we're in that Feasibility Study phase, which falls under CH2M Hill. Yes, sir.

MR. TYLER: And another thing, I noticed that you've got monitoring on Dunn Field all the way to 2015. Is there anything -- any ground that determines that you need that shelf life or that chemicals last that long or just ---

MR. HUNT: This, I believe, is typical for long-term monitoring. For both Dunn Field and the Main Installation we anticipate probably about -- and I can't see this before me, but I think it's about 15 to 20 years of long-term monitoring. That's not anything that's unusual.

MR. TYLER: Okay.

MR. HUNT: If that's what you're asking?

MR. TYLER: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: Let's see, I've got a statement and question. Statement first, I think we've been in restoration at the Depot for the last -- I think it

started in 1985. Am I right? In 1985, 1989, somewhere like that, 1989? And my question is: We've been doing a lot of restoration and revising the Depot, and at the same point nothing has ever came up to be wrong with this property. You know, every way they check there is no contamination. And my question is: At what point will we say that, okay, there is a clean bill of health there, and so we need not do anymore studies? We did studies and did analysis until we're done analyzed out because we haven't found anything. So, at what point will we get to that?

MR. HUNT: Can we turn the light back down? Because I think what we probably need to do is go back through the CERCLA update process. You have to understand that there is a process for remediation for both Dunn Field -- let's go back to the one that was prior to this. (Indicating) Mondell, if I'm understanding what you're asking, right now for Dunn Field we're in the Feasibility Study phase, and then from there we will go to the Proposed Plan and then the Record of Decision, which will basically define the remedy, what we will need to do for Dunn Field.

And once that remedy is defined, we'll move into a design phase where we basically come up with a plan. And then the Remedial Action is construction, where you actually go in there and do whatever is necessary or go over all safety measures for human health and the environment. So, this is a construction phase here. You can see that kind of picks up in 2005. (Indicating)

MR. WILLIAMS: So, right now we're at the Proposed Plan and remedy?

MR. HUNT: Right now we're here (Indicating).

MR. WILLIAMS: We're there.

MR. HUNT: In 2002, we're in that Feasibility Study for Dunn Field, but for the Main Installation the remedy has been selected. Okay, and now we're in the process of design for this remedy, and then after that, that moves into the Remedial Action, which is a construction phase. And then after that, you have to monitor what you've done to ensure that it meets the guidelines that have been outlined in our Record of Decision. So, this is the monitoring area phase here that begins for the Main Installation around 2005, and I think for Dunn Field it picks up a little bit later.

Because if you look at this, (Indicating) you can see that the process is the same, but for Dunn Field we're slightly behind the Main Installation. The Main Installation is a little bit further ahead in the process than Dunn Field. For the Main Installation the Record of Decision, the ROD, was last year. So we're a little bit further ahead, but we're hopeful to have the Record of Decision for Dunn Field by I believe the summer of 2003.

MR. WILLIAMS: The reason I ask that is because for Dunn Field it said once they dug up the mustard gas containers that the ground was not contaminated. So they went over to the ammunition area, and it was not contaminated. And they went to the slush pit, and it was not contaminated. So, my thing is that there shouldn't really be a remedy or process if nothing was ever found.

MR. HUNT: You have to understand that there are several burial sites at Dunn Field, and in order to do one thing, you have to do initial work. The CWM (chemical warfare materiel) was a project that we had to get in there and do first. So there are still other projects coming.

For example, the lead removal project, we just planned for to occur probably early winter in December of this year or January 2003. Each project is an isolated occurrence.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, all right, does anyone else have any questions you would like to address?

MR. TYLER: Yes, sir. On the Remedial Design for the Main Installation, what health standards are you remediating it to, like industrial, residential, light industrial?

MR. HUNT: For ---

MR. TYLER: The Main Installation first. You've got your design. You're trying to clean it up to a certain level of use.

MR. HUNT: Right.

MR. TYLER: What is that level and the cost?

MR. HUNT: Right, and this has been addressed before. In fact, it's in the Information Repositories. For the Main Installation it's for light industrial.

MR. TYLER: Okay, all right, and then Dunn Field, we haven't got to that point yet?

MR. HUNT: Exactly.

MR. TYLER: Okay.

- MR. HUNT: Because we're still here in the Feasibility Study stage.
- MR. TYLER: And the projected cost of the Main Installation Remedial Design, projected cost of numbers?
- MR. HUNT: I do not have that information in terms of projected cost for each isolated occurrence.
- MR. TYLER: Well, you've got a Remedial Design. And I'm sure that in the line there's money involved, and what I'm talking about is if it's a lot of money involved, we are going to have proper minority participation, are we not?
- MR. HUNT: Well, you're kind of pushing me to a phase that we haven't gotten to yet.
- MR. TYLER: Okay, all right
- MR. HUNT: Which is that Remedial Action. That's the construction phase.
- MR. TYLER: I always ask in the beginning with money.
- MR. HUNT: Right. I understand.
- MR. TYLER: Thank you.
- MR. WILLIAMS: And at that point, let me ask him, would we have a say so? You know, I know we're here on the back end of whatever goes on, like once they go to their BCT meeting.

- MR. WILLIAMS: And we get the backlash of what goes on in the meeting. So, would we really have a say-so over what contractor was used to do this kind of work?
- MR. HUNT: I believe your input would probably be the same as it has been in the past.
- MR. WILLIAMS: Okay
- MR. TYLER: I will give it to you. That's what I was trying to find out.
- MR. HUNT: And what I'm saying is that nothing has changed in the records to, you know ---
- MR. WILLIAMS: You answered the question. It was a good question.
- MR. TYLER: That's why I was trying to get a cost, projected cost, of what we were looking at.
- MR. HUNT: Yes. We haven't done that.
- MS. PETERS: Right now -- Johnnie Mae Peters. Right now we would be using the same contractors that we already have, and then maybe later on you might have some other recommendations where you need somebody else to come in to help you complete whatever you need to complete when you get farther ahead. Is that right?
- MR. HUNT: When we move into the construction phase -- and the Corps of Engineers, Mobile District is responsible for the construction aspect. Presently we have Jacobs Engineering. So, it is anticipated

that they would be involved in doing the construction work. Yes, sir.

MR. TYLER: I remember the presentation. A gentleman from Mobile who was in charge of the contracting office came up. We were in the old cafeteria, and he said it was one of his goals and timetables to try to use as many minority contractors as he possibly could. Is there a way to find out how many was used or will be used?

MR. HUNT: See, once again, you know, we're talking about something that's in 2004.

MR. TYLER: Okay.

MR. HUNT: So we're still really very early in the process. We haven't gotten to that point yet. It's 2004 for the Main Installation, 2005 really. And then for Dunn Field we're looking at late 2004, 2005.

MR. WILLIAMS: Ms. Hooks.

MS. HOOKS: Janet Hooks. Mr. Hunt, let me ask a piggyback on some of this minority participation. Obviously we have really no say-so, and while it may sound good to say that certainly our input is considered, the bottom line is we have no say-so. There are other BRACs (Base Realignment and Closure Teams) around the country that have closed that have to go through this process. Jacobson, is that a company that ---

MR. HUNT: It's Jacobs Engineering.

MS. HOOKS: Jacobs and Son?

- MR. HUNT: Jacobs I'm sorry. Jacobs Engineering.
- MS. HOOKS: Jacobs Engineering, okay. Is that a company that has done other BRACs that have closed?
- MR. HUNT: I am not sure. I don't have that information, and it would probably be best to -- what I would probably do is submit a letter addressing some concerns that you have in regards to our contractors and the use of minorities. And that would probably be the best way to receive the information that you're looking for.
- MS. HOOKS: Okay, and in that letter that I would submit could I -- well, certainly I can ask. Would I have access to other BRACs and their level of minority participation?
- MR. HUNT: I believe you probably would have access to that information.
- MS. HOOKS: Okay, address it to . .
- MR. HUNT: Well, okay, if your question would be centered on future work or present work. Because we're looking at Jacobs Engineering now, and they're going to do the lead removal project. And the way that firms generally work, they hire subcontractors. So, if you have a concern about the use of minorities, you can address that letter to me. I can certainly find out. Or, you know, you don't have to write the letter; I can simply find out from our Mobile district on their policies regarding the use of minority firms or subcontractors or ask simply what subcontractors we are going to use in the lead removal project that are minority.

MS. HOOKS: Okay, and while I understand that we're talking of something on the one hand down the road. I think that what I'm hearing is concern that this body has. But there is no information to come forward to say that this is the level of participation that the government expects and holds people's feet to the fire?

MR. HUNT: Well, I think from previous meetings this issue has been addressed. With the chemical warfare materiel removal project I believe there was some concerns about the use of minorities.

MS. MOORE: Excuse me. I just want to interject. The young man who came from Mobile, I don't think you were our remedial program manager at that time Clyde, but they did a P-RAC -- that's another acronym, Preplaced Remedial ---

MR. HUNT: Remedial Action Contract

MS. MOORE: The Corps gave a detailed report at that RAB meeting. And prior to that the Corps held a P-RAC conference. There is a list of minority businesses that attended. They hosted -- the Corps hosted that conference at the Depot when we were using the former "J" Street Cafe. From that, there are certain rules Ms. Hooks that you have to use. I can't remember right off, but that information is available in the Depot Repository.

Now, I can send you the information that I had from that meeting. I don't know if it's changed, but that information is available on the amount of minority participation. It's a certain percentage. I just can't remember off the top of my head. Mr. Tyler, you were there, so you remember that there are requirements, but I don't know what they are now, but there are requirements.

MR. TYLER: What I got from that meeting, I don't know if it was a certain flat percentage that has to be used, but he said he would like to have the contract written that those who use minority contractors will be rewarded on a point system. There is nothing in stone saying you have to use them. If you can justify not using them, that's fine, but he has a point system, and if you use minority contractors and you use them very well, then we'll give you more points in the system, and you will move up to the top of the ladder. But the actual participation numbers, I don't know, are they available or have we seen them?

You know, you can say a lot of things, but until you see it in black and white, you don't know what the participation effectiveness was. Timetables and goals -- instead of using that "dirty word", I'll say timetables and goals. And we don't know what timetable they were using and what goals, and the bottom line is what was used and how many was used. You gave a great presentation though.

MR. HUNT: I think you might want to address for future contracts that issue if that is a concern to the RAB members. And once again, we do have a lead removal project that's coming up pretty soon. So you might want to address it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anymore questions?

MS. PETERS: I think the presentation was done real good, and I hope we remember what we heard today so we won't ask for the same thing over and over and over again. And thank you, sir, you did a very good presentation.

MR. TYLER: Second the motion. Ms. Peters.

RAB COMMENT PERIOD

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, as we move right along, this is the RAB Comment Period, and during this process I would like for y'all to just take a moment out to really think about what has went on during this year and what you look forward to seeing with the RAB next year and what can we bring to the table to make the Restoration Advisory Board a lot better. So, if anyone wants to, you know, just freelance and comment on that, I would appreciate it.

MR. TYLER: Well, I'm always talking anyway. Stanley Tyler. Number one, I would like to thank the chairman for putting up with us and holding that honorary position for no money, which I know is very stressful, and I would like to thank him for letting me chair that subcommittee to try to get all the information to Ms. Hess. I thank him for his confidence and his vote of confidence in me for trying to run that committee.

And I would like to thank Mr. Eskridge, Ms. Bradshaw and all the others who served on that committee for all the information we had to go through. And I would like to thank Mr. Hunt for giving me those documents to be reviewed in a timely manner. And, also, I would like to say that I've enjoyed participating on the RAB Board, and, obviously, we are cutting back on these meetings, which I know some people are very happy about, and we're not going to have another one until ---

MR. WILLIAMS: February.

- MR. TYLER: -- February. Okay, and what about the BCT minutes? Are we going to get those or get a report from what went on in Atlanta?
- MR. HUNT: Those minutes have not been approved yet.
- MR. TYLER: Can we get a short synopsis or you can't talk until they're approved?
- MR. HUNT: Well, I don't have those minutes with me. I can make sure that we mail out the minutes to all of the RAB members as soon as we get final approval, if that's okay, Mr. Tyler.
- MR. TYLER: All right.
- MR. HUNT: Well, let's see. I do have -- okay, I do have a draft. That's good. We talked about the Master Schedule. First of all, the meeting was held on September 24. It was held in Atlanta. We did discuss the Master Schedule, which we talked about on this evening. There is an internal document that's called the BRAC Cleanup Plan, and that document is due November 1. So we talked about that briefly. We addressed the CERCLA Five-Year Review, basically that the BCT is reviewing Revision Zero. We're hopeful to have that completed by January of 2003.
- We talked about the enhanced bioremediation study on the Main Installation. I addressed that as one of the pilot studies that we started early this summer. Early results have indicated some positive direction in terms of those microorganisms, but it was concluded that it's too early to make a definitive statement on whether this study is really working the way that we want it. They are doing seven rounds of sampling, and we have only done, to this

point, two rounds. I think by January of 2003 would be the seventh round of sampling for this enhanced bioremediation study. So I anticipate by the spring of next year we'll have a good feel of whether or not this will be a good remedy for the groundwork on the Main Installation

MR. TYLER. Is it because the science is not good or the study takes so long to get the information back?

MR. HUNT: It takes time. Understanding that with this enhanced bioremediation the wells were dug, the fluids were injected, and now they are just doing the sampling to see how it is all working, and we've only done two rounds, and it's just a little bit too early. Although the data from the two events has indicated some changes that seems to be in the positive direction, but our -- I think it was Mr. Morrison had suggested that perhaps it's too early to make any definitives regarding the outcome of this study. And I do agree. Because we still have five more sampling events to occur.

We talked about the recovery system at Dunn Field. Once again, that CERCLA Five-Year Review centers on the recovery system because it was those wells that were placed in January of 1998, and the five years is up in 2003.

We also talked about the Site 60 EE/CA. We've completed that. We've completed the Action Memorandum. It was signed on October 8. And we're looking forward now to Jacobs Engineering going in and doing the actual removal of the lead, and we anticipate that to occur in December. So that was discussed at the last BCT meeting.

We also talked about the Feasibility Study that we're at the Revision Zero phase, and we're hopeful to have Revision 1 to the RAB members probably by January because I believe the February meeting will be on the Feasibility Study, and it will give the RAB members an opportunity to review and have some questions for our presenters at that time. That was basically it.

MR. TYLER: One other question. Did y'all touch on the plume, any possible off-site contamination that y'all have touched on once before in one of your BCT meetings?

MR. HUNT: There was a discussion of the upgradient VOCs, and that's the area where we believe that there are some contaminants that are flowing onto Dunn Field at the northeast corner. We have -- we're looking at installing some wells up in that area to identify perhaps the source. Because one thing about it, you know, if we do the remediation for Dunn Field, we can never really reach a level where we're complete.

We still have contaminants flowing. So we need to identify -- get that source identified. So, yes, that was addressed at the last BCT meeting.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anymore questions?

MR. HUNT: I will have the final probably within about a week or so, and I will make sure that it's mailed out to everyone.

MR. WILLIAMS: Ms. Brooks.

MR. HUNT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BROOKS: Peggy Brooks. In reference to your comment or your solicitation of information for next year for the future RAB meeting, I think that whether we're government personnel or just lay citizens, we all are stakeholders in the success of the Memphis Depot Restoration. And it is vital, it is incumbent, it is imperative that we cooperate and continue or let's not say, well, improve upon mutual respect and cooperation. And I hope that we can continue to keep the lines of communication open through our meetings, through postal mail, through e-mailings, through telephone calls and conferences. I hope that we can feel a closeness that we have not yet reached based on respect for and need for each other, and, basically, that's it.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyone else?

MR. TYLER: I won't see y'all again. Merry Christmas. Happy New Year. Happy Kwanzaa. I make a motion to adjourn.

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyone like to second that motion?

MS. PETERS: Second.

MR. WILLIAMS: All in favor? All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

MR. WILLIAMS: Any abstained. (Brief pause.)

MR. WILLIAMS: So moved. Meeting adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED At 7:00 P.M.

NEXT RAB MEETING FEBRUARY 20, 2003

Attendance List

Restoration Advisory Board Members

Mr. Clyde Hunt	Remedial Program Manager
Mr. Mondell Williams	Community Co-Chair
Mr. Dave Bond	Citizen Representative
Ms. Johnnie Mae Peters	Citizen Representative
Mr. Stanley Tyler	Citizen Representative
Ms. Peggy Brooks	Citizen Representative
Ms. Janet Hooks	Civic Representative/Memphis City Council

Others in Attendance

Ms. Joy Farwell	Community Member
Ms. Alma Black Moore	Frontline Communications
Mr. Trevor S. Diggins	Frontline Communications
Ms. Adrienne Hill	Frontline Communications

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE