

**Minutes
Fort McClellan Restoration Advisory Board
Fort McClellan, AL**

Monday, April 15, 2002

Submission to RAB for approval - minutes of meeting April 15, 2002

PRESENT:

Co-Chair: Craig Branchfield

Board Members: Scott Beckett, James Buford, Monty Clendenin, Pete Conroy, Barry Cox, Jerome Elser, Donna Fathke, Curtis Franklin, Mary Harrington, Jerry Hopper

BCT Members: Philip Stroud, Ron Levy

JPA:

A. CALL TO ORDER AND MINUTES

Mr. Branchfield called the meeting to order, conducted roll call, and asked for guest introductions. The board approved the minutes from the March meeting.

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. JPA Request for Extension of Public Comment Period for Landfill EE/CA

Due to her absence at tonight's meeting, Ms. Miki Schneider submitted a letter to the RAB explaining the JPA was requesting an extension of 60 days to the public comment period for the Landfill EE/CA. The extension was needed to give their contractor time to review the revised March version of the EE/CA. Mr. Levy stated the Army intends to entertain the JPA request. A public notice will be published after the JPA submits the request to the Army. The Technical Review Committee will receive the extension, too.

2. Technical Review Committee Membership

Jerry Hopper accepted a position on the TRC.

3. Technical Assistance Public Participation Startup Meeting

Mr. Conroy and Dr. Cox met with Mr. Ryan and Mr. Levy to discuss opportunities for getting TAPP money to assist with RAB efforts. Dr. Cox discussed the TAPP proposal request to contract out document reviews for the RAB. Two contractors were proposed. Mr. Levy asked the RAB members to look carefully at the scope of work to be sure it reflected their needs. A brief discussion ensued concerning the technical aspects of the scope of work. The RAB voted to accept the TAPP application as well as Mr. Ron Grant as the sole source contractor. Dr. Cox suggested Mr. Grant review the landfill EE/CA, and there was no dissent from the RAB. The RAB discussed particulars concerning when the contract would be in place.

C. PROGRAM

Review of Landfill EE/CA

Mr. Conroy expressed concern that the direction the Army has taken with regard to these landfills is not in the best interest of the community. He stated the financial data showed eight million dollars to take care of the landfills and 11 million dollars required for thirty-year maintenance adding up to nineteen million. Consolidation of landfills would cost twenty-two million dollars. He said reconsideration of the Army's proposed decision for the landfills was attractive.

Mr. Conroy then discussed keeping the permanent wells in place for use later. He asked if the existing wells could be used for dye testing as Mayor Kimbrough mentioned. Mr. Stroud stated there were about 41 permanent wells and 29 temporary wells.

Mr. Levy explained there are two separate investigations for the landfill – an investigation of the fill area and another for the groundwater. The Army will have to address the groundwater contamination regardless of whether the action taken at the landfill is a cover or a removal. The study is not complete but assuming the action for the groundwater has a long-term monitoring requirement the Army will have to leave enough wells to continue monitoring groundwater.

Mr. Levy stated the purpose of the EE/CA was to look at protection of human health and the environment, not necessarily to address reuse issues. Ms. Fathke stated there was potential for the contents of landfill 3 to further contaminate the groundwater and could get worse if landfill were not cleaned up. Mr. Levy explained the purpose of the cap would be to stop infiltration and leaching of contaminants into groundwater.

Dr. Cox stated the Army's plan limits reuse of the property, and Mr. Conroy stated a consolidation approach for the other landfills would lift the burden from the community. Based on the costs he presented earlier, Mr. Conroy thought consolidation seemed feasible.

There was further discussion regarding consolidation of landfills. Mr. Stroud discussed washing of the landfill, which happens when the fill material is buried in the water table. A cap does no good in those cases and he said he wants to look at it when he gets all of the water level data. He said ADEM is watching how the Army and the community work this out.

In answer to why the Army has not responded to Mayor Kimbrough's request to put dye in the Army's wells, Mr. Doyle stated the Army is awaiting a written request from the City of Weaver stating the details of what the Mayor wants to do.

There was discussion of groundwater flow and direction from landfill 3 and Ms. Yacoub stated that would be addressed in the remedial investigation that is underway to look at the groundwater at landfill 3.

Mr. Beckett raised a question regarding how the risk management decision was made that there was no risk at 3 landfills when the study showed ecological risks by EPA thresholds. Mr. Levy replied that the Army would answer this question after they had time to talk to their contractor. (Note: Mr. Beckett had submitted this question in writing to the Army.)

There was discussion regarding providing additional LF EE/CA documents to the RAB members with Mr. Levy stating to let him know if anyone wanted a document. The RAB voted to concur with the JPA for the sixty-day extension on the public comment period for the landfill EE/CA.

Ms. Fathke asked whether the Army would wait to finalize the draft landfill EE/CA until after the groundwater study was complete in order to address issues such as washing as mentioned by Mr. Stroud. She questioned whether the cap would do any good if the landfill is being washed. Ms. Yacoub replied the cap is compatible with any future groundwater remedy in that it would solve infiltration. The washing would have to be addressed in a separate manner as a groundwater remedy independent of the cap. Dr. Cox stated if the landfill were removed, the cap would not be required.

Mr. Levy discussed the non-CERCLA actions the Army is proposing because of safety or reuse issues at some of the fill areas. He stated there are no reuse restrictions on those properties so a developer could come in and remove the material.

Mr. Branchfield summarized the discussion by stating the RAB agreed it would like more time to review the EE/CA and would like to see comments from the JPA reviewer as well as from the TAPP contractor. He stated there appear to be three common themes in the discussion: (1) need to keep in mind the groundwater issue is separate from the landfill issue because they are being addressed through a separate process, (2) interest in the mayor's proposal for dye tracing, (3) Mr. Conroy's comments regarding consolidation of landfills because there is not much difference in cost over consolidation versus the other alternatives, and the RAB is looking for more information regarding that issue.

Mr. Stroud stated that even if the landfill is removed, there would probably be cost involved in long-term monitoring because of the leachate that is already there.

Mr. Levy expressed concern that Mr. Grant would have a lot of information to go through in 1 1/2 months. Mr. Branchfield stated maybe they could focus Mr. Grant's efforts if they want him to concentrate on a few issues or landfills.

In response to a request to set an agenda item after the public comment period to come back and discuss comments again, Mr. Levy stated he would like to have the comments in hand prior to the meeting so that he could respond to them and be prepared to discuss the comments in depth.

There was brief discussion about the landfill public meeting.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Agency Reports

ADEM – Mr. Stroud reminded the RAB that EPA now sends their review comments to ADEM where they are incorporated into ADEM's comments. He stated ADEM has selected a UXO contractor that now has to go through a legislative process for approval. Due to EPA Region 4 withdrawal from UXO reviews, ADEM requires a UXO contractor to aid in that review process. Mr. Levy stated the Army is concerned about delays in reviews holding up work and, in turn, property transfers. Mr. Stroud discussed his visit to well drilling sites on Mr. Brown's property and the highway and the information coming out of the drilling data.

EPA – Mr. Brittain was unable to attend due to budget constraints. Mr. Conroy passed out a letter he wrote Mr. Jimmy Palmer, the regional administrator of EPA Region 4, expressing concern over Mr. Brittain's inability to participate in RAB and BCT meetings due to the funding situation and requesting EPA to provide adequate funding. Mr. Conroy stated he had committed to write another letter relative to the concern over EPA's pulling out of the UXO business and would do so soon. Mr. Stroud stated ADEM is preparing a letter encouraging EPA to again deal with HTRW and UXO issues. Mr. Conroy committed as a RAB member to tracking the contract review process to assist ADEM in getting a contractor on board as soon as possible.

JPA – Ms. Schneider was unable to attend the meeting but sent a note to the RAB stating the JPA will ask the Army for a 60-day extension to the landfill EE/CA public comment period. This note was discussed at the beginning of the meeting.

2. Action Summary Sheet

Mr. Levy stated he would take any comments or questions on the action summary sheet. He briefly discussed the CWM investigations on Main Post and Pelham Range. He mentioned the Alpha Area EE/CA report is undergoing internal and regulatory agency review. Fieldwork is complete in the Bravo Area and the EE/CA report is being written. In Charlie Area, the fieldwork is beginning. The removal action is underway in M1.01 area.

3. Eastern Bypass Concerns

Mr. Levy addressed a concern presented by Mr. Thomassy at a previous meeting that ALDOT stated the Army was holding up the eastern bypass. Mr. Levy stated ALDOT denied they were saying anything like that, and they would talk to their people about it if anything were being put out to that effect.

4. Request for Transcript

Dr. Cox requested an electronic copy of the verbatim transcript of the meeting, and Mr. Levy agreed to look into it.

5. Additional 1300 Acres for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mr. Conroy made a motion and it was seconded that the RAB convey its concerns regarding anything other than a fed to fed transfer of 1300 acres of property relative to the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge. The RAB voted unanimously to accept Mr. Conroy's motion. Mr. Branchfield asked Mr. Conroy to write a letter to the JPA expressing the RAB's support of this issue.

E. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Mrs. Gail Allen stated she owned property in Weaver and expressed concern about groundwater contamination (from landfill 3) affecting her family and others in Weaver. Mrs. Allen has property on Weaver Road bordering about 2000 feet of Cane Creek. She wants to know if the water in the creek is clean enough for her family to play in and for her to plant, in a possible flood area, corn for resale or personal consumption. She questioned whether there had been a study of Cane Creek water. Mr. Conroy stated that JSU would test the water free of charge and gave her his number to call.

F. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business brought before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.