

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

\* \* \* \* \*

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court  
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at  
Building 141-A, Basement Conference Room, Fort  
McClellan, Alabama, on the 19th day of August, 1996,  
commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.

R E P O R T E R ' S I N D E X

CAPTION SHEET . . . . .	1
REPORTER'S INDEX . . . . .	2
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD . . . . .	3-98
CERTIFICATE . . . . .	99-100

1

2

MR. TURNER: Shall we come to

3

order. Good evening. For those that don't know me,

4

I'm Charles Turner. This is the regular monthly

5

meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board.

6

We have a court reporter at our

7

meetings, and she asks that anybody who is not sitting

8

at the table, that wants to speak, identify themselves

9

first, so she doesn't have to interrupt us and ask who

10

is speaking.

11

Let's call the role. I'm here.

12

Mr. Levy is not. Mr. Anderson?

13

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

14

MR. TURNER: Mr. Brown?

15

Mr. Conroy? Dr. Cox?

16

DR. COX: Here.

17

MR. TURNER: Mr. Cunningham?

18

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Here.

19

MR. TURNER: Mr. Elser?

20

MR. ELSER: Here.

21

MR. TURNER: Ms. Harrington?

22

Mr. Hood?

23

MR. HOOD: Here.



1 MR. TURNER: Mayor Kimbrough?  
2 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.  
3 MR. TURNER: Ms. Longstreth?  
4 MS. LONGSTRETH: Here.  
5 MR. TURNER: Mr. Miller?  
6 Mr. Moore?  
7 MR. MOORE: Here.  
8 MR. TURNER: Mr. Parks?  
9 MR. PARKS: Here.  
10 MR. TURNER: Mr. Perez?  
11 Mr. Thomassy?  
12 MR. THOMASSY: Here.  
13 MR. TURNER: Mr. West? Mr. Reedy?  
14 MR. REEDY: Here.  
15 MR. TURNER: Mr. Johnson?  
16 MR. JOHNSON: Here.  
17 MR. TURNER: Has everybody had a  
18 chance to look over the minutes from the last meeting?  
19 Are there any editions, deletions, or corrections?  
20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: We might want  
21 to just clarify that there was seventeen sites that  
22 had SI's and only twelve that underwent RI's.  
23 MR. TURNER: Okay. What's the



1 correction again, Chris?

2 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: There is  
3 seventeen sites that underwent an SI.

4 MR. TURNER: Yes.

5 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: And that of  
6 those seventeen, twelve underwent an RI.

7 MR. TURNER: Anything else? With  
8 that correction in mind, is there a motion to approve  
9 the minutes?

10 MR. THOMASSY: I make that motion  
11 that we approve the minutes as amended.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

13 MR. TURNER: All in favor? Motion  
14 carried.

15 Before we get into our guest  
16 speaker presentation, it occurred to me and Ron, after  
17 the last meeting, that perhaps it went a little long  
18 and that it was taking some of the fun out of the  
19 public service for our meetings to endure so.

20 So, what we discussed was putting  
21 us at not doing any training until we had taken care  
22 of the administrative part of forming up. And it  
23 seemed like a good idea. Then we realized that y'all

1 might have some questions that you wanted answered on  
2 the EBS. And that since the time to respond to the  
3 EBS is clicking and that Mr. Elliott was willing to  
4 come and answer our questions, we thought perhaps we  
5 would do that and put off the administrative,  
6 particularly the bylaws, until next month.

7 I've got the bylaws pretty much  
8 finished. They need to be proofed. And I thought we  
9 would just take that up next month and try to keep  
10 this meeting to an hour and a half, if that was  
11 possible.

12 Anybody got any ideas on that?

13 Okay. Let's get started. Mr. Elliott?

14 MR. ELLIOTT: I don't have a formal  
15 presentation prepared, but I'm prepared to accept  
16 questions and answers, if you have specific questions  
17 they've come across.

18 MR. TURNER: I do have a question  
19 related to the incinerator at the hospital. I noticed  
20 in the EBS that it recited that the incinerator was  
21 planned to be shut down in May or June of 1996, so  
22 that they would have to avoid -- they could avoid  
23 future compliance with the Clean Air Act.





1 to the folks over at the hospital, that they've been  
2 running the incinerator for a number of years. And  
3 there have recently been enacted some regulations  
4 which require them to take certain actions and comply  
5 with a certain set of regulations regarding air  
6 emissions from among other things, incinerators. And  
7 those regulations are taking effect at this point.

8 Rather than go to the expense of  
9 complying with those regulations, they're going to  
10 shut the incinerator down and manage their waste in  
11 another manner. I think they're going to ship it  
12 off-site to be managed by a permitted biological or  
13 infectious waste certified outfit. So, they can avoid  
14 the expense of complying with the EPA regulations by  
15 just shutting the incinerator down.

16 And that's just about the extent of  
17 my knowledge. I would have to go back and look at my  
18 notes in more detail. But I hope that answers the  
19 question. Does that answer the question or not?

20 MR. TURNER: Yes, sir, I guess it  
21 does. But it was a cost issue?

22 MR. HERBERT: Right. I didn't go  
23 into much more detail, because I really didn't feel I

1 needed to. But I assume that it's more cost effective  
2 for them to manage their waste by sending it to  
3 somebody who handles, I guess, a lot of waste from  
4 similar hospitals, rather than for them to keep their  
5 incinerator up to burn just a little bit at a time.

6 MR. TURNER: Right. Where is Rob?  
7 Rob, do you have any questions?

8 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Is it closed,  
9 now?

10 MR. TURNER: Do what?

11 MR. RICHARDSON: Is it currently  
12 closed?

13 MR. HERBERT: Is the incinerator  
14 currently closed? I have no information, other than  
15 what I collected back in, I think it was January, is  
16 when I collected that information. So, I assume that  
17 they maintained that schedule. I've not done any  
18 checking to see if they have.

19 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Are you aware  
20 of other permits that have been lapsed, due to cost  
21 issues?

22 MR. HERBERT: Am I aware of any  
23 other permits that have lapsed?

1 MR. GARY HARVEY: Not lapsed.

2 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Or that won't  
3 be renewed, due to cost issues?

4 MR. HERBERT: Are we aware of any  
5 other permits that -- any operations they're going to  
6 shut down to avoid the cost of complying with the  
7 permits? None that I'm aware of.

8 MR. ELLIOTT: Bill Elliott. The  
9 only other one that we know of -- and Lisa may be able  
10 to help us address this a little bit better. But the  
11 landfills, I think, are the only other permitting  
12 issue, where rather than again, go through the formal  
13 procedure of getting a landfill permit to continue  
14 operating, they're just not going to continue using  
15 the landfills.

16 And as far as the incinerator goes,  
17 the only other thing I can think of to go with that  
18 was that part of the cost was associated with the  
19 actual mechanical upgrading they would have to do to  
20 meet the stricter air emissions requirements. And  
21 part of it had to do with the actual documentation of  
22 permitting process and the expense associated with the  
23 filing for that modification and the new documents



1 that would have to be prepared to do that.

2 Like you were saying, it's a small  
3 volume of waste that they're wanting to treat. And  
4 the permit hasn't lapsed. It's just not going to be  
5 renewed is my understanding.

6 MR. HERBERT: It's not that they're  
7 out of compliance with anything, it's just that  
8 they're going to shut down operations before they  
9 would be required to meet these new more stringent  
10 requirements.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, if we have  
12 somebody come in that wants to reuse the hospital or  
13 something, then that will not be able -- that  
14 incinerator will not be able to be used unless some  
15 expense is put out to meet -- to comply with these  
16 regulations?

17 MR. HERBERT: I would assume that's  
18 true. But, again, I did not press the people about  
19 the particulars of exactly why they were shutting it  
20 down. All I needed to know is, as far as I saw it at  
21 the time, from the standpoint of, are they complying  
22 with the laws. Yes, they are. They're going to stop  
23 operations.

1                   So, I assume that what you're  
2           saying is correct. I mean, that was implied. But  
3           again I didn't go into much detail on that.

4                   MR. MICHAEL MOORE: When you're  
5           talking about the landfill issue, are we talking to  
6           the actual base closure and then the permitting will  
7           stop? Because right now the landfill is being  
8           operated for construction debris and also burial of  
9           asbestos. Is there a specific time that you know of  
10          for the closure? Because, also ADEM out of Montgomery  
11          has given permission to raise the height of the  
12          landfill for construction debris only. As we all  
13          know, the household waste is sent to a transfer point.  
14          But are there any specified dates, other than the BRAC  
15          time line?

16                  MR. ELLIOTT: And I have to review  
17          the section that we wrote for the EBS and see if we've  
18          mentioned a specific date in there. But I don't know.  
19          Lisa, do you know --

20                  MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: I don't know  
21          the particulars on it. I know that ADEM came out not  
22          too long ago and looked at the landfill and said we  
23          still had more room to put stuff in it. So, somebody

1 was supposed to be renewing the permits so that we  
2 could keep operating until '98 or '99. Well, until it  
3 gets filled up.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: My understanding was  
5 it was supposed to be at least a one year extension.  
6 But I don't know from what date it was going to be  
7 extended. But I believe it was at least a one year  
8 extension.

9 MR. TURNER: Chris, does that fall  
10 under your domain?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes. I'll be  
12 glad to find that out for you. I'll talk to land  
13 division. No problem.

14 MR. HARRY SUMMERS: My name is  
15 Harry Summers. I'm with ECG. The question I have,  
16 again, about the incinerator, Fort Rucker closed an  
17 incinerator of similar nature and then spent probably  
18 fifteen years trying to get it officially closed by  
19 ADEM because of the residual hazardous waste that was  
20 on the facility.

21 I'm wondering if the EBS addresses  
22 the residual hazard that is posed by the closed  
23 incinerator? I mean, as far as getting rid of it, if





1 in fact we end up wanting to get rid of it, is it in  
2 fact, will it be classified hazardous and will it be a  
3 large expenditure of money associated with having to  
4 get it closed?

5 MR. ELLIOTT: That's one of the  
6 things that will be looked at in the BRAC clean up.  
7 The EBS really just documents the current condition of  
8 the facility. And then based on that information, in  
9 the BRAC clean-up plan, we would evaluate what type of  
10 remediation and closure strategies will be required  
11 and what the impact or expense would be there.

12 But we haven't done that, yet,  
13 because the EBS just basically documents the current  
14 condition of the facility.

15 MR. HERBERT: One thing we do know  
16 is that they analyze the ash that comes out of that  
17 incinerator. And every time they've analyzed it, with  
18 one exception, I think, it's been non-hazardous. So,  
19 this is not an incinerator that produces hazardous  
20 waste, routinely.

21 MR. ELLIOTT: Right.

22 MR. HERBERT: The only time it  
23 failed, it was -- I believe it may have been mentioned

1 in the EBS. It failed once for barium. It was high  
2 in the middle, barium. We're not sure how it got in  
3 there. Maybe somebody took a bag of some barium  
4 contained material, put it in there that shouldn't  
5 have gone in the incinerator.

6 That load of ash failed. It went  
7 to a hazardous waste landfill. Everything else has  
8 passed, so it's not a hazardous waste source.

9 MR. ELLIOTT: Right.

10 MR. HERBERT: So, I would assume --  
11 I would make -- I would work under the assumption that  
12 there would be no problem closing this. That you  
13 wouldn't have the same problem here that you did at  
14 Fort Rucker.

15 MR. SUMMERS: Rucker.

16 MR. ELLIOTT: Keep in mind, this is  
17 not a hazardous waste incinerator, per se. It's  
18 mainly biological and infectious waste.

19 MR. HERBERT: Right.

20 MR. ELLIOTT: And the standard in  
21 the industry is to incinerate biological and  
22 infectious waste. So, it's not -- its primary  
23 function is not to treat hazardous waste, it's to

1 incinerate biological and infectious waste. So it's a  
2 little bit different.

3 MR. REEDY: Before we -- I'm Bart  
4 Reedy with the EPA. Before we stamp the -- after it  
5 closes and before we stamp the incinerator, you know,  
6 clean, good to go, we will do whatever testing is  
7 required and is appropriate to ensure that there is  
8 not a problem with it. That will happen.

9 MR. ELLIOTT: Right.

10 MR. REEDY: Now, exactly what that  
11 entails, I can't speak to right now.

12 MR. TURNER: Mr. Anderson?

13 MR. REEDY: But we're not just  
14 going to close it and walk away. That's not  
15 happening.

16 MR. ANDERSON: To the question of  
17 documenting the state of the facility, one of the  
18 things that is sort of very nebulously documented in  
19 the EBS is -- if I may use the laser pointer right  
20 here -- all of this stuff out here. Okay. All it  
21 says is that we've been firing munitions at it for  
22 about a century. But it doesn't tell us what's there.

23 And one of the things that I guess

1 I have a concern with is this installation has been  
2 the economic engine of this community for half a  
3 century. The easy way out is to do absolutely  
4 nothing. Which, of course, the Nature Conservancy and  
5 everybody really wants us to do. And it's the cheap  
6 way out. But it doesn't do anything for the economic  
7 livelihood of this community.

8 What's going to happen to that area  
9 there depends on what you tell us in this EBS. Are we  
10 going to get anything more on what's out there? I  
11 know we've got problems with metal -- with iron ore  
12 out there that makes magnetometers a problem and so on  
13 and so forth.

14 MR. REEDY: Can --

15 MR. ELLIOTT: Basically, what we  
16 did was -- and again, the EBS is not really the  
17 document that presents your remediation strategies --

18 MR. ANDERSON: Right.

19 MR. ELLIOTT: -- for different  
20 environmental problems. Really, the EBS, again, just  
21 documents the current condition. And, of course,  
22 historical use is included in that.

23 So, what we tried to do with the

1 ranges was to first of all to document the maximum  
2 extent of ranges, historically and currently, that  
3 have ever been used at Fort McClellan and then kind of  
4 make a composite outline there. You see that brown  
5 area on the map you're talking about. You can notice  
6 that it's roughly three quarters of the main post.

7                   What we tried to do there was to  
8 divide that up. And since then -- and this is the  
9 first version of this map that came out. It's just  
10 kind of an internal version. In the June or July  
11 draft EBS, which you recently received, if you look at  
12 this area on the map, you'll now notice it's divided  
13 up into fused ordnance and small arms ordnance.

14                   And basically what we're concerned  
15 with, there are two different environmental problems.  
16 One area, you're concerned -- like you were  
17 mentioning, small arms -- you're concerned mostly with  
18 environmental degradation, due to incidental disposal  
19 of lead, lead fragments, cartridge casing, that type  
20 of thing. That's one type of a problem. And  
21 obviously, less difficult of a problem to deal with.

22                   The other area that you're talking  
23 about would be areas where fused ordnance or anything

1 in the warhead or an explosive, high explosive was  
2 known to have been used. And that's a completely  
3 different problem. That's really not as easy to  
4 address as the small arms ranges are.

5 Basically, a lot of these ranges  
6 have been used for fused ordnance, at some point in  
7 the past. Some of them have since been converted to  
8 some other use, small arms range. Some of them have  
9 become inactive. But none of those ranges, to my  
10 knowledge, at least anyway, has recently received a  
11 thorough survey for unexploded ordnance. I mean,  
12 that's a very expensive and time consuming task.

13 One of the problems with a lot of  
14 historical ranges, especially in the eastern portion  
15 of the main post, that makes it difficult to assess  
16 exactly what's there is the fact that they're steeply  
17 sloped and they're heavily wooded. And doing  
18 unexploded ordnance surveys by the typical methods  
19 that are employed today with the equipment that's  
20 available today, requires really ideally level terrain  
21 and no trees. And so, to try to address those with  
22 the existing technology is difficult and will be very  
23 expensive.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Let me ask -- this  
2 is a two part question. And there really is a hidden  
3 agenda to this.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: Okay.

5 MR. ANDERSON: Was that supposed to  
6 be part of the baseline survey or was it scoped out?

7 MR. REEDY: Say again.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Was it supposed to  
9 be part of the baseline environmental survey or was it  
10 scoped out?

11 MR. ELLIOTT: The environmental  
12 baseline --

13 MR. REEDY: Can I speak to that?

14 MR. ELLIOTT: Sure.

15 MR. REEDY: Mr. Anderson, the  
16 environmental baseline survey is a document designed  
17 to give the Department of Defense a snapshot of what  
18 it is that they're looking at nationwide. It is also  
19 designed to give -- we generated, here at the base  
20 level, and it gives DoD a snapshot of what's going on  
21 nationwide. Because this isn't the only base closing.

22 We knew up front that everything  
23 that you're talking about there, the ranges, we knew



1       that -- and DOD is still trying to make up its mind  
2       with input from every Congressman and every lobbying  
3       group and EPA and a whole bunch of states, that what  
4       it is that we can do as a nation with ranges. And  
5       that issue is being debated hot and heavy. And it's  
6       something that we knew as the base closure team and as  
7       our contractors -- I'm calling them "our contractors,"  
8       because they really are our -- they don't work for me,  
9       but they're our eyes and ears --

10                       MR. ANDERSON: I understand.

11                       MR. REEDY: We knew that we could  
12       not -- there was not enough money budgeted to go out  
13       and adequately do anymore than just barely draw a line  
14       around it and do some bit of exploring, talking to  
15       people, what was done and where it was done. And that  
16       is all that we intended to do with the EBS. The  
17       reason being, as John said -- excuse me. I'm sorry --  
18       as Bill said, the technology to adequately define the  
19       areas is designed for -- it would be -- it works great  
20       in Miami. It doesn't work worth a hoot over here in  
21       the mountains. The technology really doesn't suit  
22       what we've got and the money is not there and in the  
23       -- in the budget right now that we had to spend. And

1 we also knew that the primary of the two halves of the  
2 base, the part that has buildings on it and the part  
3 that's out in the mountains, that in all probability,  
4 people were going to want the part that's already  
5 cleared and has some infrastructure already up and  
6 running, as opposed to out in the mountains. And we  
7 did not have the -- again, we did not have the  
8 rule-making authority -- what we're talking about here  
9 is the range rule. And we did -- that is well beyond  
10 the scope of the base level and EPA and ADEM's level.

11 And so, everybody is really kind of  
12 waiting on clarification on what it is we can and  
13 should do with literally thousands of ranges across  
14 the nation.

15 MR. ANDERSON: I'm not an advocate  
16 of clear cutting timber or anything of this nature,  
17 but it seems to me that an option that might be nice  
18 to have in the future is if Georgia Pacific or Alabama  
19 Power wants to come in and do some logging up in those  
20 areas, they ought to be able to do that.

21 And if we don't have this in the  
22 EBS, are we cut out of anything like that in the  
23 future for those areas?



1 MR. REEDY: Oh, no, no. The EBS --  
2 again, the EBS is simply a snapshot as, this is the  
3 information we know right now. It is not a decision  
4 document.

5 MR. TURNER: And it can be amended.

6 MR. REEDY: Yes, oh, yes. We'll  
7 amend it and update it. But, no, it is not a decision  
8 document by any ways.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. That's --

10 MR. THOMASSY: On a general subject  
11 of what I was going to ask, I've heard that the  
12 radiological laboratory in the surrounding systems,  
13 including the underground storage systems, have been  
14 cleaned up completely, now. Would you be able to  
15 quickly get changes like that out to the EBS so that  
16 it's a living, up-to-date document?

17 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, Bart, do you  
18 want to address that?

19 MR. REEDY: Yes.

20 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: I'll address  
21 it.

22 MR. REEDY: Dean?

23 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: I'm Dean



1 Hutchens. Yes. I mean, that can be one of our  
2 comments. Right now it's in the draft stage. It can  
3 be a comment from us. And they know, as reports come  
4 in, as things happen, they're doing it today, they'll  
5 do it up until it goes final. But at some point,  
6 they're going to have to cut it off at some date.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: All right. Since we  
8 just interviewed someone else today, to provide more  
9 information for the environmental baseline survey, we  
10 conducted another interview today. So, we're still  
11 gathering information.

12 MR. THOMASSY: So, we can expect to  
13 see changes coming out soon, based on additional  
14 information you've gleaned since that was published in  
15 June?

16 MR. HUTCHENS: You won't see it  
17 before the next iteration. There won't be  
18 supplemental handouts, input, or amendments to it. It  
19 will be incorporated in the next version.

20 MR. TURNER: This is just a draft.

21 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: Right.

22 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right.

23 MR. THOMASSY: When will the final

1 document be published?

2 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: It depends on  
3 when the comments are received. Thirty days after  
4 they receive comments, they're due to us.

5 MR. THOMASSY: When is that period?

6 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: We'll, we've  
7 asked for comments from everyone, I think, by the end  
8 of this month. And I think Ron Levy was thinking  
9 about extending the review period. And I think maybe  
10 that's something for debate. I'm not sure if it is or  
11 not. For right now, we're scheduled for about the end  
12 of August to get in comments.

13 MR. TURNER: Now, I know the LRA is  
14 going to respond by the end of August. Isn't that  
15 right, Rob?

16 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: 29th.

17 MR. TURNER: And ADEM is going to  
18 be prepared to respond about the same time, right,  
19 Chris?

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I can have mine  
21 done by the 29th. I mean, we would like to keep it as  
22 expeditious as we can. But I mean, if Bart -- if  
23 something comes up and Bart feels like he needs more

1 time, if there is something that is major pending, I  
2 mean, there is nothing to keep us to the 29th.

3 But we'd like to kind of stay on  
4 track with the time line in getting -- I'm not sure  
5 what the date -- is Lisa -- what is the date?

6 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: It's the  
7 29th.

8 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I'm talking  
9 about the final.

10 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: Thirty days  
11 after they receive the comments, the final.

12 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: There's a legal  
13 -- going back to the legal requirement. There is a  
14 legal requirement to have this done, and I think it's  
15 either fifteen or eighteen months after the  
16 installations are listed or officially closed, which  
17 was in September of '95. So, I think if -- whatever  
18 that time frame is, that's the legal requirement.  
19 We're ahead of that and we want to be ahead of that.

20 MR. REEDY: It's going to be close,  
21 though, because, frankly speaking, I work in Atlanta,  
22 we've had the Olympics, and I'm actually behind Chris  
23 now in reviewing the EBS. And we're fixing, this



1 week, to actually pick all of our office up and move  
2 it about eight blocks and then try to set the phones  
3 and the computers back up. So, I'm a little behind  
4 the curb on that.

5 But, if I could for just a minute,  
6 if I could speak maybe to your question. I think this  
7 speaks to it. I hope it does.

8 The EBS identifies sites and areas  
9 that all of us have identified, either through  
10 documentation or past experience of similar kinds of  
11 operations that may or may not have an environmental  
12 problem. And we have -- you know, we've worked quite  
13 closely with ESE and Ron and the base. And every  
14 interview, turned over every piece of paper, kicked  
15 every rock we can find, and we've updated it. The  
16 maps up there are out of date. But we have -- we're  
17 coming up with a list of sites. And that list of  
18 sites is parcels or buildings that may or may not have  
19 a problem with them. And where you will find the  
20 answer to your question, well, how will we know when  
21 it's clean, we will -- we are going to establish --  
22 that's not it?

23 MR. THOMASSY: No. My question

1 was: Since we got a significant change in the study,  
2 itself, by the clean up of the RAB lab, that's been  
3 done now. But it was just done within the last few  
4 weeks.

5 MR. REEDY: Right.

6 MR. THOMASSY: I think that's a  
7 significant change and we've got to make sure it gets  
8 into that baseline study, because that's a clean area  
9 for the LRA to look at.

10 That's what I was driving at,  
11 something significant. I wasn't trying to dot the I's  
12 and cross the T's. That's stuff I'm not concerned  
13 about.

14 MR. REEDY: Does the thought that I  
15 was -- does everybody follow the thought that --

16 MR. THOMASSY: Uh-huh.

17 MR. REEDY: -- on the sites?

18 MR. TURNER: Yes.

19 MR. REEDY: What we're doing with  
20 those?

21 MR. TURNER: I'm going in order, so  
22 I'm going to write you down. Mr. Richardson?

23 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Oh, I was just

1       curious, will the qualifiers, relative to UXO, be  
2       included in the baseline study, some of the, you know,  
3       the business from EPA about the technology is not  
4       there and just barely draw lines and do some  
5       exploring, that type of thing? Will that be included  
6       in the document?

7                       MR. REEDY: Not necessarily, no.  
8       The document is not -- we're not going into technology  
9       or explanations, we're just going to state that here's  
10      what we know about it.

11                     MR. HERBERT: I think that would  
12      more appropriately --

13                     MR. REEDY: Yes.

14                     MR. HERBERT: -- go in the BRAC  
15      clean-up plan, if we were to address it there.

16                     MR. ELLIOTT: And the EBS is not  
17      really meant to address remediation strategies.  
18      Again, it's only --

19                     MR. ROB RICHARDSON: I didn't say  
20      -- I didn't mean that, either. One of the things the  
21      LRA will be commenting on is that if there are  
22      qualifiers attached to it, then they should be  
23      included in the document, that's all.

1 MR. ELLIOTT: They are. We've  
2 identified all the sites that we know of where fused  
3 ordnance has been used. And, you know, that  
4 discussion is in the EBS, the fact that those sites  
5 need to be further investigated before we can do  
6 anything with them.

7 MR. TURNER: Mr. Summers?

8 MR. HARRY SUMMERS: Yes. My  
9 question was: I hear you draw a distinction between  
10 fused ordnance and regular small arms. Is there -- I  
11 mean, who establishes that criteria and says that's  
12 the end-all criteria? I guess I was wanting to know  
13 why we couldn't do small arms areas where there is a  
14 potential for lead to be impacting ground water or  
15 surface water and just all other range areas, small  
16 arms? And then by the same token, in the fused areas,  
17 that some kind of a risk based assessment done to say,  
18 an area where this is extremely critical to keep the  
19 people out, because there is a higher risk and then a  
20 lower risk or whatever, who establishes those  
21 criteria, as opposed to just say, cut it in half or  
22 whatever and say, fused over here and small arms over  
23 there?



1 MR. ELLIOTT: That's a good point.  
2 And again, the purpose of the EBS is not to recommend  
3 remediation strategy. The purpose of the EBS is just  
4 to document what's there. And basically those are the  
5 two major issues, as far as the DoD is concerned, with  
6 these types of firing ranges. Fused ordnance  
7 obviously represents a much higher safety hazard,  
8 because you may have an unexploded, high explosive  
9 warhead or some other -- a grenade or a rocket or  
10 something like that that poses an acute safety hazard,  
11 as opposed to environmental lead, which does -- it  
12 does pose environmental contamination hazard.

13 So, that's the way we split it up  
14 for the EBS. But that's not to say that all the sites  
15 will be treated exactly the same.

16 Again the BCP is where you develop  
17 your remediation strategies for specific sites or  
18 parcels. And they'll be looked at in that regard. I  
19 mean, they'll be looked at site by site and not as one  
20 contiguous area. We'll look at, you know, specific  
21 ranges that are known to have used specific types of  
22 ordnance. And that's the way we'll look at them,  
23 based on the best available information.

1                   But again, a lot of the ranges we  
2           don't have complete information on everything that was  
3           ever done there. We have the best available  
4           information. So, there really needs to be more  
5           investigation that would need to be done before you  
6           could even adopt a remediation strategy for a  
7           particular area.

8                   But you're right, the ground water  
9           is important and the other issues are important.

10                   MR. HARRY SUMMERS: Again, it's  
11           just a matter of definition. You tell me -- do I  
12           understand you to say the DoD prescribes that you  
13           classify fused and non-fused? And that's the level of  
14           distinction that you will draw on that big area?

15                   MR. ELLIOTT: Well, maybe -- I  
16           guess that may look like an over-simplification. But  
17           really, again, there are two different issues.

18                   MR. HERBERT: Really, the answer to  
19           that -- John Herbert with ESE -- the answer to the  
20           last question that you asked, as I understand it, the  
21           answer is, no. DoD did not specify that we break out  
22           fused versus small arms or just lead shot ranges.

23                   MR. ELLIOTT: Right.

1 MR. HERBERT: We made that  
2 determination because it was -- because, again,  
3 there's not a whole lot of detail that's necessarily  
4 available about an individual range. We've got a  
5 certain amount of information. Looking at the  
6 records, we can go back so far. And we really don't  
7 have specific information prior to -- pick a date. I  
8 don't know exactly what the date would be. But back  
9 in the -- we don't have any records from back in the  
10 30's and 40's as to what was fired at these ranges.

11 We know where small arms ranges  
12 are. We know where there are anti-tank ranges. So,  
13 we can say there's small arms ammunition here, they're  
14 fused ammunition there. It's a clear break, as far as  
15 a safety hazard. And we thought that was useful  
16 information to convey. DoD did not tell us how to do  
17 that. We made that determination on our own.

18 MR. ELLIOTT: Correct.

19 MR. HERBERT: As far as some of  
20 these other factors that you're concerned about,  
21 they're something that we all need to be concerned  
22 about. But we don't have all the information that we  
23 might want to convey, all the information that you're



1 asking for, at this point. We don't necessarily know  
2 what the depth of the ground water is at a particular  
3 range.

4 MR. ELLIOTT: Correct.

5 MR. HERBERT: And over a six  
6 hundred yard range, the depth to ground water can vary  
7 quite a bit, if there is topographic relief on the  
8 range or other factors. So, it gets kind of -- it  
9 gets more complicated than we are prepared to handle,  
10 at this point, with this document.

11 In the next document that's going  
12 to come out, that's going to address clean-up issues,  
13 there is a risk assessment component where we'll be  
14 looking at proximity to surface water, whether it's  
15 creeks or marshes. We'll be looking at exposure  
16 pathways for humans and biological critters and flora.  
17 And we'll address the risk to human health and the  
18 environment at certain of the parcels that we've  
19 identified.

20 So, those types of issues will be  
21 addressed in the next document to come out, not in  
22 this particular document here.

23 Am I correct? Did I -- do you need

1 to elaborate or did I miss the beat anywhere in there?

2 MR. REEDY: This is the way that  
3 we, at EPA -- all of the bases that I'm familiar with,  
4 that have ranges on them, where there is the  
5 possibility to make a distinction of, you know, a  
6 bullet versus a round, we make that distinction. And  
7 that distinction then can impact not only what we do,  
8 but how we go about doing it. And it is simply a  
9 distinction that makes sense from an environmental  
10 point of view, because you can go out and scrape up  
11 the surface soil. That can be done.

12 Now, over here in the mountains,  
13 that's a heck of an undertaking. But that's a doable  
14 thing. Whereas, going out with and trying to find  
15 people that would work on a crew to dig up half the  
16 Choccolocco mountains over here to look for fused  
17 ordnance is another proposition, altogether.

18 And so, we have made that  
19 distinction for those two reasons, because they are  
20 separate and kind of environmental reasons and there  
21 is a tremendous safety component involved.

22 MR. RALPH JOHNSON: Could I say  
23 this, please: On these ranges, I've been over all of

1       them for about thirty-seven year around here. And  
2       they may have been -- previously been used for rifles  
3       or pistols or hand grenades or what have you. But  
4       back in the 30's, when you're talking about like that,  
5       you'll find these mortars. You find mortars from the  
6       south gate over here on Summerall Road, in front of  
  
7       the grammar school, that goes down through there, all  
8       the way in around where the museum is, all around the  
9       mountain.

10                       I mean, you know, I've been there.  
11       I've seen them. I worked every fire lane. I've  
12       marked every street that's been marked on this post.  
13       And this whole area is full of it. It's not just  
14       where the ranges are, where there's mortars. The  
  
15       mortars are scattered all over, all over this whole  
16       dog gone area. And I have seen that.

17                       And how they classify it and break  
18       it down, I don't know. But I do know what I've seen  
19       in the thirty-seven year I've been around here.

20                       MR. ELLIOTT: If I could add one  
21       more thing on that. The other main reason to break  
22       those ranges out into those two categories is  
23       obviously the remediations and costs that are



1 associated with those two types of ranges are going to  
2 be vastly different.

3 It's extremely time consuming and  
4 extremely expensive to look for individual, unexploded  
5 warhead or mortars or grenades or rockets with  
6 geophysical methods like a magnetometer or something  
7 like that. That's one of the other reasons we broke  
8 it out that way. There is a major remediation  
9 difference.

10 MR. TURNER: Dean, you had a  
11 question, didn't you?

12 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: Yes. I would  
13 also like to add something else. Is there any other  
14 sub-categories that you can think of that would be  
15 helpful?

16 MR. HARRY SUMMERS: Yes. Here is  
17 what drives the train here. If we draw a fence around  
18 the fused ordnance area and say, we're going to have  
19 to restrict this particular property, the land use of  
20 this property, because it's inherently dangerous and  
21 the technology does not exist, I agree with that,  
22 that's fine.

23 The concern I have is that if the

1 baseline study then says, okay, the rest of this stuff  
2 is -- risk is minor, because it was small arms fire on  
3 this and it then becomes classified as usable,  
4 economically usable for whatever.

5 Now, within that, that particular  
6 definition hides however the fact that some of that  
7 property may be grossly contaminated with lead and be  
8 totally unacceptable for any use, whatsoever. And see  
9 what I'm saying is -- and that's the only reason I'm  
10 asking. Who made these distinctions?

11 You know, you say fused and not  
12 fused. And we're assuming now that there is -- you  
13 know, this not fused, low risk is good for, let's take  
14 it back Anniston and we can do something with it. And  
15 --

16 MR. ELLIOTT: Not necessarily.

17 MR. HARRY SUMMERS: -- I'm saying,  
18 that may be not the case, at all.

19 MR. TURNER: I got you next.

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Chris Johnson,  
21 ADEM. So, your main concern is about -- say there is  
22 gross lead contamination, and you want to make sure  
23 that lead contamination is addressed, whether it's

1 impact to ground water or if the surface soil  
2 ingestion to a trespasser or whatever?

3 MR. SUMMERS: Sure.

4 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That definitely  
5 will be addressed. That will be addressed. So, you  
6 can make sure of that. I mean, we have to look at  
7 that to make sure that it isn't posing other problems,  
8 other than just safety problems due to ordnance.

9 MR. HERBERT: We never intended to  
10 write that lead problem off without addressing it.

11 MR. REEDY: No.

12 MR. ELLIOTT: That's why they're  
13 identified as areas of concern on the maps. But it's  
14 a different type of concern. And environmental lead  
15 will be dealt with under a lot of existing regulations  
16 that EPA and ADEM already have in place for ground  
17 water, soils, etcetera. It's just not the same type  
18 of concern as DoD explosive warheads buried in the  
19 soil.

20 So, it will be addressed by  
21 whatever applicable and relevant standards apply. But  
22 it's just not the same type of an issue as a warhead  
23 buried in the ground.





1 MR. TURNER: Dean had another part  
2 to his question.

3 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: I just wanted  
4 to address Mark Anderson's question a little bit more  
5 in detail. The EBS is a non-intrusive, non-sampliable  
6 (phonetic). And it's important to point that out.

7 We're not going out here and  
8 telling you what's there, just what may be there and  
9 what we know is there from past records. It's just a  
10 record search.

11 Going back to what John Herbert's  
12 -- you probably weren't here for that, but his  
13 overview on what the EBS was. It's just showing us  
14 what's out -- what could be there and what we know is  
15 there. We're not going to take any samples. We're  
16 not going to put monitoring wells in with this report.  
17 It's not meant to be that. That would take hundreds  
18 and millions of dollars.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Hello. It says  
20 sampling in your briefing. That's why I've been  
21 asking questions about sampling.

22 MR. HUTCHENS: What is sampling?

23 MR. ANDERSON: It says it right in

1 your briefing from last time.

2 MR. HERBERT: There is a provision  
3 for sampling if required as part of the EBS process.  
4 We could, according to the guides we've got, we could  
5 do sampling. But that's not part of our scope of  
6 work.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: Right. The law  
8 allows it. Actually, it's allowed by law, but it's  
9 not required by law.

10 MR. HERBERT: And there is going to  
11 be sampling done concurrently through other  
12 mechanisms, but it's not part of us doing this EBS  
13 right now.

14 MR. TURNER: Mr. Harvey?

15 MR. GARY HARVEY: I've got a couple  
16 of things that maybe we forgot the last time. Number  
17 one, what the EBS is. This is not the clean-up plan.

18 After we get the EBS final, then  
19 there is a BRAC clean-up plan. And that's where you  
20 get to check, are we going to do this, are we going to  
21 do that.

22 The second part, and I believe Ron  
23 mentioned it during another meeting, is: Nobody has

1 written off UXO, unexploded ordnance.

2 Ron looked at the EBS and, of  
3 course, talked with ESEO, we think we got UXO's out  
4 there. We don't know. We're talking about 1917, the  
5 20's and the 30's. And Ron got together with St.  
6 Louis district engineer. I think he covered that  
7 here. And they are doing a study on just UXO here at  
8 Fort McClellan. And end of September is when that's  
9 due, you think. So, maybe we'll have it by the next  
10 September meeting and the corps can tell you what it  
11 is he's found from his separate study of UXO.

12 The problem with it -- and I'll  
13 restate what was said before, is: In the 20's,  
14 battalion commander come out here and said, okay, put  
15 the guns here, we're shooting there. They didn't have  
16 ranges like we had today. All right. Didn't go out  
17 to range fifty-seven where, here was a range flag,  
18 here is a left and right markers. Okay. None of  
19 that. It's hey, shoot here.

20 So, Ron is attempting -- and I'm  
21 saying "attempting," because I don't know if we'll be  
22 successful -- but he had St. Louis district -- they  
23 have more expertise than the other corps districts in

1 UXO, and they're doing a separate study for that.

2 And maybe we'll have the details  
3 for next meeting, if not the one after that. So,  
4 hopefully, that will quantify more the UXO problem, if  
5 there is one.

6 MR. TURNER: Mr. Anderson?

7 MR. ANDERSON: This is kind of a  
8 quick follow-on question to that, then. Is there  
9 money in the pond for a technology search, in the  
10 event that that --

11 MR. GARY HARVEY: For what?

12 MR. ANDERSON: For a technology  
13 search, in the event that this study doesn't give us  
14 the order of magnitude or level of detail that we need  
15 to be able to clean this stuff up?

16 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: There is money  
17 requested in the outer years. They're guesstimates,  
18 based on some --

19 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I mean, that's  
20 all they can be.

21 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: That's why  
22 there's the larger issue that Bart had addressed and  
23 talked about, nationwide, the munitions rule, the

1 range rule, the --

2 MR. ANDERSON: Then, who does have  
3 the rule making authority? That's the question.

4 MR. REEDY: Right now, it's being  
5 debated, as I understand it, reading my CC mail, it's  
6 being debated right now in Congress, between DoD and  
7 EPA --

8 MR. GARY HARVEY: OMB.

9 MR. REEDY: Yes, Office Management  
10 Budget. Every one it has dawned on everybody that,  
11 military bases, we paid people to learn how to protect  
12 us. Well, the net result of that is: Sometimes there  
13 is bombs and missiles and stuff out here. And that  
14 really didn't dawn on a lot of folks when we decided  
15 to close all these good bases. And now it has. Now,  
16 what are we going to do with it? And reality has  
17 reared its ugly head and it's being debated right now.  
18 And it is way, way up the ladder.

19 MR. TURNER: Mark, when Ms. Goodwin  
20 was here, I asked her the same question you just  
21 asked. And her reply was that the technology isn't  
22 sufficient now to adequately identify where UXO is.  
23 And that since the technology doesn't now exist to do

1       it, that there is no way of knowing how much it will  
2       cost to clean up once there is. So, on the other  
3       hand, I understand Fort Devins -- isn't that  
4       Massachusetts, Rob?

5                       MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Yes. They  
6       cleaned Fort Devins up.

7                       MR. TURNER: Is completely clean?

8                       MR. ANDERSON: You think about  
9       programs like the small business innovation research  
10      and what (inaudible) has been able to do, going out  
11      and finding firms that can do this. It seems to me  
12      that at least the technology search ought to be in  
13      order to say, hey, can we find the technology that  
14      will allow us to reclaim some of it.

15                      I don't have any illusions of all  
16      of it. I mean, you're right, you can't get a mule to  
17      pack anything up some of those hills, because I've had  
18      to hoof it over them.

19                      But still, you know, looking at  
20      options in the future, if there is money in the pond  
21      to be able to look at it in the out years, when the  
22      technology is available or money in the pond to do the  
23      technology search, where we could then try and put

1 money in it in the future, then that's -- you know,  
2 then that seems to be the way to go, rather than --  
3 and please, don't anybody get their feelings hurt by  
4 this -- than saying, it's in the too hard box, and  
5 we'll just let old Fort McClellan go, you know, and  
6 we'll close the gate and turn over the keys and not  
7 worry about it, because it was too hard when we  
8 started it.

9 You know, I just want my community  
10 to have some options in the future.

11 MR. TURNER: I had a question to  
12 ask and I put myself in the cube, so I --

13 MR. GARY HARVEY: Put L. Z. After  
14 you.

15 MR. TURNER: You're after Mayor  
16 Kimbrough. I was interested in what Ralph had to say  
17 about all the UXO he had observed and I wondered why  
18 that wasn't reflected in the interview notes that  
19 related to the interview with him.

20 MR. HERBERT: I don't recall that  
21 we discussed the -- that that came out in that  
22 particular interview. But there is a discussion about  
23 the extent of firing into the mountains and a map that

1 we found that dates back to -- I don't recall the date  
2 now. But it's got a lot of (inaudible) in this area  
3 here, a big area covered by -- I think it was called  
4 an artillery impact area. It was an artillery range.

5 So, we are fully aware of the fact  
6 -- and as a matter of fact, there are identified on --  
7 I forget which map it is, now. I think it's the green  
8 dots on this map -- places where we have been able to  
9 document people saying, okay, we saw rounds, mortar  
10 rounds or one fifty-five millimeter rounds or whatever  
11 at these locations. So, we documented as much of that  
12 as we could. That's these points like here, here,  
13 here.

14 And again, this entire area through  
15 here is -- it's called out in the new maps.

16 MR. TURNER: Have you looked at  
17 this, Ralph, this map?

18 MR. RALPH JOHNSON: I don't think  
19 so.

20 MR. TURNER: Do you think that this  
21 adequately describes the areas where you've seen UXO?  
22 Here is the legend over here.

23 MR. ELLIOTT: Keep in mind, this



1 map is out of date and these areas have been expanded  
2 in the July 2nd version of the EBS. Again, these  
3 areas have been expanded. This is out of date.

4 MR. TURNER: Right. I didn't bring  
5 my map.

6 MR. HERBERT: We can look at that  
7 in a little while.

8 MR. ELLIOTT: We have that here.

9 MR. TURNER: Okay. Why don't we  
10 get it together.

11 MR. ELLIOTT: July 2nd version of  
12 the EBS map.

13 MR. TURNER: Okay.

14 MR. RALPH JOHNSON: (Inaudible.)

15 MR. REEDY: Can you make it out?

16 COURT REPORTER: No, I can't hear  
17 what --

18 MR. REEDY: We can't hear what's  
19 happening.

20 MR. RALPH JOHNSON: That is pretty  
21 well -- that is pretty well the areas that I've been  
22 through there, except maybe you might come on back  
23 down a little further on the north end up here toward



1       where the landfills are, now, the old landfills. It's  
2       completed. That's pretty well covered all of that.  
3       That may -- I don't have my glasses on and can't  
4       really see the streets. From right behind the old  
5       hospital area all the way around in there, around the  
6       ammunition dump up there, that whole area, around back  
7       -- Reily Lake.

8                       MR. TURNER: Ralph, we're going to  
9       get out the updated -- they've updated that map and  
10      we're going to get it out during the break and take a  
11      look at it if you can hang around.

12                     MR. RALPH JOHNSON: I tell you what  
13      concerns me, we're talking about the lead and stuff  
14      like that -- do some of these fellows in the Army  
15      here, I know one sergeant I talked to over here. That  
16      when chemical was doing a lot out here and didn't --  
17      you know, they were just -- but they didn't really  
18      know what they was doing. They would stop here and  
19      have a little skirmish. They got stuff left over  
20      here, just bury it and go on. We've got some of that  
21      that --

22                     MR. TURNER: Major, you had a  
23      question, didn't you?



1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Most of them have  
2 been answered. My question was with the process. I  
3 know we've identified these areas and then we get into  
4 technology. And then, I think we discussed a cost  
5 factor.

6 In one note that I made it says,  
7 are we going to do this, are we not going to do it.  
8 And I asked a question about the super fund, I think,  
9 the last time. And the super fund is not available  
10 for the clean up of this.

11 And you're talking about Congress.  
12 So, really, as we identify technology, that's fine,  
13 but the funding is my concern. And I'm reading from  
14 all this is that there is some possibility that we  
15 will say on the cost factor that it's too expensive to  
16 clean this up. And I think, when we talked about the  
17 transfer to the LRA, that there is a possibility that  
18 there will be some properties, that if they're not  
19 cleaned up, can not be transferred. So, I guess I'm  
20 answering my question and asking one. Is that a  
21 correct assumption?

22 MR. REEDY: I think that pretty  
23 well captures it, yes.

1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: That concerns me,  
2 concerns me greatly.

3 MR. REEDY: But now, saying that,  
4 it's not a cost that will be solely, you know, singled  
5 out on Fort McClellan. It's just -- it's just an  
6 unfortunate situation that there is literally dozens  
7 of Fort McClellans and dozens of bombing ranges. And  
8 what are we going to do as taxpayers to try and clean  
9 this up? What can we do?

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And that's being  
11 left up to Congress, right?

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right. In  
13 fact, I would like to add that Mark and whoever wants  
14 a copy of the latest proposed rule -- I brought one  
15 copy with me today -- I mean, we've dedicated a person  
16 from the state to talk about this range rule. It is  
17 extremely a big deal right now. And I've got the  
18 latest proposed rule that Larry gave me. My  
19 supervisor is on that task force with other states  
20 throughout the nation. And because the states have to  
21 take a position on this, as well as EPA and DoD, and  
22 they're going to sit down and everybody is going to  
23 basically present their case to Congress. And

1           somebody is going to finally make the call on what  
2           they're going to do with these things.

3                       So, if anybody would like to at  
4           least read where they're at right now, get with me  
5           after this and I'll see to it that you get a copy of  
6           that and look over it.

7                       MR. TURNER: Colonel Johnson had a  
8           question, then Colonel Thomassy. Let's cut it off  
9           after that and take a break and then come back and ask  
10          as many questions as we've got. Go ahead, Colonel.

11                      MR. L. Z. JOHNSON: L. Z. Johnson,  
12          Redevelopment Authority. There is a public hearing  
13          right now with the new range rule that is tentatively  
14          scheduled for September the 11th at Jacksonville,  
15          Florida for the southeast region, unless you know  
16          something different than that, Chris.

17                      MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I'm not sure on  
18          that.

19                      MR. GARY HARVEY: Tentative.

20                      MR. ROB RICHARDSON: We'll be  
21          there.

22                      MR. GARY HARVEY: Will that be the  
23          public scoping?

1 MR. ANDERSON: Do you know where?

2 MR. L. Z. JOHNSON: I'm not sure of  
3 the location, Mr. Anderson, in Jacksonville. I just  
4 know Jacksonville right now. We're trying to confirm  
5 everything about that hearing.

6 MR. TURNER: The LRA is definitely  
7 considering sending some folks down there for that.  
8 We would be happy to act as a conduit for the LRA for  
9 any -- it's a public hearing -- for anybody else's  
10 opinions. If you'll write them down and give them to  
11 us, we'll make sure they get delivered.

12 Colonel Thomassy?

13 MR. THOMASSY: Just something I  
14 can't let lie. It's a reasonable assumption that you  
15 would go ahead and figure that those up through the  
16 chain in the Pentagon and maybe even in Congress  
17 didn't understand the impact of the contamination  
18 problems, even the UXO problems. And I can understand  
19 why you said that.

20 But let me put that straight,  
21 because I think it's very, very important to us, from  
22 the LRA standpoint, as well as the Restoration  
23 Advisory Board to understand, unfortunately, that's



1 not the case. The United States Army and the  
2 Department of Defense and the Congress understood very  
3 well that there was a tremendous cost associated with  
4 closing bases in the installation restoration site.  
5 And it refused to address that cost in the economic  
6 analysis, because I guarantee you, if they would have  
7 addressed that cost, these bases could not have been  
8 closed. There could not have been any economic  
9 justification, whatsoever, for doing it. And they  
10 purposely left that out, in order to be able to close  
11 these bases and do the things they've done. And that  
12 impacts more on Fort McClellan than it does on any  
13 other.

14 I've spent six years with this,  
15 from the time I was actively involved with the chamber  
16 of commerce, right up until now. And I don't want  
17 anybody to go away from here thinking that there was a  
18 justifiable mistake made. It was a calculated,  
19 purposeful act to leave that out. And we should never  
20 forget that. I know I've dug up some horrible wounds.  
21 They make me mad, too, just doing it.

22 MR. TURNER: Well, on that cheerful  
23 note, let's take a break.

1 (WHEREUPON, there was a brief recess.)

2 MR. TURNER: Let's get started back  
3 up. When we broke, I had people who wanted to ask  
4 questions. During the break, Gary discussed with me  
5 briefly this range rule. And I thought it might be  
6 informative for us if Gary would give us a brief  
7 explanation of what all this UXO range rule is.

8 MR. GARY HARVEY: The Army is going  
9 through the process, the Army, DoD, and OMC. And  
10 right now, DoD has got proposed range rules from all  
11 the services. They'll put something together, a  
12 hybrid or parts of that. Then that goes up to OMB,  
13 Office of Management and Budget. And then they  
14 negotiate back and forth what this range rule -- is  
15 what it's called right now -- will be.

16 And once they agree on that, then  
17 there will be public notice. And it will be hearings  
18 throughout the country like L. Z. Mentioned. The  
19 closest one we know about, tentatively set for some  
20 time in September, will be in Jacksonville, Florida.  
21 And that will be announced, once OMB has a final draft  
22 of the range rule. So, it will be a draft of the  
23 range rule that will be stamped all across the country

1       there will be public -- or all across the country  
2       there will be public hearings on it.

3                       We plan to attend from here -- I've  
4       been told by a base transition office, I'll be going.  
5       I know the LRA wants to go. And I'm sure the DOE, the  
6       director of environment down here will go. And that's  
7       where they accept public input to the proposed rule.  
8       And then, of course, they will develop a final ruling  
9       and that will be put out.

10                      So, this range rule is just going  
11       through the process right now.

12                      MR. TURNER: L. Z., would you mind  
13       telling us -- you understand -- I know you understand  
14       the range rule pretty well. Would you explain it, the  
15       proposed range rule?

16                      MR. L. Z. JOHNSON: I will explain  
17       it as I know it. That may not be very well.

18                      MR. TURNER: That will be fine. I  
19       trust you.

20                      MR. L. Z. JOHNSON: As I understand  
21       it, there is basically two things going to occur. And  
22       it does not mean that the Army is not going to clean  
23       up the range areas. Basically, they go through a

1 range assessment to determine the extent of  
2 contamination. And that's presently ongoing at Fort  
3 McClellan through the St. Louis Corps of Engineer  
4 Office.

5 From that point, the property you  
6 see on the map there, broad brush painted, could in  
7 fact be transferred to an entity of some type, under  
8 what they call a presumptive response. And simply  
9 what would happen there is there would be restrictions  
10 on the deed or the title of that land, as it was  
11 transferred. And some of those restrictions may  
12 include nothing more than, before you dig, you survey,  
13 and then the Army would come in and clean up whatever  
14 happened to be discovered, etcetera. And that's  
15 generally what I understand that the thing is,  
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. TURNER: Thank you, Colonel.

18 All right. Let's get back to  
19 questions on the EBS. Does anybody have any questions  
20 that they would like answered about the EBS?

21 Well, great. Mr. Herbert, Mr.  
22 Elliott, thank you so much. Colonel?

23 MR. THOMASSY: Not on the EBS,



1 directly, but can I get a better explanation of what's  
2 next, where we go, and some feel for the time line as  
3 to where we go next? Is it the development of a plan  
4 and then some type of remedial investigation or what?

5 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: The way I  
6 understand it, St. Louis is currently doing the  
7 archive search report. When they're done, we're  
8 supposed to have that in September. And they'll be  
9 sending that to Huntsville. Huntsville is going to  
10 review it for any safety problems and for whatever  
11 else, I don't know. And then, we'll probably go  
12 through the Mobile Corps of Engineers and they'll work  
13 with Huntsville on developing the scope for an  
14 engineering study.

15 And in the engineering study, they  
16 will take some samples and try to determine the extent  
17 of the contamination. And in October or November,  
18 we're going to invite St. Louis and Huntsville down to  
19 talk to y'all about the next step.

20 MR. THOMASSY: Mobile, too, Lisa?

21 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: Mobile will  
22 probably be here, too.

23 MR. ELLIOTT: Lisa, that's for UXO.

1 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: UXO. Arms, I  
2 don't know about.

3 MR. ELLIOTT: The broader question,  
4 I think, that Mr. Thomassy wanted answered was: Where  
5 do we go from here? I guess the first thing we have  
6 to do is finalize the environmental baseline survey,  
7 because that document, again is -- all this is time  
8 dependent, and a lot of things are clearly conflicts  
9 here. And the normal baseline survey is one of the  
10 main components that feeds into the BRAC clean-up plan  
11 to help us determine what the status of all these  
12 different programs are that need to be dealt with.  
13 And in addition to UXO, there are a lot of other  
14 things. You know, there are CERCLA issues. There are  
15 pesticides, PCBs, radon, lead base paint, asbestos,  
16 radiological, all these other issues.

17 And the EBS basically documents  
18 what's here. And then the BRAC clean-up plan, we  
19 determine what type of remedial approach to apply for  
20 particular sites and how to prioritize the sites and  
21 what regulations apply for clean up, what levels we  
22 need to clean up to.

23 And the BRAC clean-up plan is

1 basically the document that the BRAC clean-up team  
2 will be using to develop and implement whatever  
3 remedial strategies are required before they can  
4 release parcels. And it also helps us to accelerate  
5 the release of those parcels that are shown to be  
6 unaffected or not contaminated and ready to be  
7 released.

8 So, the EBS needs to be finalized.  
9 That feeds into the BRAC clean-up plan, along with the  
10 bottom up review of existing programs on post that the  
11 DOE is doing. And input from the LRA on reuse and  
12 input from the RAB, also, of course, on reuse. And  
13 that all gets rolled up into the BCP.

14 So, that's the next big milestone  
15 is the draft BRAC clean-up plan.

16 MR. THOMASSY: I think where I'm  
17 stumbling on that is: What are the first components  
18 of the BRAC clean-up plan? I would assume studies  
19 that you're talking about that are going to come out  
20 of the corps, which will be studies on what type of  
21 sampling or remedial investigations be accomplished,  
22 then it will be the contracting and the accomplishment  
23 of that remedial investigation; is that correct?



1 MR. ELLIOTT: That's again, done on  
2 various levels. The installation, themselves, I mean,  
3 like the radiological work that you've already done,  
4 the radiological billings, that's been done directly  
5 through the installation. And then there are other  
6 aspects of investigations that will be, I guess,  
7 handled through AEC, Army Environmental Center, and  
8 other entities. And I guess Dean would be better  
9 equipped to deal with that or maybe Bart or Chris.

10 MR. DEAN HUTCHENS: Yes. I think  
11 once -- we have ongoing work that we're doing right  
12 now. We contracted through RAD waste disposal group  
13 to clean up the hot cell, which was the RAD area that  
14 you were talking about earlier.

15 We've also gone to the U. S. Army  
16 Center for (inaudible) and Preventive Medicine to do  
17 some RAD surveys on general things. We have a  
18 restoration program that's ongoing.

19 By closing Fort McClellan, it's  
20 going to basically, you know, just speed that process  
21 up. It all depends what comes out of the BCP. We'll  
22 do a logical base clean-up team, which Bart and Chris  
23 and Ron are composed, with support from many other



1 people. They'll logically group sites. They'll look  
2 at -- they'll try to work with the LRA, which sites,  
3 you know, they're looking at, to maybe get those  
4 looked at first, and possibly get those either, I  
5 don't want to say certified clean, but that's used a  
6 lot, and move those on for reuse.

7 Typically, in the restoration  
8 department, we've always done worst first. And I  
9 think under BRAC, you will get some of the other sites  
10 first, depending on the finding. You know, it all  
11 fluctuates, depending on how much money has been  
12 requested, what sites have been -- or what process in  
13 the remediation flow.

14 MR. THOMASSY: What I'm aiming at,  
15 and I think this board needs, is eventually to get  
16 some type of documentation on where we're going. Lay  
17 this plan out in some tree formation or flow chart  
18 process, so that we know the various components on it.  
19 And look at it down to a couple of tiers, a couple of  
20 levels so we can understand the details and the time  
21 lines that are on those. Because some of this is  
22 going to extend out pretty far. Some of it can be  
23 pretty short, but people have to have goals, not only

1       us, but the people who are performing are what I'm  
2       more concerned about, to be committed to something.  
3       And certainly, exceptions are going to cause it to  
4       change.

5                       But those exceptions should be  
6       reportable to somebody and somebody should be  
7       responsible for them. And they can't just be, we  
8       didn't get to it. And that's going to happen until we  
9       -- unless we get those firm time lines laid out and  
10      each of us know what they are and hold the people --  
11      there is a gant chart right there. And that's what  
12      I'm referring to.

13                     MR. REEDY: This is -- I've carried  
14      this around. I don't know whether we're going to  
15      adopt this kind of a flow chart, but the three of us  
16      -- and, you know, in cahoots with ES and E, exactly  
17      what you're talking about, will be part and parcel of  
18      the base closure plan, yes. This is just not an ad  
19      hock, you know, what do you feel like doing today.  
20      That's not what we're going to do, because we've got  
21      time lines we've got to meet.

22                     And to tag along with what Dean  
23      said, we've got two things going on here. They had

1 installation restoration program, which is just the  
2 Army's basically -- the Army's basic environmental  
3 clean-up program. That was ongoing. And there were  
4 things and sites being cleaned up and restoration  
5 ongoing funded, you know, out funding available. And  
6 that was happening when the BRAC, you know -- when the  
7 base closed.

8 So, our job -- one of our jobs is  
9 to finger in what's already been done as to what has  
10 to be done to get the base closed.

11 MR. TURNER: Maybe we should  
12 consider having some training on that, you know, on  
13 this process. I don't know if it could be  
14 encapsulated into an hour or if we need to break it up  
15 over several meetings. But I think that it would give  
16 us a good frame work to know -- have a better idea of  
17 what we're doing.

18 MR. THOMASSY: Yes.

19 MR. TURNER: And Lisa, do you have  
20 that figured into the training?

21 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: I missed the  
22 first part of what you said, Charles.

23 MR. TURNER: What we're talking

1 about is getting some more information about the  
2 process from start to finish on -- particularly  
3 related to the environment, environmental issues.  
4 What Colonel Thomassy wanted was perhaps a flow chart  
5 on -- Bart produced a flow chart. But maybe to have  
6 more information and have that integrated into our  
7 training schedule, that just a section on, this is  
8 what happens first, the EBS, then this is what  
9 happens, and then this is what happens, you know. Is  
10 that possible?

11 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: That's  
12 possible.

13 MR. REEDY: Don't do that. We can  
14 certainly go back -- we did that once and maybe we can  
15 go back over it again and how we intend to, you know,  
16 dove tail what was ongoing with what remains to be  
17 done. We can certainly do that for you.

18 MR. TURNER: We've already had  
19 training on that?

20 MR. REEDY: Yes, sir.

21 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: On the general  
22 BRAC process.

23 MR. TURNER: I know about the

1 general BRAC process. I'm talking about the  
2 environmental BRAC process with perhaps more detail.  
3 I mean, I know that on BCP is what file exists, to an  
4 extent. But exactly how the BCP is formed and what  
5 happens after that I think is what you're after, isn't  
6 it Colonel?

7 MR. THOMASSY: Yes. Getting down  
8 into the actual components of it, time lines, which I  
9 think is exactly what you're showing me on that chart.

10 MR. REEDY: Right.

11 MR. THOMASSY: Some of that hasn't  
12 been laid out, I think is what your reluctance  
13 probably is in trying to give that in a short period  
14 of time, because these studies out of the corps have  
15 to be completed.

16 But understanding how to use it is  
17 part of what Charles is saying, I think. To  
18 understand how to read gant charts and what we would  
19 look for on it and what the various components would  
20 be.

21 Is that what you're aiming at, is a  
22 training session?

23 MR. TURNER: Yes, sir, right. More

1 of a training session designed just to speak to the  
2 procedural aspects of what we're doing. And having it  
3 in enough detail so that it's -- you know, we don't  
4 just skim over it. And if it takes -- I don't know  
5 what kind of subject I'm proposing. I don't know  
6 whether that's an hour session or three or four one  
7 hour sessions. And so, I would just like -- well, we  
8 can certainly talk about it some more.

9 MR. REEDY: I think -- I would like  
10 to -- if we could, I would like to hold off on that  
11 for a couple of months, until we get the -- until we  
12 get the EBS tied up, get that wrapped up.

13 MR. TURNER: Sure.

14 MR. REEDY: And now, you know,  
15 don't -- there is ongoing work now with the BCP.  
16 There is some boiler plate kinds of things that go in  
17 there. And that's being done right now, you know.  
18 They're building that. DoD has a prototype that we're  
19 to follow. I've given them a couple. They've got a  
20 couple from other installations. So, the base closure  
21 plan is being worked on right now, as is the EBS. So,  
22 it will happen. But let us get the EBS tied up first  
23 and then we can try and lay out a few more things.



1 MR. THOMASSY: Okay. But Charles  
2 has a good point. His point was on procedure and  
3 knowledge of what's going to go into it and how it's  
4 going to be laid out, not necessarily giving us the  
5 details of a study that's not even prepared. So, the  
6 process can be laid out at any time. It doesn't have  
7 to wait for the study to be accomplished. And we will  
8 know the components of that process, because they're  
9 standard. They're written into laws and rules and  
10 regulations right now.

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: The only --  
12 they are, but see, the nice thing about the base  
13 clean-up plan is it is a document that all of us can  
14 put together for this base. So, there are rules and  
15 regulations, yes, but there is also a lot of guidance  
16 and that plan can take on many shapes and forms, so it  
17 is only really for -- since it is for this base, I  
18 think something that you would want to look at after  
19 we probably got the draft out, instead of really just  
20 seeing the generic process for, I take it from a dirty  
21 site to one where it's transferred.

22 MR. THOMASSY: I'm speaking for  
23 Charles, so interrupt me. But I'll say a couple of

1 more sentences on that. We have to learn -- I  
2 probably know it fairly well, but I think most of the  
3 rest of us have to learn how to read those things and  
4 know what the various words and definitions are that  
5 are going to be in it, so that once it is published,  
6 then we can read it right away. So, that's what he's  
7 asking for is a tutorial, in a generic sense, just to  
8 learn the frame work of how this is going to be put  
9 together and the terminology. And then let us read it  
10 when it comes out on our own.

11 MR. TURNER: Colonel, that's  
12 accurate. And let me tell you what a joy it is, as a  
13 lawyer, to have someone else speak for me.

14 MR. REEDY: Colonel, there are  
15 components of the base closure plan that are pretty  
16 much standard from base to base. And there's not --  
17 it's not going to be extremely site specific.

18 MR. THOMASSY: Right --

19 MR. REEDY: I don't want to get  
20 your hopes up that you're going to be able to flip  
21 through it and go to T-38 and know what we're going to  
22 do. That's not -- it's not going to be that way.

23 MR. THOMASSY: Don't even want to

1 hear T-38, unless you want to use it as a what if  
2 example and explain the process.

3 MR. TURNER: Just a more detailed  
4 explanation of the process that we're going through.  
5 And if we've gotten as much detail as we need, maybe  
6 we need a refresher course. But in any event, we can  
7 certainly talk about this more later.

8 And I think, if anybody has  
9 anything to add, we would certainly entertain it, now.  
10 But otherwise, let's move on down the agenda.

11 Now, what we're going to do for the  
12 rest of the meeting, I believe, is to cover on the  
13 agenda -- and that is the report of the committees,  
14 old business and new business.

15 While this, I promise you, will be  
16 fascinating, anybody that has other commitments, we  
17 certainly won't be offended if you leave.

18 The first thing, report of  
19 committees. Charter membership didn't meet last  
20 month, except, I mean, the time I spent drafting the  
21 revisions to the bylaws. I'll get those faxed out to  
22 you. I mean, literally, they're about done. And I  
23 can get them out within the next week. And we can

1 discuss them at our next meeting.

2 I would like a motion, if y'all  
3 consider it appropriate, that we not have any training  
4 next month. We're an hour and forty minutes into this  
5 meeting already, and are just now getting to the  
6 board's business. And I'd think that if we could  
7 devote an entire session to housekeeping, we can get  
8 it out of the way. Does anybody else feel similarly?

9 MR. ANDERSON: I will make that  
10 motion. And it will be important for some of the  
11 things we need to address.

12 MR. TURNER: Is there a second?

13 MR. THOMASSY: Second.

14 MR. TURNER: All in favor? Any  
15 opposition? Motion carried.

16 Community relations, do y'all have  
17 a report?

18 MR. ANDERSON: We did not have a  
19 meeting this past month. I'd like to just grab  
20 everybody on the committee up briefly and try and set  
21 a date for this month, because we have a couple of  
22 things that we need to do. We have due ins to the  
23 body as a whole on implementing instructions to the

1 community relations plan and the information briefing  
2 that we discussed.

3 I have kind of a plea, if you will,  
4 or query. For those folks who have taken the time to  
5 read their community relations plan, do you have any  
6 questions or comments that need to go in on that? Ron  
7 last time said that he felt it would be acceptable if  
8 we went ahead and submitted comments, even though the  
9 deadline had passed for them to get it done up the way  
10 the contract was written.

11 MR. THOMASSY: I've got some and I  
12 need to retype them --

13 MR. ANDERSON: If I could, let's  
14 try and do this: Let's say, two weeks from tonight,  
15 if you haven't called me or sent me something in the  
16 mail on them by then, I'll just make a lump group of  
17 comments to turn in to the body as a whole next month  
18 for RAB blessing before we send those as our comments  
19 to the community relations plan. We'll attach those  
20 as part of our implementing instructions for how we  
21 intend to proceed here. And the implementing  
22 instructions is just, we intend to do this type of  
23 educational thing, that type of monthly press release

1 or what have you.

2 MR. TURNER: Mark, thanks for  
3 taking the lead on that, and thank you for this new  
4 list with everybody's name, address, and telephone  
5 number.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Thank Lisa.

7 MR. TURNER: Lisa, thanks.

8 MR. ANDERSON: She furnished it.

9 MR. TURNER: Anybody that wants to  
10 send me electronic mail, my email address is fpmredev  
11 --

12 MR. THOMASSY: Fpm --

13 MR. TURNER: Fpmredev at  
14 jsucc.jsu.edu.

15 MR. THOMASSY: One more time.

16 MR. TURNER: Fpmredev. And then,  
17 if you'll look down at Pete Conroy's, that's my -- the  
18 main thing. Anything else from community relations?

19 MR. ANDERSON: No, sir.

20 MR. THOMASSY: I'm going to get on  
21 line here. Take mine down.

22 MR. TURNER: All right.

23 MR. THOMASSY: Jfthomassy.

1 MR. TURNER: Yes.

2 MR. THOMASSY: At alo.com.

3 MR. TURNER: Anybody else got an  
4 email address they want to tell us about? Thank you.

5 MR. THOMASSY: And Thomassy is  
6 spelled without an E.

7 MR. ANDERSON: That's right.

8 MR. TURNER: You'll be getting your  
9 email back.

10 MR. THOMASSY: Yes.

11 MR. TURNER: Anything else for  
12 community relations?

13 MR. ANDERSON: No, sir.

14 MR. TURNER: Bylaws, we've  
15 discussed.

16 Old business, draft letter to local  
17 clubs and organizations. That is in this handout that  
18 Mark gave us on page six. Mark, would you discuss  
19 this with us, please?

20 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. What this  
21 was, we initially said that we wanted to get an invite  
22 out to organizations within the community that may  
23 have been missed by the PAO on the first go around.

1 We, I think, since that that letter went out, we've  
2 gotten in the -- that community relations plan that  
3 has, I don't know, something on the neighborhood of  
4 twenty-six pages worth of names, organizations, and  
5 whatnot, that expressed interest in the process as a  
6 whole.

7 So, the idea with this was: To  
8 invite people to attend the meetings, invite them for  
9 input, and to provide them with a little bit of  
10 information about what it is we're really doing. And  
11 also, more importantly, not have it come, necessarily,  
12 from the Army, but rather from the board. And make it  
13 so that it's coming from somebody who is a member of  
14 the community at large, rather than from the PAO of  
15 the post.

16 MR. TURNER: It looks good to me.  
17 Comments?

18 MR. ANDERSON: Everybody had a  
19 chance to look at it within the last month?

20 MR. REEDY: Bullet two, what did  
21 you have in mind there at that -- about the eighth  
22 word?

23 MR. TURNER: He wants you to go to





1 the women's study club every Wednesday and discuss  
2 base clean up.

3 MR. REEDY: Mark, I'll just cut  
4 right to the chase, huh-uh.

5 MR. ANDERSON: You can't, right.  
6 Ron had indicated that he was willing and able to do  
7 some things with select organizations.

8 MR. REEDY: Okay. So, I would  
9 suggest that you change that from the Government to  
10 Army.

11 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: Bart, you  
12 wouldn't do a couple?

13 MR. REEDY: I'm sorry?

14 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: I said, you  
15 wouldn't do a couple?

16 MR. REEDY: I don't want to  
17 obligate myself right now to that. I've got some  
18 other obligations that are outstanding.

19 MR. ANDERSON: What about ADEM  
20 there, does ADEM want to decline on that?

21 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Let's just --

22 MR. REEDY: Ron loves to do it.  
23 Ron wants to.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Lisa, you can tell  
2 him I volunteered him when he wasn't here.

3 DR. BARRY COX: Why don't we just  
4 leave the word government out, then?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Say base clean-up  
6 team.

7 MR. TURNER: Just cross out the S  
8 on members. A member of the government team.

9 Any other comments relating to the  
10 letter? Is there a motion that we adopt it?

11 MR. THOMASSY: I'll make that  
12 motion that we adopt the letter.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Second.

14 MR. TURNER: All in favor? Any  
15 opposition. Motion carries.

16 Next, Mark has made another motion

17 --

18 MR. ANDERSON: Just a question, if  
19 I could, before we proceed --

20 MR. TURNER: Sure --

21 MR. ANDERSON: -- off from that.

22 Very quickly, the community relations plan, the  
23 baseline list, lists the word processing files or the

1 spread sheet or whatever it's in. Where is that?

2 MS. LISA KINGSBERRY: It's in Joe  
3 Baker's hand.

4 MR. JOE BAKER: Got it.

5 MR. ANDERSON: I'll need to chat  
6 with you afterwards, Joe, so I can turn it into a data  
7 base that I can use.

8 MR. TURNER: Mark has made another  
9 motion. Why don't we take a few minutes to read the  
10 motion to obtain a post office box. And after  
11 everybody has finished reading it, we'll discuss it.

12 Everybody finished? I think,  
13 procedurally, we need a second. Is there a second?  
14 Let's move on.

15 Next is a motion to hold meetings,  
16 other than at Fort McClellan. Ask everybody to read  
17 it and we'll discuss it afterwards.

18 MR. THOMASSY: Some discussion on  
19 that.

20 MR. TURNER: We need a second  
21 first, I believe. Is there a second? Just because  
22 it's seconded it doesn't mean --

23 MR. THOMASSY: I'll second it so I

1 can discuss it.

2 MR. TURNER: All right. Discuss  
3 it.

4 MR. THOMASSY: Since we've slowed  
5 some things down, the next meeting we're going to go  
6 ahead and have no training. Also, by the way, the  
7 letter that everybody signed up for, probably, we're  
8 not going to make people available until November,  
9 rather than October. December may be a little  
10 premature. It's around Christmastime, things changing  
11 at that point.

12 I would recommend we talk about it  
13 right after the first of the year in doing something  
14 like that. It's a good idea, though. We need to take  
15 this show on the road some time.

16 MR. TURNER: But we need to know  
17 what we're talking about before we do.

18 MR. THOMASSY: We need to be, I  
19 think, a little more conversant.

20 MR. TURNER: I think it's a good  
21 idea. We do it with the LRA meetings. And usually  
22 what you have -- what we have are the elected  
23 officials from the jurisdiction we're in at that time.

1 When we came to Weaver, Mayor came and made us feel  
2 welcome. But you don't get -- it's hard to get people  
3 to these kind of meetings.

4 But I think it's a good idea. And  
5 also, I think that the Anniston city meeting center  
6 will waive the fee if it's this kind of organization.

7 MR. ANDERSON: Right.

8 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: If it's during  
9 their regular work hours. If it's after work hours,  
10 then they have just started charging, if they have to  
11 have a person there to keep it open.

12 MR. TURNER: So, I think it's a  
13 good idea. But I would feel more confident in doing  
14 it, if we had more information than we do now. So --

15 MR. ANDERSON: I will stipulate to  
16 amend to add a date in the future. And we'll  
17 determine -- we can determine the date when we feel  
18 comfortable to take the show on the road.

19 MR. TURNER: Let's see. The motion  
20 has been amended to --

21 MR. THOMASSY: First quarter.

22 MR. ANDERSON: First quarter  
23 calendar year '97.

1 MR. THOMASSY: Date to be  
2 determined --

3 MR. TURNER: Or date to be  
4 determined. Which is it, Mark?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Let's amend it to  
6 first quarter calendar year '97. That gives us some  
7 options there.

8 MR. TURNER: You can --

9 MR. THOMASSY: Will exact dates be  
10 determined by the board?

11 MR. ANDERSON: Right. That's fine.  
12 With exact date to be determined by the board.

13 MR. TURNER: Motion has been made.  
14 Seconded, amended. I assume Colonel Thomassy doesn't  
15 want to withdraw his second. All in favor?

16 MR. ANDERSON: I.

17 MR. TURNER: Any opposition? Good.  
18 We're done. Anybody got anything else before we go?  
19 We're adjourned.

20 (WHEREUPON, the proceeding was concluded.)

21

22

23

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)  
CALHOUN COUNTY )

I, SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court  
Reporter and Notary Public in and for The State of  
Alabama at Large, duly commissioned and qualified,  
HEREBY CERTIFY that this proceeding was taken before  
me, then was by me reduced to shorthand, afterwards  
transcribed upon a computer, and that the foregoing is  
a true and correct transcript of the proceeding.

I FURTHER CERTIFY this proceeding  
was taken at the time and place and was concluded  
without adjournment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,



1 on this the 25th day of August, 1996.

2

3

4

5

6

7 SAMANTHA E. NOBLE

8 Notary Public in and for

9 Alabama at Large

10

11

12 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-97.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

