1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
7	REDIONATION ADVIDONT DOARD MEETING
8	FORT MCCLELLAN, ALABAMA
9	PORT MCCEBERAN, ABADAMA
10	
11	
12	Taken pursuant to stipulation and agreement before Donna D. Gallahar, Court
13	Reporter and Commissioner for the State of
14	
15	Alabama at Large at the Quintard Mall, Oxford
16	Alabama on the 17th day of August, 1998,
17	commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

1		R	Ε	Р	0	R	Т	Ε	R	'	S		I	N	D	E X	
2																	
3	CAPTIO	N.														.Page	1
4	INDEX.															.Page	2
5	RAB ME	ET:	INO	3												.Page	3-51
6	REPORT	ER	' S	CI	ER:	ΓII	FIO	CA:	ΓE	•	•	•	•	•	•	.Page	52-53
7																	
8																	
9			-									-					
10																	
11																	
12																	
13																	
14																	
15																	
16																	
17																	
18																	
19																	
20																	
21																	
22																	

1	MR. CONROY: Well, folks, should we
2	get started? It is right now, 6:41, and
3	why don't we get this RAB started. It's
4	a little unusual to have a meeting in a
5	shopping mall, but I think it's probably
6	a pretty good idea. And it's nice to
7	have everyone in the audience with us.
8	We'll start by calling the roll. And
9	then if you all in the audience wouldn't
10	mind, we'd like for you to identify
11	yourselves as well, just so we'll know
12	who you are. Mark Anderson? Ike Brown?
13	James Buford?
14	MR. BUFORD: Here.
15	MR. CONROY: Barry Cox? Don
16	Cunningham? Jerome Elser? Alan Faust?
17	MR. FAUST: Here.
18	MR. CONROY: Mary Harrington?
19	MS. HARRINGTON: I'm here.
20	MR. CONROY: Ronald Hood?
21	MR. HOOD: Here.
22	MR. CONROY: Ed Kimbrough?
23	MR. KIMBROUGH: Here.

1	MR. CONROY: Margarette Longstreth?
2	MS. LONGSTRETH: Here.
3	MR. CONROY: Jim Miller? Jimmy
4	Parks?
5	MR. PARKS: Here.
6	MR. CONROY: Fern Thomassy is out.
7	Charles Turner? Chris Johnson?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Here.
9	MR. CONROY: Ron Levy?
10	MR. LEVY: Here.
11	MR. CONROY: Bart Reedy. Does
12	everyone have an agenda in front of them?
13	I saw that they were on the table out
14	front if anyone in the audience does not
15	have one. How about if we start with the
16	audience, and Jonathan, start with you.
17	(Inaudible.)
18	MR. CONROY: And everybody knows
19	Bill Wilson with the Anniston Star.
20	Approval of the minutes. Do I hear a
21	motion to approve?
22	MR. LEVY: I don't know that we have
23	enough membership for that. We may just

1	have to do does anybody have any
2	comments on the minutes, let's put it
3	that way, at this point. Can I ask a
4	question? Is everybody getting copies of
5	the minutes in the mail, able to
6	understand them? Do we need to do
7	anything in terms of redefining how the
8	minutes are done? Okay, I guess what we
9	had proposed to do at the last RAB
10	meeting was to go back in and continue to
11	look at the BRAC cleanup issues, in
12	particular the BRAC cleanup plan and open
13	up discussion. It was an open
14	discussion, issues that people wanted to
15	bring up, that RAB members wanted to
16	bring up were there for just the
17	mentioning, and we did attempt to try to
18	answer as many questions as we possibly
19	could. So with that we want to try to
20	continue with the cleanup plan and
21	discussion. I believe everybody got a
22	copy of the draft cleanup plan. Is that
23	correct? At this point does anybody have

1	a specific cleanup issue that they want
2	to talk about the cleanup plan?
3	Let me do this then, if there are no
4	actual questions. In front of you there
5	should be a piece of paper called a
6	schedule. Have you all seen it? As
7	we've mentioned in the previous RAB
8	meeting, and Lisa put this schedule
9	together, we told you that we were
10	getting ready to kick off a significant
11	aspect of the cleanup program, that's the
12	site investigations at Fort McClellan.
13	What you are looking at is a schedule.
14	And the schedule is by packages.
15	Essentially what we're doing is we've
16	split up sites and grouped them together
17	by likeness and we've awarded them
18	contractually to IT our contractor for
19	clean up purposes. On the schedule
0.0	
20	you'll see parcel number description, and
21	again they correlate directly with the
22	parcels off of the CERFA maps, and the
23	CERFA map is out there in the coming into

1	the area. So you can correlate them
2	directly with that. And it tells you
3	when the field work begins and when it's
4	due to end, and then when a draft report
5	of that field work is due to be issued to
6	the Army and our regulatory agencies for
7	review.
8	The purpose of this was to give you
9	all an opportunity to come out and look
10	at and understand and see what's going on
11	in terms of the field work. Because
12	there is a lot of field work. Lisa,
13	we're expecting how many months of this
14	actually occurring?
15	MS. KINGSBURY: All through the fall
16	and probably into the spring of next year
17	for this task.
18	MR. LEVY: Various sites, and they
19	are all going to be different in terms of
20	the work plans that are out there. So
21	there's various sampling investigations
22	ongoing for each of the sites. If you

are interested and want to see that, we

23

1	want to know that and we want to try to
2	set that up so that we can get you out to
3	the sites and have you take a look at it.
4	If you would take a look through these
5	here, these areas that you understood
6	were not included and you want to bring
7	those up, if there's issues particular to
8	a site that you are concerned about that
9	you want to bring up, please do. Because
10	now is the time to bring it out. If you
11	are interested in seeing a copy of the
12	work plan for those sites, we can do that
13	for you. I'd ask that if you do want
14	that that you actually take it home and
15	read it because they are expensive to
16	produce and get out to everybody. But we
17	have those available. And we can take
18	some comments from you as well. Does
19	anybody have any comments on this? Take
20	a moment to go through and see what we're
21	doing here. I will tell you that the
22	last page represents some of the
23	projects, the last two pages represent

1	some of the projects that have either
2	completed, the field work has already
3	been completed or is being done under
4	different contracts. Example is the
5	long-term monitoring for landfills one
6	and two. Those sites have been
7	completed. At this point decisions are
8	made for no further monitoring, that's
9	different from no further action. I want
10	you to understand that. Still discussion
11	is going on with the BCT and with
12	landfill three some additional
13	characterization requirements on that
14	site. And then some ranges that are on
15	hold until the BCT can define exactly
16	which direction we're moving on those.
17	And other sites that are on there, like
18	range data out on Pelham Range, survey
19	work for creeks and tributaries as it
20	relates to risk assessment. Pistol
21	ranges, we have two of those right now in
22	some of the attics of the buildings. You
23	can see that we're still involved in work

1	that was done by another contractor.
2	Remember I've told you in the past that
3	we've actually got three different
4	contractors at Fort McClellan doing
5	various aspects of the work. We're
6	eventually transitioning all to one
7	contractor, that being IT. But we still
8	have work left over from previous
9	contractors. And we the BCT are still
10	reviewing those documents. So there's a
11	number of sites on there too that we have
12	gone through and we actually have not
13	gotten to a decision point or a point
14	where we can establish where we're going.
15	MR. PARKS: Ron, is there any
16	particular rationale of why you picked
17	the first six to be done before the
18	other? Is it prioritized or tied in to
19	the redevelopment plan or something as to
20	why you've got these starting in `98 and
21	the others starting in `99? The first
22	six starts in `98 to be complete.
23	MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, it's tied to

1	reuse.
2	MR. KIMBROUGH: Since I wasn't here
3	last time, maybe you discussed, but I
4	noticed in the minutes it said there was
5	a difference of opinion between EPA and
6	DOD. Is that on all clean up or was that
7	just a particular area of Buckner Circle?
8	MR. JOHNSON: That was just for
9	lead-based paint in soils. That should
10	be clarified.
11	MR. KIMBROUGH: That's lead-based
12	paint only?
13	MR. CONROY: You would like that
14	clarified in the minutes?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I think it
16	should be to make it a little clearer.
17	MR. LEVY: You might want to
18	reiterate what that was about, Chris,
19	because there were some RAB members that
20	weren't here.
21	MR. JOHNSON: We talked briefly
22	about lead-based paint. Really we talked
23	about some issues that are ongoing, and

1	lead-based paint was one of them. And
2	the EPA and, of course, we at the state
3	feel that lead-based paint in soils
4	should be treated as a hazardous
5	substance just like any other lead in any
6	other type medium, because it does get
7	released into the soil, especially around
8	the building pad and drip lines of
9	buildings from past scraping activities
10	or just where the paint gets old and
11	chips off the building. So we just want
12	to go in those areas and look at them and
13	make sure they are okay before the
14	property is turned over to the public.
15	And the Army right now, they want to kind
16	of follow the HUD guidelines and what's
17	kind of evolving through HUD. And the
18	criteria between HUD and EPA, there's,
19	you know, there's some difference there
20	of opinion as far as what's clean and
21	what's the proper method of
22	investigation. So that's an issue that
23	we need to get worked out between all of

1	us.
2	MR. CONROY: Of the two of those
3	MR. JOHNSON: EPA being more
4	stringent.
5	MR. LEVY: And that's EPA's
6	guidance. I don't know that it's written
7	in law at this point. The Army's
8	position is that or I should say DOD's
9	position is that requirements that are
10	set up for DOD should be the same
11	requirements that would affect not just
12	the Department of Defense but all
13	entities, which it's not. In fact, those
14	laws don't apply across the board.
15	That's their position, if you are going
16	to do that to us, then you should be
17	doing it to everybody.
18	MR. JOHNSON: And we'll end it
19	right there.
20	MR. FAUST: Ron, the specifics on
21	the investigations you are going to do at
22	all these sites, that's captured in the
23	work plan, not in this BRAC document?

1	MR. LEVY: Those are in
2	site-specific work plans.
3	MR. FAUST: You have those in your
4	offices?
5	MR. LEVY: We do. Some of them are
6	still in a draft phase. Some of them
7	actually are still being produced.
8	MR. CONROY: Do you loan those out?
9	MR. LEVY: As I said, I would be
10	willing to reproduce those that people
11	are interested in seeing if they are
12	going to use them for review and want to
13	bring up questions as it relates to them.
14	So we'll do what we can to get them to
15	RAB members.
16	MR. HOOD: Here in packet 16 on your
17	schedule, I was just curious about that
18	one. No particular reason, just that
19	isn't that outside what's already been
20	released to the state?
21	MR. LEVY: No, Choccolocco Corridor
22	is going to undergo investigation by the
23	Army. It's still under lease to the

1	Army. And we've agreed to go out and
2	investigate the sites where we've used
3	the property.
4	MR. HOOD: It's just some mound that
5	you've discovered there?
6	MR. LEVY: I can't remember exactly
7	what, I'd have to go back and review this
8	particular site. Lisa, do you remember
9	what this site was?
10	MS. KINGSBURY: I'm sorry, I wasn't
11	listening.
12	MR. LEVY: Packet 16, do you
13	remember what this site was about?
14	MS. KINGSBURY: Do I remember what?
15	It's hard to hear.
16	MR. LEVY: Package 16, do you
17	remember what that site was on?
18	MS. KINGSBURY: Yeah, it was out in
19	the Choccolocco Corridor.
20	MR. LEVY: What specifically was it
21	about?
22	MS. KINGSBURY: It was taken from
23	the EPIC (phonetic) report, aerial

1	photography.
2	MR. LEVY: It was an undefined site?
3	MR. JOHNSON: Probably an undefined
4	ground scar that we need to go in and
5	look at.
6	MR. HOOD: You've got it in here as
7	a mound.
8	MR. LEVY: Probably because it
9	looked like a mound and it was the best
10	thing we could do to describe it.
11	MR. PARKS: When they get to the end
12	of that and they issue a report, who does
13	that go to and what would it say in it?
14	Would it have recommendations on the
15	cleanup?
16	MR. LEVY: If you remember how we
17	move through the process, we do site
18	investigations, from there we move into
19	remedial investigations, feasibility
20	study. It's at that point where there
21	will be defined actions for a particular
22	site. If there is no data to support
23	moving beyond the SI, it'll just drop

1	out. But for removal action, once we get
2	into the RI, remedial investigation
3	phase, there will be a feasibility study
4	that will define actions to be taken and
5	a decision process will evolve from
6	there. The decision, again, will be
7	between the Army, EPA and the state.
8	MR. PARKS: It goes through the
9	base cleanup team?
10	MR. LEVY: It goes through the team,
11	through the BRAC cleanup team.
12	MR. PARKS: So they will issue that
13	report to y'all, and what they found and
14	what the recommendation is to clean it
15	up?
16	MR. LEVY: All reports are sent in
17	to the BRAC cleanup team, yes. They will
18	become a matter of public record though.
19	MR. KIMBROUGH: And the transfers of
20	property are not going to take place
21	until this resolves?
22	MR. LEVY: Yeah, in fact EPA or the
23	state will attempt to, I would think,

1	stop any property transfers that don't
2	meet that would be the wrong word
3	but that aren't protective of human
4	health and environment.
5	MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely. I've got
6	a question, Ron. I was thinking when we
7	got going that the RAB formed a technical
8	review committee and that committee would
9	kind of be the focal point for reviewing
10	documents and so forth. Did that ever
11	come to pass?
12	MR. LEVY: No, we were attempting to
13	do that. I don't think we ever got that
14	far. We were going to ask the RAB to
15	form a group that was technically
16	oriented to actually look at the
17	documents, and those who really have the
18	technical background and then come back
19	and report to the RAB. I don't know that
20	we ever got that far.
21	MR. CONROY: Is that something that
22	you still want to pursue?
23	MR. LEVY: That's up to the RAB, of

1	course. The point would be that if you
2	are uncomfortable looking at very
3	technical documents and trying to
4	interpret from those documents what it
5	says. I mean, there are members of the
6	RAB who have very technical backgrounds,
7	Barry Cox is one being a chemistry
8	professor. I'm sure Alan is another.
9	You know, Ron has got a degree in
10	environmental science, he'd be another.
11	But you know, those folks who may be more
12	technically oriented or interested in the
13	technical side to be looking at the
14	documents. I don't know that we ever got
15	to a decision on that.
16	MR. CONROY: Is that something you'd
17	be interested in Alan?
18	MR. FAUST: Sure.
19	MR. JOHNSON: I think from our
20	standpoint it's nice to have something
21	that comments from all the RAB members,
22	kind of funnels through. That way we
23	know we've gotten RAB comments or

1	community comments. At least, the RAB,
2	they focal through one point and we know
3	we've got them instead of them trickling
4	in here and there, sometimes it's hard to
5	keep up with the concerns of the RAB
6	unless it's kind of done in a systematic
7	approach. So that's a recommendation I
8	have. And that way I guess Ron could
9	just go ahead and supply one copy of
10	every document to the review committee.
11	MR. FAUST: That sounds like fun.
12	MR. LEVY: You've been through some
13	of those documents, Alan, you know what
14	they are like.
15	MR. FAUST: I guess, it seems to me
16	that we're at a point now where we are
17	actually getting into the field. I don't
18	know that a technical committee or even
19	the whole RAB needs to digest all the
20	work that's done to get to the work plan.
21	I think there's just going to have to be
22	a certain leap of faith that the work
23	plan is established. I think when it

1	gets more interesting and more adaptable
2	to comment is when you start getting
3	results back and you get a hit of this or
4	a hit of that and we as a RAB want an
5	explanation for that. You know, I think
6	that's where it would be easier or more
7	applicable. I, for one, don't want to go
8	back and dissect every work plan you guys
9	have generated. And it looks like we're
10	on the brink of some of that starting to
11	happen. And I realize too that you guys
12	are going to be getting data in and you
13	want to have it for a certain amount of
14	time to understand what the implications
15	are, make sure it's validated and all of
16	that too. We don't need to see
17	invalidated data or data too early.
18	MR. LEVY: I wouldn't disagree with
19	you. Let me give you an example of
20	something I talked to Chris about
21	earlier, before the RAB meeting started.
22	Landfill 1 and 2, we thought sometime in
23	October we might want to open that up for

1	discussion, because essentially we've
2	come to a point where we haven't actually
3	got to a decision for no further action,
4	but we've got enough data to support that
5	there's not much there. But that would
6	be good for the RAB to go in, maybe even
7	a technical review committee, to go in
8	and look at the data we got and make
9	their on interpretation and then come
10	back and advise us as to what their
11	feelings are about the site. I've even
12	thought we could supplement that with a
13	contractor coming in and giving a
14	discussion of the work that went on out
15	there and the results that came from it.
16	MR. FAUST: Just a quick overview
17	that would facilitate our review. We
18	have to be able to understand it as
19	members of the public. That's your
20	charter to be able to make us comfortable
21	that there is enough data and that would
22	be a valid decision. I think some kind

of review to get us over that hurdle to

23

1	understand what you've done at a site
2	like the landfill I think would be real
3	good.
4	MR. LEVY: Maybe we might want to
5	hold off on any decision for a technical
6	review committee within the RAB until we
7	can get some more members involved and
8	get some more discussion on it. Maybe we
9	can open it back up for discussion at the
10	next RAB meeting.
11	MR. CONROY: That sounds good. I'll
12	talk to Barry Cox about it in the
13	meanwhile.
14	MR. LEVY: Anybody else got any
15	issues or questions they want to raise at
16	this point? I hate to sound like a
17	broken record, but I really need you all
18	to look at this document and provide us
19	with comments if you've got them. We're
20	getting ready to go in and update this
21	document. So the more input we get, the
22	better the document is going to be.
23	Hasn't really stopped us from moving

1	ahead on our investigations. We really
2	want to finalize this document, and we're
3	trying to mirror what we've got in here
4	now, but it's changing, and as you know
5	things evolve, as we get new data it's
6	going to track us in different
7	directions. But it'll also give you, if
8	you haven't had a chance to, it'll give
9	you a good history background of some of
10	the processes we've got to go through and
11	why we're doing what we're doing. If
12	nothing else, it will give you an
13	education if you would sit down and read
14	it. Anybody here not been given the
15	document or sent the document? John, I
16	know you are just starting out.
17	MS. MCKINNEY: I'll get one to John
18	on Thursday.
19	MR. KIMBROUGH: When is the testing
20	on landfill 3 scheduled for?
21	MR. LEVY: Well, actually you see
22	9/18 February, so that gives you a
23	sampling of events, when we are going to

1	start, and the draft report.
2	MR. KIMBROUGH: That's `98, that's
3	right now. It should have already been
4	started.
5	MR. LEVY: I stand corrected, that
6	should be `99.
7	MS. MCKINNEY: Could you speak a
8	little louder.
9	MR. LEVY: He was asking about
10	landfill 3 and sampling, and I think
11	we've got a mistake in there, Lisa, that
12	should be February `99, right? On
13	landfill 3?
14	MS. KINGSBURY: Which one? The one
15	under long-term monitoring?
16	MR. LEVY: Right. We've got the
17	wrong calendar year.
18	MS. KINGSBURY: No, May `98 the
19	report came out and it's been under
20	review.
21	MR. KIMBROUGH: That was the one
22	where no recommendation was made, wasn't
23	it?

1	MR. LEVY: The reference there is
2	to work that has already been done.
3	Right now what recommendation, are you
4	talking about peer review?
5	MR. KIMBROUGH: (Inaudible)
6	MR. LEVY: That's the recommendation
7	that we're going to do out at landfill 3.
8	We're doing additional work out there.
9	MR. KIMBROUGH: It's already
10	started?
11	MR. LEVY: No, no.
12	MR. JOHNSON: They are going to have
13	to submit another work plan for the work
14	they are going to do and what it's going
15	to involve and they are going to submit
16	it for review to us, EPA, the whole
17	MR. KIMBROUGH: The contractor?
18	MR. JOHNSON: Right. I'm not sure
19	when that report actually is going to be
20	due to us for review. We really two
21	weeks ago
22	MR. CONROY: What's the ballpark?
23	MR. JOHNSON: I really don't know.

1	I don't know about the funding.
2	Contractual funding has to be done
3	MS. KINGSBURY: They've got funding
4	for it. They will use whatever was left
5	over with the recommendation of no
6	further monitoring at this time, they'll
7	just use whatever's left over. So it's
8	funded. They've got a lot of work going
9	on right now, and they are throwing out
10	work plans left and right. It may be
11	three months before they can get that one
12	developed.
13	MR. LEVY: The answer right now is
14	that we don't have definitive dates when
15	to start the additional work.
16	MR. CONROY: Community report.
17	MS. MCKINNEY: In response to the
18	RAB's concerns about us getting out into
19	the community, this past month I went
20	ahead and have set up several firm
21	meetings, firm presentations. I've given
22	you a list in your package. We've got
23	about four more that are tentative. So

next month I'll have another listing that will show more of these. We're also working on developing some of the television program for the chamber live that they do. Hopefully we'll be able to do a seven-minute segment there with a group of us later on in the fall. But if you all have any other groups that you want me to do the coordination with, we're happy to do that. Just let us know who it is. 

I also heard earlier talking about the tours for these sites. We had also discussed in the office any groups that you may have or that you represent or that are interested in this, if we can work it out, you know, we will include those in some of the tours to the sites.

Now, obviously there may not be something going on at that time. But at least we can go to the site, we can discuss what it is, and we can show the folks that are interested what we're doing there. Last

1	week we spoke at Kiwanis at Oxford and
2	they asked the question, if we, perhaps
3	if they could hold a meeting, they do a
4	lunchtime meeting, if they could hold the
5	meeting there at the Fort and then do a
6	site observation. Which I thought was
7	very good, and so I said sure, we can
8	probably work that out. So we'll do that
9	later on in the fall. So anything at all
10	that we can do for the groups that you
11	represent or to help you feel more
12	comfortable with what we're doing, just
13	let us know.
14	MR. CONROY: Thanks. Ready for old
15	business?
16	MR. LEVY: Well, old business was a
17	request for the schedule which I actually
18	showed you and talked about. So we
19	didn't get into much on the BRAC cleanup
20	plan, although it directly relates to it.
21	So the schedules in front of you had been
22	requested during the last RAB, and in
23	fact, that's what we've already gone

1	through. And I will have Lisa or Joan
2	send out the schedule to the missing RAB
3	members so they can look at it and maybe
4	come to the next meeting and bring some
5	additional discussion about it. I think
6	what we want to do though, is we want to
7	get people to respond back to us about
8	what they want to see, in terms of field
9	work that's going on, looking at the
10	schedule and knowing the dates that the
11	field work begins. So if you'll come
12	back to us, either call me or call Lisa,
13	and say "Look, I want to go out and see
14	those items that are going on within
15	package four particularly the wash rack
16	at Building 1298, I want to see what kind
17	of work they are doing out there." Just
18	let us know and we'll schedule it for
19	you.
20	MR. FAUST: Ron, again, without the
21	work plan, it's hard to tell what kind of
22	activities are going to go on.
23	MR. LEVY: Yes, what I'll do too

1	for you then at that point, is if you
2	tell me which particular site you are
3	interested in, I will provide you with
4	what the work plan says as well. Or, if
5	you are looking at a particular package,
6	we can provide you with the entire work
7	plan for that package.
8	MR. FAUST: Is there a matrix set up
9	at all that says for a particular package
10	soil sampling, ground water sampling?
11	MR. LEVY: No, it's all going to be
12	different.
13	MR. JOHNSON: Well, now, pretty
14	much for most of these sites, I now I've
15	already reviewed and turned in comments
16	for packages one through six, they should
17	go into final work plan status pretty
18	soon. And pretty much every one of them
19	on here we're doing multi-medium
20	sampling.
21	MR. LEVY: But it's all driven by
22	site specific. I mean there are going to
23	be consistencies amongst the sites in

1	terms of what we're doing.
2	MR. PARKS: On the underground
3	storage tanks which we've got in there, I
4	thought you just replaced all of them.
5	What needs to be done on them? All of
6	them are brand new, been replaced, got
7	that sealer in there where they guarantee
8	they don't leak and all of that.
9	MR. LEVY: I'll let Chris talk to
10	you about that one. That's an issue that
11	ADEM has brought up in the past.
12	MR. JOHNSON: Well, there are USTs
13	that have been replaced
14	MR. CONROY: What's a UST?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Underground storage
16	tank, I'm sorry That Ron has been
17	upgrading through compliance and they
18	have the monitoring systems in whether
19	it's wells or whether it's the gas
20	protection systems. But the old tanks
21	that were there prior to the ones that
22	were dug are really the ones that we're
23	concerned about and that we're going to

1	be looking at. And the department,
2	through the closure process, on some of
3	the tanks have issued no further action
4	to Ron. The problem, though, is that a
5	lot of no further actions were based on
6	the Army staying at Fort McClellan and
7	the property would remain the way it is
8	at that time. Now that it's being
9	transferred, we want to go back and look
10	at every UST and make sure that every
11	site meets the reuse and meets the risk
12	criteria that we've established. So
13	that's why we're going back and making
14	sure all tanks have been addressed.
15	MR. LEVY: Anybody else got any
16	questions that relate to the schedule or
17	the BRAC cleanup plan?
18	We've got new business. The video.
19	I believe Joan put in front of you some
20	information as it relates to the longleaf
21	pine ecosystem and protecting our
22	properties on Fort McClellan. Most of
23	you know the issues with the longleaf

1	pine. Is anybody here not familiar with
2	what's been going on in that area?
3	MR. FAUST: Did we talk last month
4	that Chris was going to give us an
5	overview of the background metals report?
6	MR. LEVY: We did, and I kind of
7	skipped over that because it wasn't on
8	the program. Do you still want to do
9	that, Chris? Are you ready to talk about
10	it?
11	MR. JOHNSON: Sure.
12	MR. LEVY: We'll backtrack then.
13	MR. JOHNSON: We will be brief.
14	That request came from you, right?
15	MR. HOOD: I did that.
16	MR. JOHNSON: The report he's
17	referring to is the background metals
18	report that we did for both Pelham Range
19	and Main Post. And really the purpose of
20	the report is basically to determine what
21	is naturally occurring as far as the
22	metals on Post. Okay, looking at all
23	mediums, we're looking at surface water,

1	surface soil, subsurface soil, sediment
2	and ground water. So five matrix there
3	that we're actually turning our
4	concentrations. What we did in the past,
5	if you look back at the RI's, we're
6	trying to establish background for each
7	site. It might be a half acre or it
8	might be ten. We would compare site
9	versus background within one little piece
10	of parcel. Well we kind of looked
11	forward through the BRAC process and
12	realized that if we continue that route,
13	we're going to be spending a lot of
14	unnecessary time and tax dollars trying
15	to determine background for each parcel.
16	So we went with this base-wide approach.
17	It's going to basically streamline the
18	whole process. We're going to use this
19	report for every single site we have out
20	here to compare against background.
21	Why do we need to know what's
22	naturally occurring? Well, naturally
23	occurring metals, they unnecessarily

1	create risks. Okay, mother nature put
2	metals in the ground, you know, that when
3	you look at it from a risk standpoint,
4	they just naturally cause problems.
5	Especially like leads and arsenic and
6	beryllium, they create risks and they
7	certainly do in the southeast and they
8	especially do in northern Alabama in the
9	soils we had. So we knew we were going
10	to have this problem. We had already
11	seen it in the RI. It drove a lot of
12	site risk unnecessarily in the RI. So
13	basically with the report we're going to
14	be able to differentiate what the Army
15	did versus what was there to begin with.
16	Our key strategies really are, again,
17	sample the different matrix water verses
18	sediments. At first we segregated Main
19	Post and Pelham Range. They weren't
20	contiguous, they were separate pieces of
21	land, so we kept the work plans different
22	for each one. We looked at different
23	geologic formations in the water. We

1	looked at different soil types, we
2	studied aerial photography, we used the
3	environment baseline survey to determine
4	where we need to go and where we know
5	it's clean. So there was a lot of
6	up-front work to go in to find a sample
7	location on the Fort and saying we know
8	that this area is clean and we can sample
9	here and use it to establish a
10	background.
11	MR. FAUST: You say clean, but even
12	though there may be some presence of
13	metals in a certain medium.
14	MR. JOHNSON: Right, I'm saying
15	clean meaning there is no Army activity.
16	MR. FAUST: That contributed beyond
17	background.
18	MR. JOHNSON: Right. Manmade versus
19	naturally occurring. We also used
20	existing data. We had from SI works,
21	from RI works, from `91 to `95. We also
22	used some background data from Anniston
23	Army Depot. We used Weaver wells as some

1	of our background data. We did go and
2	use whatever we could as long as it met
3	our criteria for being able to use it.
4	The sample size, we wanted minimum of
5	twenty-five samples per medium for each
6	Main Post and Pelham Range. After we
7	went and took all the data and got it
8	back and looked at it, we realized that
9	we could combine the data sets. The
10	water was pretty much the same, the
11	differences in the metals in the soil
12	were really not statistically different,
13	so we combined them. It gave us a
14	stronger data set. On average we had
15	sixty-five to seventy samples per medium,
16	which is a lot, and it made our
17	confidence of background a lot, lot
18	better. And we had, I think, around
19	averaging around fifty to fifty-three per
20	metal for the ground water. But up to
21	even seventy in say the surface soil and
22	subsurface soil. But in the end, after
23	looking at the report, SCIC went back and

1	they did a really good job with it. Real
2	good job in looking at all the different
3	aspects of the property from
4	precipitation to soil types to geologic
5	formations, to looking at the creeks and
6	water sheds and we got some, what I feel
7	is going to be a good report, and it's
8	certainly going to save a tremendous
9	amount of time and effort down the road.
10	MR. LEVY: And money.
11	MR. JOHNSON: And that's what you
12	got, was it the last meeting y'all got
13	this from SCIC? That was the average
14	background concentrations. I'll pass
15	this around, but this is basically the
16	numbers they come up with. We're still
17	going to have to thoroughly go through
18	the data set, but I think it's pretty
19	much right.
20	MR. HOOD: We didn't get that last
21	month.
22	MR. JOHNSON: I'll pass this
23	around. Whoever needs a copy, we'll try
23	around. Whoever needs a copy, we'll try

1	to get you one. But that summarizes all
2	of the work we did.
3	MR. HOOD: So you are saying it was
4	fairly constant across both areas, over a
5	large area? There weren't any gray?
6	MR. JOHNSON: It was constant
7	are you talking about as far as Pelham
8	Range to Main Post?
9	MR. HOOD: Or like let's say certain
10	metals, like you might find a higher
11	rating uphill than you would down lower,
12	did you even see anything like that?
13	MR. JOHNSON: Not really, we used
14	what we call an outliar package to see
15	what didn't fall within what we felt was
16	the range. You've got some pretty good
17	ranges. Let's just take beryllium and
18	say maybe we had a low of fifty and a
19	high of a hundred. But when you look at
20	the data set from a statistical
21	standpoint and see how it fell in the
22	range, we really didn't have anything
23	that was out of the normal. We also

1	luckily are able to compare against other
2	sites. We've got backgrounds for
3	Redstone Arsenal, from NPO sites
4	throughout the state, for NASA. So we
5	did more than just compare.
6	MR. HOOD: What you are saying, this
7	is fairly common for northeast Alabama?
8	MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely.
9	MR. JOHN JOHNSON: That's no
10	comparison as to what is good or what is
11	standard?
12	MR. JOHNSON: What, as far as how
13	Fort McClellan stood around the south?
14	We didn't really do that. We can
15	certainly look at that. I know just from
16	experience it does fall in the range of
17	soils in northern Alabama and even the
18	southeastern United States. So, if
19	there's any questions on it, I'll try to
20	answer. But overall, I'm happy with the
21	results and I think SCIC really did a
22	good job on it.
23	MR. LEVY: I think EPA was happy

1	too.
2	MR. JOHNSON: They were. That's
3	it's.
4	MR. LEVY: I think one thing Chris
5	really didn't mention is that it will
6	save us some dollars, taxpayer dollars as
7	we go out and look at sites.
8	MR. FAUST: Because you did a global
9	approach rather than individual site by
10	site?
11	MR. JOHNSON: Right. I've got to
12	prepare a pretty detailed presentation
13	for a conference down in Mobile next week
14	and I'm going to have actually some
15	dollars savings or cost avoidance by
16	doing this versus us going and doing it
17	the old way. Just a gut feeling, I'm
18	thinking we're probably getting into the
19	hundreds of thousands of dollars if not
20	even approaching the million range.
21	Because it gets expensive when you really
22	start taking background in each medium
23	for each site. You just can't take one

1	per medium per site. You can't do
2	anything with that statistically, you
3	have to take more. So we're dealing with
4	a hundred and fifty to two hundred sites
5	out here, that would be a lot of
6	background, which was really unnecessary,
7	looking back on it. And this is the best
8	approach we feel to use especially for
9	the large installations like this.
10	MR. CONROY: Back to the longleaf
11	pine ecosystem?
12	MR. LEVY: Right. You might want
13	to lead into, you know, why this is
14	important.
15	MR. CONROY: Sure. At one of the
16	earlier RAB's I gave a presentation about
17	the possibility of establishing about ten
18	to twelve thousand acres of Fort
19	McClellan as a national wildlife refuge.
20	And the local reuse authority at the time
21	voted in favor of that, and the process
22	has been moving forward and forward. In
23	fact, tomorrow there will be a big

1	meeting at 1:00 o'clock at Fort McClellan
2	between the Fish and Wildlife Service and
3	the Army and the Corps of Engineers and
4	ADEM as well as the Department of
5	Conservation, other state and federal
6	agencies to discuss the details. And
7	it's really getting down to, it's not a
8	matter of if it's going to happen, I
9	think it's going to be how it's going to
10	happen and exactly when it's going to
11	happen is what we're worried about now.
12	A tool that Ron's office worked on, I
13	know Ron Smith was probably the principle
14	fellow working on this, he pulled
15	together a video that summarizes the
16	project. I've never seen it. Is that
17	essentially what this is?
18	MR. LEVY: Well, I think it
19	summarizes the longleaf pine.
20	MR. CONROY: The need to protect the
21	longleaf pine ecosystem. Can we roll the
22	tape?
23	MR. KIMBROUGH: Who is this property

1	going to be transferred to?
2	MR. CONROY: Ed just asked a good
3	question here, who is the property going
4	to be transferred to? It's what they
5	call a lateral transfer, it's from one
6	federal agency to another federal agency.
7	That makes it much easier. So it goes
8	from Department of Defense to the
9	Department of the Interior.
10	(Whereupon a video was shown.)
11	MR. CONROY: I don't know who would
12	want to rush home to the President's
13	testimony when you have exciting video
14	like that to watch. That was good. That
15	will be a very useful tool in trying to
16	sell our project.
17	MR. LEVY: Anybody have any comments
18	on the video. Any questions?
19	MS. MCKINNEY: Ron, it might be nice
20	to tell the local folks here that that
21	was done locally with very limited funds.
22	Ron, you might want to mention.
23	MR. RON SMITH: Yeah, it was done by

1	Action Video, down in Saks, it was done
2	by a local film director. They do more
3	than wedding photography, as you can see,
4	he did an excellent job for far less than
5	if we had rented on a large scale. It's
6	something that we wanted to use as a tool
7	and can be used by anybody or that can be
8	built on by anybody to let them know
9	what's out there on Fort McClellan and
10	this is one of the things that we looked
11	at as closure goes through.
12	MR. CONROY: Do you have multiple
13	copies?
14	MR. RON SMITH: Yes, I think we have
15	twenty-five. I think we've used two. If
16	you need some of them to go out, we can
17	always make more.
18	MR. CONROY: Local schools can
19	borrow them and that kind of thing?
20	MR. RON SMITH: Hopefully.
21	MR. CONROY: Are you going to have
22	one tomorrow at our 1:00 o'clock?
23	MR. RON SMITH: I think Ron had

1	mentioned that earlier.
2	MR. LEVY: That's up to you if you
3	want to show it.
4	MR. CONROY: That would be great.
5	Maybe make it optional but sure would
6	love to have it available. Anything else
7	before we head home? And in particular
8	is there anyone who has been sitting with
9	us on the side who has any questions
10	about anything? If in case you do,
11	please state your name for the record.
12	Hearing nothing
13	MR. LEVY: Well, let me just mention
14	our next RAB meeting is 21 September, it
15	should be back at Fort McClellan. And
16	the October meeting should be the 19th of
17	October. I believe that will also be at
18	Fort McClellan in our conference room
19	down there. If anybody has any
20	particular interest in terms of
21	discussion for the next RAB meeting,
22	we'll continue to attempt to go through
23	the BRAC cleanup plan if we can get some

1	discussion rolling on that. Comments,
2	questions?
3	MS. LONGSTRETH: Just a statement
4	about the video, I think it was very
5	informative and I learned a lot. And I
6	think if more citizens knew what was out
7	there at Fort McClellan, they would be
8	more concerned about the preservation of
9	it.
10	MR. HOOD: I think that would be
11	good for the schools, because I was
12	watching my daughter over there who was
13	yawning to begin with paid very close
14	attention to the video when it got
15	started.
16	MR. FAUST: What's the accessibility
17	to one of the big boy trees? That's the
18	first time I had actually seen one in
19	context with a person standing. I didn't
20	realize the needles were that big.
21	MR. CONROY: The biggest and most
22	impressive trees, to be honest, are a
23	little bit hard to find. But you can go

1	up there and even driving on the paved				
2	road, Bains Gap, and see impressive trees				
3	that are a hundred years old, plus.				
4	MR. FAUST: Those are predominantly				
5	longleaf?				
6	MR. LEVY: If you look at the				
7	needles, you can tell just by the length				
8	of the needles the longleaf as opposed to				
9	the loplolly.				
10	MR. ANDERSON: Now that I think				
11	about it, I do have kind of a dumb				
12	question. What's the concentration of				
13	these on the Post? Are they all over or				
14	in the south end where we're hoping to				
15	put that little walk trail?				
16	MR. LEVY: What you saw was aerial				
17	photography at Fort McClellan, and you				
18	can see it's kind of like a mosaic. We				
19	did that during leaf out when all the				
20	hardwoods essentially were without				
21	leaves. So you can see kind of like a				
22	mosaic of the longleaf. But there are				
23	high concentrations in certain areas,				

1	particularly along Bains Gap Road as you
2	go up through there you can see quite a
3	number of them. It just depends on what
4	area you are talking about. We do have a
5	map that shows that if you are
6	interested.
7	MR. ANDERSON: I was thinking if
8	they are in the south where the UXO
9	cleanup is a critical issue, that's kind
10	of a slump your shoulders and say well,
11	we've got to figure out a way to have
12	access to them without damaging them.
13	But if they are out in Bains Gap and the
14	Choccolocco Corridor area, that's not as
15	big a problem.
16	MR. LEVY: Throughout the entire
17	area.
18	MR. CONROY: Right.
19	MR. LEVY: Any other questions?
20	Focus on next month's RAB, BRAC cleanup.
21	Additional questions? BRAC cleanup plan.
22	Additional questions? I ask really to go
23	back and take a hard look at the plan and

1	come back and talk to us if you would.
2	Unless you all are interested in a
3	specific presentation.
4	(Whereupon this meeting adjourned at
5	7:45 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

23

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	
5	STATE OF ALABAMA )
6	CALHOUN COUNTY )
7	I, DONNA D. GALLAHAR, a Court
8	Reporter and a Notary Public in and for
9	the State of Alabama at Large, duly
10	commissioned and qualified, hereby
11	certify that the above meeting was taken
12	by me and reduced to shorthand in the
13	presence of said, afterwards transcribed
14	upon a computer; and that the foregoing
15	is a true and correct transcript of the
16	meeting as aforesaid.
17	I FURTHER CERTIFY that this
18	meeting was taken at the time and place
19	in the foregoing caption specified, and
20	was completed without adjournment.
21	////
22	////
23	////

1	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
2	hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal
3	at Anniston, Alabama, on this the
4	, day of, 1998.
5	
6	
7	
8	DONNA D. GALLAHAR
9	Notary Public in and for Alabama at Large
10	Alabama at Large
11	
12	My commission expires May 21, 2001.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	·
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	