

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at
Weaver City Hall, Weaver, Alabama, on the 9th day of
February, 1998, 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 BOARD5-123
CERTIFICATE124-125

1

2

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Let's go ahead

3

and get started. First, I would like to start taking

4

the role so we can get this meeting underway. I think

5

before I go ahead and take the role, I would like to

6

thank Mayor Kimbrough and the citizens of Weaver for

7

inviting us into their home.

8

And I certainly want to tell you

9

that this is an important event for us. It's one of

10

our first public meetings outside of Fort McClellan.

11

Of course, we had one with a government environmental

12

board where everybody could come to it in Anniston in

13

June, but this is why the restoration advisory board

14

exists. It exists to serve the community that is

15

around and near Fort McClellan and that is interested

16

in its future use, and certainly the cleanup of that

17

fort, so that it can be used to the advantage of the

18

community in the best ways possible.

19

Our biggest job is to assure that

20

we know what we're talking about, we can provide

21

proper advice and information to the federal

22

government, the Army, specifically. And to do that,

23

we have to inform the public of what we're doing and

1 at the same time, hopefully receive your feedback.

2 And this is one of those forums where we can at least
3 start that process and begin to inform the public of
4 what's going on and that we exist and who we are.

5 So, we'll go ahead and start our
6 meeting and move through the process that we do. And
7 certainly, these meetings are open to the public, not
8 only here, when we come into this wonderful new
9 facility you have in Weaver, but also at Fort
10 McClellan, where we routinely hold them when we're not
11 on the post.

12 So, I'll go ahead and start the
13 meeting. The first thing I would like to do is get
14 our board attendees this time. Mr. Turner?

15 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I'm here.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Levy?

17 MR. RON LEVY: Here.

18 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Anderson?

19 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Brown?

21 MR. IKE BROWN: Here.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Conroy?

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Here.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Dr. Cox?
2 DR. BARRY COX: Here.
3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Cunningham?
4 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.
5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Elser?
6 MR. JERRY ELSE: Here.
7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ms. Harrington?
8 Mr. Hood?
9 MR. RON HOOD: Here.
10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mayor
11 Kimbrough?
12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.
13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ms. Longstreth?
14 Mr. Miller? Mr. Faust? Mr. Parks?
15 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Here.
16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Some guy by the
17 name of Thomassy. Mr. Johnson? Mr. Buford?
18 Mr. Reedy?
19 MR. BART REEDY: Here.
20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mr. Johnson,
21 Chris Johnson?
22 Okay, I would like to go ahead, I
23 believe. Everybody has had a chance to look at the

1 minutes that were sent to you in the mail. Any
2 discussion?

3 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Move to
4 approve.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Do I have a
6 second?

7 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Second.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All those in
9 favor for approval of the minutes say I? Opposed?
10 Minutes are approved.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Before you begin,
12 Charles, did you, as was mentioned in the minutes, get
13 to brief the Calhoun County --

14 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Yes. After I
15 got through briefing, there was a call for an
16 investigation by the Justice Department. Yes, it went
17 well. I thought it went real well. I was at the tail
18 end of several presentations, but I discussed some of
19 the problems I thought we faced and what the process
20 -- where we were in the process. And I thought it
21 went pretty well.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I wanted you
23 to know that, representing the Army, that I appreciate

1 that and I appreciate that more members get out and
2 talk to the community, because that's one of the
3 functions of this board is to get out within the
4 community and tell them what's going on here. The
5 more that's done, the better it is for us within the
6 installation, and also the board, itself. So, any
7 chance you get to talk to people about the cleanup, I
8 really like to see that.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: What I would
10 like to do, at this point, is I'm Fernand Thomassy.
11 I'm the co chairman from the community side of the
12 restoration advisory board. And I'm co chairman with
13 Mr. Ron Levy, who is the environmental chief at Fort
14 McClellan, and also from the Fort McClellan and the
15 Army side, then the cochair of this board.

16 And quickly, I would like to go
17 right around the room and ask each one of the board
18 members just to introduce themselves and give a little
19 quick background for the audience. I'll still start
20 with Mr. Parks.

21 MR. JIMMY PARKS: I'm Jimmy Parks,
22 and I'm the director of logistics at Fort McClellan.

23 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I'm Charles

1 Turner. I'm a lawyer in Anniston, and I'm also former
2 chairman of this board and former chairman of the Fort
3 McClellan Reuse and Redevelopment Authority, which is
4 now the Fort McClellan Development Commission.

5 DR. BARRY COX: I'm Barry Cox. I'm
6 director of environmental programs at Jacksonville
7 State.

8 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: I'm Don
9 Cunningham. I'm currently employed at Fort McClellan
10 in the combat developments of the chemical school.
11 Been a long-time employee of -- a long-time resident
12 of Calhoun County.

13 MR. JAMES BUFORD: I'm James
14 Buford, retired military, and I recently retired from
15 Anniston Army Depot, small arms.

16 MR. RON LEVY: I'm Ron Levy. I'm
17 the BRAC environmental coordinator. I'm also chief of
18 the environmental office and cochair.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: Pete Conroy. And
20 I'm the director of Jacksonville State University
21 environmental policy and information center.

22 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I'm Ed Kimbrough.
23 I'm part-time mayor and other jobs, City of Weaver.

1 MR. JERRY ELSE: I'm Jerry Elser.
2 I'm a life-long resident of Calhoun County, and I'm
3 service manager of Sears Repair Services.

4 MR. RON HOOD: Ron Hood.
5 Obviously, I deliver mail in Anniston. I'm retired
6 military and I just recently got a Masters Degree in
7 Environmental Management.

8 MR. MARK ANDERSON: I'm Mark
9 Anderson. I'm the military and veterans affairs
10 advisor for Congressman Bob Riley, or was until the
11 31st of last month.

12 MR. IKE BROWN: I'm Ike Brown. I'm
13 a financial consultant at Merrill Lynch.

14 MR. BART REEDY: I need you.
15 I'm Bart Reedy. I'm with the EPA
16 -- the feds, EPA, out of Atlanta. I'm the federal
17 contact with the cleanup of the property before it is
18 turned back over to y'all.

19 And there is another individual
20 that's not here, Chris Johnson, who is the state
21 counter-part to myself, ADEM.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And as I said,
23 I was cochair and I'm also retired Army and spent a

1 lot of time at Fort McClellan. Live in Jacksonville.

2 And right now I work for Westinghouse.

3 What I would now like to do, unless
4 you have anything else that you would like to discuss,
5 at this point, is get into the presentation.

6 And I think it's appropriate that
7 at this public meeting, we do something to show you
8 what is extremely important to us. This is a
9 partnership in getting this job done properly. And as
10 a restoration advisory board, we have to understand
11 where the community is going and what it wants its
12 priorities to be, as well as the details of what it's
13 going to do.

14 And Mr. Rob Richardson is the best
15 person in the world to tell us where the reuse plan
16 and the reutilization efforts are going today. And so
17 this will help calibrate us as a board, as well as
18 provide, I think, good presentation for the citizens
19 of your community, Mayor, and what this is all about.

20 So, I would like to introduce
21 Mr. Rob Richardson to you, who is going to give us a
22 presentation on the reuse plan and environmental
23 priorities.

1 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, members of the
3 RAB. It's great to be here today on behalf of the
4 Fort McClellan Development Commission, here in the
5 center of the wrestling universe, Weaver, Alabama.
6 Special congratulations to the community here for the
7 recent success and also for this fine facility. It's
8 a real honor to be here and spend time and share with
9 you what we're doing at Fort McClellan Development
10 Commission.

11 Want to start by, I guess,
12 reiterating what the chairman said. We can't do the
13 development at Fort McClellan without you. You are as
14 integral to the process and as strong a partner as
15 there is. And we look forward to sharing information
16 with you and, of course, continuing in a partnership
17 as we work to develop the property and to clean it.

18 What I wanted to do is really give
19 you something a little bit different. This is not the
20 standard rotary stump speech. That's a pretty good
21 overview of Fort McClellan and of the impact
22 associated with base closure and sort of where the
23 community is headed.

1 I wanted to delve a little bit
2 deeper, into some minutia even, and share with you
3 some of the real critical components of the
4 comprehensive reuse plan and give you an idea of where
5 we're headed with the development.

6 The reuse plan was recently
7 submitted to the Department of Defense at
8 Christmastime. It has been approved by the Calhoun
9 County Commission, by the counsel of elected leaders,
10 and by the Fort McClellan Reuse and Redevelopment
11 Authority at Fort McClellan Development Commission.
12 So, it's had -- survived some fairly strict scrutiny
13 through that process. And I'm pleased to report to
14 you on it today.

15 I think that my comments will
16 probably take about twenty minutes and then I'll be
17 happy to answer any questions. Let me start by just
18 giving a real general overview of the property at Fort
19 McClellan. I know all of you are familiar with it,
20 but perhaps some of the audience may not be as
21 familiar.

22 What we're talking about when we
23 talk about the development at Fort McClellan is Fort

1 McClellan proper, not Pelham Range, but Fort
2 McClellan, itself. By the way of orientation, this is
3 Highway 20, this is the eastern bypass extension that
4 you've all read about and there has been a lot of
5 discussion about. And this is about eight thousand
6 acres of yellow, the cantonment area at Fort
7 McClellan. That's where the majority of all the roads
8 and streets are and all the facilities and structures.

9 What's left is about ten thousand
10 maybe twelve thousand acres of the Choccolocco
11 Mountain Range. There has been a lot of discussion
12 about a national wildlife refuge out in this area
13 here. This piece of property generally is what we're
14 talking about when we talk about the development.
15 That's a pretty good 2-D image.

16 There is a better 3-D image. It
17 will give you a sense of the mountainous terrain, when
18 we talk about development and some of the constraints
19 that are there. We call that the cantonment area,
20 that flat developable property that you just saw in
21 yellow where most of the facilities and roads are. Up
22 here is here in the valley. And, of course, the
23 Choccolocco Mountains, themselves, the proposed

1 national wildlife refuge is here.

2 The significance, of course, is:

3 Over a hundred year history of Fort McClellan, these
4 mountains served as a perfect backstop for artillery
5 practice. One of the issues you face and we face
6 today, unexploded ordnance, is a consequence of that
7 practice, itself.

8 One more image. The developable
9 property of Fort McClellan. This is really just a
10 juxtaposing of the two maps I just showed you
11 together, to give you some idea and a sense of the
12 topography. This is a blowup that shows water sheds,
13 with flood planes, as well. Those are areas obviously
14 we can't develop, and that need to be protected.

15 What's left, with the exception of
16 some landfills to the north? I know you're looking at
17 those and some otherwise toxic or contaminated sites
18 indicated here as dots, is available for development.

19 The reuse plan, itself, was
20 essentially a three-phase study. Phase one was just
21 an inventory, what's there, what's in the property,
22 what do we do with it, what are its strengths and
23 weaknesses. We found a couple of interesting things

1 through the phase one study.

2 The entire study, all three phases,
3 took over a year. The first phase was about four or
4 five months with an analysis. And the interesting
5 thing that we found when we did a strengths and
6 weaknesses assessment was that for just about every
7 strength you can find at Fort McClellan, there is a
8 corresponding weakness that in many ways offsets that
9 strength, and really contributes to cost, not only in
10 terms of cleanup, but retrofit and development, as
11 well.

12 Let me give you an example. For
13 example, location. We know that Fort McClellan is
14 ideally located for development purposes midway
15 between Birmingham to Atlanta, not far off Interstate
16 20, great opportunity for developers.

17 Corresponding weakness, though, is
18 access. We don't really have very good access to Fort
19 McClellan. Say, Quintard Avenue, which you know, can
20 get relatively congested. Another example of a
21 strength would be infrastructure. Six and a half
22 million square feet of facility floor space, a
23 thousand miles of roads, a hundred of which are paved,

1 a complete utility infrastructure system that would
2 support a city. In fact, it is a city.

3 Of course, its weakness is
4 operations and maintenance costs are extreme. The
5 operations and maintenance budget of Fort McClellan
6 today is twenty million dollars. They fund it at
7 about fifteen million dollars. They have a capital
8 improvements list of those projects that are real
9 priorities for them to get fixed or repaired of about
10 nineteen million dollars. So, you can see that, great
11 to have that asset, great to have it paid for by the
12 taxpayers, but on the other hand, really expensive for
13 this community to shoulder the continued operations of
14 that infrastructure.

15 We also found some interesting
16 things in terms of preliminary findings in phase one.
17 The first, I think, most noteworthy is the fact that
18 this site represents the largest military base closure
19 in the history of the United States. That, in and of
20 itself, you know, maybe doesn't mean so much, if
21 you're in Atlanta, different market, different
22 absorption rates. But in Calhoun County, a relatively
23 rural area, with limited access or poor access, we

1 know that there is some real absorption problems, in
2 terms of turning that public property into private
3 sector's hands and having it absorbed at a rate
4 consistent with the upkeep of the property.

5 Give you an example, in the hundred
6 year history of Calhoun County, our county has
7 urbanized about thirty-seven thousand acres. That's
8 not a lot, but it's about thirty-seven thousand acres.
9 That includes Weaver.

10 Now, consider that in the fall of
11 1999, in one night, we're going to throw another
12 eighteen thousand acres into the mix that needs to be
13 absorbed by the local economy and the local community,
14 and you begin to see the magnitude of the challenge.

15 In phase two, we looked at
16 alternative development strategies. We really looked
17 at three alternatives. Phase two was highly power
18 (phonetic), sort of from the bottom up. We went to
19 the community, we asked the community for their reuse
20 ideas, and wanted to include as many of those reuse
21 ideas as possible.

22 We looked at a low cost, no risk
23 investment, where essentially the property stays in

1 public hands, all the way to the extreme,
2 privatization of everything with extreme investment,
3 multi-million dollar investment, retrofits, capital
4 improvements, to really trying to entice new
5 developers to the property. And what we really sort
6 of stunned on was a hybrid strategy, a mix, something
7 sort of middle of the road that still keeps some of
8 the property in federal hands. For example, the
9 national wildlife refuge, but still makes, gee, about
10 eight thousand acres available for private sector
11 development. And what we wanted to do was strike a
12 proper balance between what we thought we could afford
13 and what we couldn't.

14 Finally, and just as important,
15 four salient land use patterns and public user needs
16 really came to the forefront. What do I mean by that?
17 Well, when we look at land use and the future of Fort
18 McClellan, there is really four main goals for the
19 development of Fort McClellan.

20 The first is research, development,
21 and training. Okay? That is anchored by the National
22 Center for Domestic Preparedness. Fort McClellan
23 today is nothing more than a college campus or

1 university. How do you take a university and create
2 new jobs? You need to replace fifteen hundred
3 civilian jobs, about three thousand military jobs
4 there. How do we do that in an academic or a
5 university setting?

6 The first way we do it is by
7 establishing a strong research, development, and
8 training component. We want to take the unique assets
9 at Fort McClellan, the laboratories, the nuclear labs,
10 the chemical labs, and reuse those in that sort of
11 scientific manner to create a new R&D component here
12 in Calhoun County.

13 Why is that important? Well, when
14 you have research, development, and training, you
15 invariably always have industrial jobs relocation.
16 So, if we can anchor a research, development, and
17 training component, industrial jobs will follow.

18 Now, industrial park expansion is
19 phase two or part of this development program. So,
20 use R&D to leverage industrial jobs. And it's
21 working. For example, with the announcement of the
22 National Center for Industrial Preparedness being
23 sited at Fort McClellan, we've already received phone

1 calls from a number of industries willing to consider
2 relocation to Fort McClellan so they will be close to
3 the national center.

4 Now, these industries manufacture
5 things like protective gear and clothing and gas
6 masks, those kinds of goods typically associated with
7 first responder training.

8 The third element is the retirement
9 community. Fort McClellan is so large and the
10 topography is so broken with so much green space and
11 forest area, that we can really do traditionally
12 non-compatible land uses. So, for example, you could
13 have a retirement community next to an industrial
14 area. And we are going to do that.

15 We have market tested the idea, and
16 there is a lot of interest in doing a retirement
17 center at Fort McClellan, reusing the housing assets,
18 about five hundred and seventy-one housing units,
19 reusing a hospital, hopefully, and certainly the golf
20 course as components of retirement.

21 And then finally, recreation
22 opportunities, anchored by the national wildlife
23 refuge. About ten thousand acres of property

1 available for the federal government's use as a
2 national wildlife refuge. And, of course, Pete Conroy
3 has really taken the lead on that, on behalf of our
4 local community.

5 Let me just show you a couple of
6 quick slides to give you an idea of how we formulated
7 those four land uses. This is just a land use
8 diagram. We wanted to do simple basic colors, to try
9 and depict what the current land uses of Fort
10 McClellan are today, so we could go in and really kind
11 of fill that map in with more detail. And what you
12 see are most of the industrial uses and research,
13 development, and training components are located to
14 the north of the property, separated by Cane Creek,
15 the green space, and the flood plane, which is in
16 large measure the golf course today, cascading down
17 into retirement areas and residential areas. So,
18 industrial to the north, then retirement down to the
19 south.

20 In a little bit more detail, the
21 comprehensive reuse plan looks like this. I believe
22 most of you have seen this map, but this is a very
23 detailed map of what we expect Fort McClellan to look

1 like in the year 2020, if we're successful and can
2 pull this development off.

3 Again, about two thousand acres of
4 industrial park space, a large research, development,
5 and training component, a golf course recreation area,
6 and retirement community, with a new town center
7 supporting our retirees, with everything else, a
8 national wildlife refuge.

9 In phase three, we really got into
10 the details. We knew through phase two, the map I
11 just showed you, what we want the property to look
12 like. Phase three was about, how do you get there?
13 How do you actually make the property look that way
14 over a twenty year period? And we broke it down into
15 its component pieces, with an acquisition strategy,
16 with a parcelization strategy, phasing plan, capital
17 improvement strategy, financing plan, target marketing
18 strategy, and a business plan pro forma. So, we can
19 see in the end whether or not it all added up.

20 Let me detail those components for
21 you real quick, and then I'll be done. But before I
22 do that, this is sort of the skinny. It's all boiled
23 down into just the facts. What? We're talking about

1 the community's ownership of Fort McClellan, about
2 eight thousand acres of that property. Who? We're
3 talking about, in all likelihood, the Fort McClellan
4 Development Commission owning it, in partnership with
5 the Calhoun County Commission. Where? We're talking
6 about the cantonment area and about eight thousand
7 acres. The rest of that property, about ten thousand
8 acres, would go to the national wildlife refuge and
9 the U. S. Government. When will we be able to start
10 acquiring that property? Well, in all likelihood it's
11 when a record of decision is issued. Record of
12 decision is the culminating act in the environmental
13 impact statement process or the NEPA process. We know
14 that that will be due in about the October of 1998
15 time frame. That is a huge milestone in the
16 development of Fort McClellan and for its cleanup.
17 Finally, how are we going to get the property? In all
18 likelihood, it will be through an economic development
19 conveyance. That's when this local community applies
20 to the federal government for the purchase of the
21 property, hopefully at a less than fair market value
22 basis, hopefully at no cost.

23 What is the acquisition strategy?

1 How will we own the property? We have three options.
2 We can do a direct purchase, we can do a negotiated
3 sale, or we can do an economic development conveyance.
4 We choose the economic development conveyance. It's
5 the best chance to acquire the property at no cost. A
6 little bit more work, but we really think it's the
7 best way to go.

8 We will supply an EDC, an economic
9 develop conveyance application to the federal
10 government for all the real property on site and the
11 personal property. The personal property, there is
12 about eighty-five million dollars in equipment,
13 personal property that the government formerly used.
14 That's about sixty thousand line items in the post
15 inventory.

16 Mr. Parks is responsible for that
17 inventory, and he can tell you, from the floor to my
18 list, it's about this high of personal property and
19 equipment inventory that he's responsible for.

20 Some of the property will be
21 conveyed through public benefit conveyances, for
22 example, the national wildlife refuge. There is a
23 mechanism for a federal-to-federal transfer at no

1 cost. So, that would go through a public benefit
2 conveyance.

3 Another example might be, for
4 example, a discussion that Ayers State Technical
5 College may move to Fort McClellan. Now, there has
6 been that discussion. No decisions have been made and
7 it hasn't really been pursued, either. But that's
8 another example of a way that through an educational
9 public benefit conveyance, the property could be
10 acquired at no cost.

11 Another way for a no cost
12 conveyance, and one that we have to be cognizant of is
13 the homeless conveyance. Federal law, through the
14 McKinney Act, requires that the reuse authority assess
15 the needs of the homeless in Calhoun County and
16 provide for them in the comprehensive reuse plan.

17 Now, we did that by providing them
18 with service space, in what will some day be our
19 industrial park. We provided them with about a
20 hundred thousand square feet of building space. We
21 asked eight Calhoun County homeless providers to come
22 together in a coalition and form a limited liability
23 company and they speak with one voice to provide

1 service to the homeless and needy in Calhoun County.

2 Now, there won't be much transient
3 traffic there. We don't anticipate that folks will
4 come there and stay the night, only on a limited
5 basis. For example, in all likelihood there will be a
6 battered women's shelter there. In all likelihood,
7 there will be a drug rehab clinic there for women and
8 children. And those are the kinds of things that we
9 see where folks might actually end up staying the
10 night there. The rest of their space is primarily
11 warehouse space and office services space for service
12 provision.

13 I should note that none of the
14 housing units are contained in the homeless
15 conveyance. Okay? They will all be reused in the
16 retirement community, if there is a retirement
17 community. And I am certain that there will be.

18 And then finally there is going to
19 be a reserve component enclave on Fort McClellan,
20 about four hundred, four hundred and fifty acres of
21 space. And you've probably followed that discussion
22 in the papers. That's in compliance with federal law,
23 as well.

1 Okay, the parcelization plan. Why
2 is the parcelization plan important and what does it
3 mean? It's really important that we understand the
4 property. You can't understand Fort McClellan at
5 large. It's too big. It's like that old saying, if
6 you're going to eat an elephant, just take one bite at
7 a time. That's why the parcelization strategy is so
8 critical.

9 What we did was divide Fort
10 McClellan into fifty-eight parcels over four phases.
11 We put our arms around fifty-eight parcels and you can
12 assess one parcel at a time over four phases a lot
13 better than you can Fort McClellan in its entirety.

14 And this is really important to the
15 RAB and to the base cleanup team, because this begins
16 to establish the community's priorities for cleanup.
17 No need for them to start on parcel fifty-eight. They
18 ought to start with parcel number one, because that's
19 the one that we want to get into the private sector's
20 hands as quickly as possible. Parcel fifty-eight can
21 wait. And I'm going to detail those parcels for you
22 just really quickly in just a moment.

23 Let me do that in the context of

1 the phasing plan, itself. When we talk about phasing,
2 you get back to the fundamental absorption. Remember,
3 I gave you that statistic, that over the hundred year
4 history of Fort McClellan, our community has developed
5 about thirty-seven thousand acres. That's absorption.
6 It's how much property you can acquire as a community,
7 given your economy and the density of your population
8 and your future projected growth.

9 Let me give you a couple of
10 interesting statistics. The first is with regard to
11 market place demand. It's ultimately market place
12 demand that drives absorption. If they're isn't a
13 market for it, we're going to sit on it for a long,
14 long time.

15 Last year, Calhoun County absorbed
16 thirty industrial acres. Okay? There are lots of
17 industrial parks here, but we only absorbed thirty new
18 industrial acres. That means new factories and new
19 construction only absorbed about thirty acres.

20 Well, contrast that to the two
21 thousand industrial acres we have highlighted in the
22 comprehensive reuse plan, and you begin to see that
23 over time, it's going to take a long time to absorb

1 that much property.

2 Residential units. There were two
3 hundred housing permits issued by Calhoun County last
4 year. Only two hundred new housing permits for new
5 construction. Well, we've got five hundred and
6 seventy units at Fort McClellan today. We're talking
7 to developers who could build substantially more than
8 that to sort out the need for our retirees.

9 And finally, consider that ten
10 thousand square feet worth of office space were
11 absorbed last year in Calhoun County. Well, we've got
12 about a million and a half square feet of office
13 space. So, our demolition plan suddenly becomes
14 really important. Of the six and a half million
15 square feet that is out at Fort McClellan today, we'll
16 end up knocking down and tearing down in excess of two
17 million square feet. We simply can't absorb that much
18 property as a local community. Even our best efforts
19 to create a new market wouldn't be successful in
20 absorbing all that property. And we wouldn't want to.
21 I mean, some of it's not in very good condition.

22 There is no change anticipated in
23 those absorption demands, unless the Fort McClellan

1 Development Commission, working in partnership with
2 the local community, with the RAB, the local
3 government, can entice new markets here. And that's
4 why we really tried to key in on growth industries, in
5 terms of research, development, and training; a
6 national center for domestic preparedness, training
7 America's first responders to weapons of mass
8 destruction contingencies, unfortunately, a growth
9 industry.

10 Retirement, a huge growth industry
11 for our country. Today, about 12.5 percent of the U.
12 S. Population is sixty-five or older. In the year
13 2020, when this plan matures, nearly twenty-six
14 percent of the U. S. Population will be at that age.
15 So, it's really a growth opportunity.

16 And then finally, environmental
17 recreational opportunities, something that I know Pete
18 has really keyed me into, are huge growth opportunity.
19 What was it, Decatur Wheeler Station was six hundred
20 thousand visitors last year?

21 MR. PETE CONROY: About half a
22 million.

23 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: The national

1 wildlife refuge?

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Right.

3 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Hopefully,
4 another growth opportunity for us. That's really the
5 only way that we could acquire this property. It's
6 got to be acquired over time, and we've got to be very
7 aggressive in our marketing to bring in new industry
8 and new demand.

9 The milestones look something like
10 this, three phases. Phase one is actually divided
11 into phase 1-A and phase 1-B. What you're looking at
12 primarily, housing, golf, and training, using that
13 residential area first. Secondly, the research,
14 development, and training industry, in phase two. And
15 then to phase three, just industry.

16 So, on that map, we start with
17 retirement and we grow north with industry. That's
18 important because the infrastructure isn't there to
19 support industry today. It needs to be built over
20 time. That's going to cost money and take time to
21 develop.

22 What does that look like? It looks
23 something like this, phase 1-A. And again, this is

1 important because it establishes our environmental
2 priorities. It starts primarily with existing
3 residential areas and the golf course and brings in
4 the facilities that we know the national center for
5 domestic preparedness will require, and also includes
6 the reserve component enclave and the homeless parcel.

7 As you can see that that's our
8 first priority, and that's where we think we'll go
9 within the first twelve months of development. We
10 think, for example, there is market place interest in
11 acquiring all those housing units in one fell swoop.
12 National housing and retirement developers would come
13 in, purchase the property, and begin development over
14 a longer period of time. Again, that will be
15 controlled by absorption and market place demand.

16 But we'll be rid of those housing
17 units, hopefully, the day we sign the deed for this
18 property, within thirty seconds to a minute, we'll
19 turn around and execute another deal with a housing
20 developer to take those properties off of our hands.

21 And really the goal of the
22 development commission and I think the community is
23 not to be a developer, but to get the property into

1 the hands of those folks who are the experts and who
2 have the deeper pockets. So, that's in large measure
3 why we've adopted that strategy.

4 Phase 1-A and phase 1-B, over a
5 five year time period, you can see the growth of this.
6 It's sort of amoebic. And over a five year period of
7 time, we've taken a historic district in Buckner's
8 Circle, and we continue to grow north and to the east
9 with some new industrial properties coming on line.

10 The yellow parcel right there is
11 building 350, heavy vehicle maintenance facility, a
12 real target for us and probably going to be a good job
13 generator.

14 Over about a twelve year history of
15 the development, the property goes like this, fully
16 extending due north, brings in new industrial
17 opportunities. We look hopefully for the expansion of
18 a rail line due north, another mile worth. And we
19 continue to bring down more and more property, until
20 finally, over a seventeen year period, Fort McClellan,
21 we ate the elephant, and it's been absorbed by the
22 local community.

23 Now, that doesn't mean we'll absorb

1 it all. This development program is going to last
2 well into the next century, probably over the next
3 fifty years. But that at least gets us a strong
4 foothold in the development process.

5 Now, what you haven't seen by way
6 of maps is that national wildlife refuge area. And
7 there is a strategy to it. These parcels are not in
8 any particular order, in terms of our priorities, with
9 the exception, that is not even numbered, the eastern
10 bypass. The Fort McClellan Development Commission has
11 put the state and federal regulators in the area on
12 notice that the eastern bypass is a really critical
13 component to the development at McClellan and our
14 first priority with regard to unexploded ordnance
15 remediation.

16 Just as important, in a different
17 sense, of course, would be parcels that are numbered
18 area nine, the national wildlife refuge. And there is
19 some discussion of setting the boundaries. But they
20 haven't been precisely defined, yet. But that gives
21 you an idea of what the green space looks like.

22 Why that map? Why is that green
23 space important and how do we determine that green

1 space? The Birmingham news article pretty much says
2 it all. This is not how you want to wake up on a
3 Sunday morning and see this on the front page of the
4 Birmingham paper, but I did one morning. And this
5 shows a pretty good assessment of where unexploded
6 ordnance is still lodged in the national wildlife --
7 what will be the national wildlife refuge in the
8 Choccolocco Mountains. And you can see as an overlay,
9 what we can develop is really what's clean, the
10 development of the cantonment area. And the rest then
11 becomes a national wildlife refuge or otherwise forest
12 reserve, at least until it's remediated.

13 Okay, just a couple more slides and
14 I'll be done. Infrastructure privatization plan.
15 There has got to be a plan for acquiring the utilities
16 at Fort McClellan. The development commission is, as
17 we speak, debating whether or not it wants to become
18 an owner/operator of the utility systems.

19 We know we're not going to be an
20 operator. The question is: Do we want to be an
21 owner? Do we want to step into the chain of title and
22 flip those to a utility provider? The issue, of
23 course, is money, because if we acquire the utilities,

1 we may be able to sell them at a premium. But it's a
2 calculated gamble the development commission has to
3 take, because on the other hand, there are certain
4 liabilities, legal liabilities associated with
5 ownership, as well as market place risks. There might
6 not be a market for them and we could be stuck with
7 them, and in the end have to provide those support
8 utility services to our own markets. So, a real
9 liability.

10 I'm not sure how it's going to pan
11 out, but I know that a decision is immediate and
12 forthcoming. And I wouldn't venture to guess if we're
13 going to be owners or not. But it is a hot issue for
14 us right now and we're watching it very closely.

15 Capital improvement strategy. I
16 told you that there is already a nineteen million
17 dollar backlog in capital improvement requirements at
18 Fort McClellan. What we did was we created a
19 sensitivity analysis for new improvements at Fort
20 McClellan. We put together two development programs.
21 One was a hundred and seventy million dollar
22 development program over the life of the project. The
23 other was an eighty million dollar project.

1 I think that the eighty million
2 dollar project actually is going to be more likely to
3 happen, simply because of the capital requirements and
4 the existing capital is not really abundant on this
5 kind of project. It's fairly high risk for lenders.
6 So, I think what you'll see is a scaled-down version.
7 What that means is we delayed a lot of up-front costs
8 when we went through a sensitivity analysis or a lower
9 cost plan. It also means that we cancelled some of
10 the major transportation requirements and
11 improvements. For example, we wanted to make a nice
12 boulevard through the center of the post, a spine road
13 we call. And I'm not sure that that will happen.
14 Now, only time will tell. If the development is
15 successful and begins to snowball, it certainly will.
16 We'll have to wait and see.

17 Again, just like the remediation
18 plan, capital improvements will be assessed and
19 developed by phases. Our initial focus is just
20 regulatory compliance. Don't worry about building the
21 Taj Mahal when you don't have ADA -- accessibility to
22 ADA compliance. There are some basic rudimentary
23 costs that have to be absorbed up front. And that

1 will be our initial focus. Longer term, we'll look
2 toward the Taj Mahal, growth and development and new
3 roads, that kind of thing.

4 I've got two more slides for you.
5 Business plan pro forma. Yes, we had to put one
6 together to get an idea of whether or not the property
7 would cash flow. It doesn't cash flow. We still have
8 a substantial unfunded debt burden of about forty
9 million dollars. All reuse authorities do, at this
10 stage of the game. We're still trying to find funding
11 sources for the project.

12 A number of our expenses will be
13 absorbed by the private sector. For example, we bring
14 in a housing developer, they purchase the housing.
15 Well, they also get some of the streets to maintain
16 and take care of. So, we'll look to putting most of
17 that burden back on the private sector where we can.

18 Now, the offshoot of that is: If
19 you expect the private sector to do most of the
20 development and to absorb most of the infrastructure
21 and capital improvement cost, you can't expect to get
22 much for the property. Pretty much giving it away.
23 It's a trade-off.

1 And then finally, a financing plan.
2 I shared with you the unfunded debt. We put together
3 a financing plan that looks at all kinds of private
4 and public sector funding. Some of these are more
5 secure than others. And we're still working -- we're
6 still looking at those sources to come up with the
7 cash required.

8 Again, in the end, public funding
9 question will be in large measure resolved when we
10 resolve the corporate government question; who is
11 going to own Fort McClellan and who is going to annex
12 it and how much money are those public entities going
13 to bring to the table. The private sector funding
14 question is resolved as we find end users. How much
15 of the cost are they willing to shoulder?

16 And finally one last slide is
17 target marketing strategy. No good plan would be
18 complete without a target market. And we're just
19 going to play off our notch of strings (phonetic).

20 Fort McClellan is a university
21 today. We're going to key in on research,
22 development, and training. Of course, the center for
23 domestic preparedness is a major coups for this

1 community.

2 We're also going to look at
3 industrial development over time. Securing a
4 retirement community developer today is an absolute
5 priority to the development commission. I talked to
6 two of them on the phone today. Had one of them in my
7 office today. We're really working that issue hard.

8 And then finally, recreational
9 uses, not the least of which is the national wildlife
10 refuge and finding a home for it and the federal
11 government having to develop it and move forward on
12 that basis.

13 So, I know that's an earful. It's
14 a lot of data. The reuse plan itself is about seven
15 hundred pages. So, I tried to summarize it as best I
16 could for you.

17 Let me say that we can't get there
18 without y'all. The RAB is a critical component to the
19 development. And we look forward to continuing to
20 work with you in a partnership. If you have any
21 questions, I'm certainly available to answer them.

22 Charles Turner didn't mention that
23 he is also a member of the Fort McClellan Development

1 Commission and a great source of information for you
2 all. And we look forward to a strengthened and
3 continued partnership with you. Appreciate the
4 opportunity to answer any questions you may have.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Rob, would you mind
6 telling the RAB your concerns as it relates to the
7 landfills on the installation and the impacts that --
8 being maintained as landfills?

9 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Yes, I have
10 two concerns, two strong concerns. Not I, the
11 development commission does. The first is the Avery
12 Drive landfill. Is that landfill one?

13 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

14 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Landfill
15 number 1, the Avery Drive landfill. It's the smallest
16 of all the landfills, but we're not sure what's in it.
17 And I believe it's also a CERCLA site.

18 MR. RON LEVY: No, not really been
19 identified.

20 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Possible?

21 MR. RON LEVY: It's being
22 investigated under CERCLA.

23 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Investigated,

1 that's right, yes. It's problematic to us, because it
2 sits in the heart of the development, in the heart of
3 what will be a retirement community. In fact, there
4 are six officers' housing units that we think sit on
5 top of it. Some real concerns about what's there,
6 about how we overcome marketplace stigma and relocate
7 retirees close to a landfill, about what the future
8 might hold in terms of leaching, those kinds of issues
9 are a real concern for us.

10 The other landfill that is of
11 somewhat a concern to us, and I know a concern to the
12 citizens of Weaver and to Mayor Kimbrough, who has
13 been very active on it, is the landfill that's just a
14 stones throw away from here. Is that landfill three?

15 MR. RON LEVY: (Nods head.)

16 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Landfill
17 number three. We did identify in our commentary to
18 the draft environmental impact statement that it is a
19 high priority landfill for us. That we certainly
20 applaud the site investigation that's going on. We
21 want to get a better idea of what that ground water
22 pool looks like, because we still haven't really seen,
23 I think, an accurate map of where that water is

1 migrating to, if at all. And we really need to get a
2 sense for where that is. And certainly the citizens
3 of Weaver deserve an answer, as well.

4 And if it's required, pump and
5 treat stations should probably be built and employed
6 to begin cleaning the water system. It's due to you,
7 if you're in danger of a contaminated water source.
8 And so we're going to watch that very closely on your
9 behalf, and we'll continue to work with the Mayor who
10 has been very active in working with us on it.

11 Mayor, did you have anything you
12 wanted to say?

13 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: The threat to our
14 community, of course, is: If it moves, if it gets
15 into an aquifer or whatever, then it could contaminate
16 our total water source. And there has been analysis,
17 cost analysis and like that. At this point, it has
18 not moved and there has -- Ron, we've talked on this
19 -- it has not moved, I think, at the rate in how many
20 years, Ron, ever since it's been closed?

21 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know. We
22 can't say it's not moved. What we can say is that
23 we've tested the wells in and around the area, we've

1 done some ground water analysis, and in fact there is
2 no impact to the wells and to The City of Weaver's
3 drinking water.

4 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And y'all are
5 consistently helping us, as far as testing --

6 MR. RON LEVY: As a matter of fact,
7 we're getting ready to kick off another ground water
8 monitoring program here very shortly. So, yes, the
9 issue of the landfills is still on the table. The
10 base cleanup team is very much aware of it. And there
11 are some decisions that need to be made, but we're
12 still waiting for some more data as it results -- as
13 it's coming out of some of these studies that are
14 ongoing.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Our water source
16 is two big wells. And so, you know, if it hits one of
17 the wells, then our water source is wiped out.

18 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: I have a
19 question. You mentioned that there was historically a
20 record of what, six hundred thousand visitors to
21 wildlife areas in some areas? You mentioned that
22 figure.

23 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: In excess of a

1 million to the Wheeler, to Decatur, to --

2 MR. PETE CONROY: The Wheeler
3 Wildlife Refuge, Don.

4 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: But in this
5 case, we're dealing with unexploded ordnance and those
6 sorts of things that have a very negative impact on
7 the attractability of that particular area. So, what
8 is the realistic figure for expectation of revenue or
9 benefit from those ten thousand acres?

10 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: You're right.
11 You can only extrapolate based on their success up in
12 Wheeler. But what we have also done is looked at
13 other closed installations that had impact ranges just
14 like we had at Fort McClellan that have also been
15 successfully turned into national wildlife refuges.
16 And there is a couple of them out there, and they've
17 had a good deal of success.

18 What's really important is that the
19 Army or someone construct and fund -- it could be the
20 Department of Interior, in this case -- a really
21 strong, solid education program. So, before you get
22 into our national wildlife refuge, stop and you check
23 in with the guard that's got the Smokey the Bear hat

1 on and he hands you out a little video. You watch the
2 video. You get a hand out. You know what UXO is.
3 You know what to do if you see any. We also have well
4 marked trails and a general policy and rule that says
5 you don't get off the trails. And that's not that
6 unheard of. I mean, with the exception perhaps of our
7 campers and hikers, possibly, been a lot said about
8 hunting, you know, you would be able to get off the
9 trails in those areas that we know are safe. They use
10 that property for that purpose today and they don't
11 have problems. And we just need to educate the
12 public. But you're right to identify. We've got some
13 marketing issues that need to be overcome. But
14 through education and laying everything on the table,
15 I don't think it's going to be that big of a problem.

16 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Second
17 question. I hear your concerns about areas that
18 landfill three, one case in point, and some other key
19 areas, that have to be considered in the overall plan
20 as a part of the basic plan, itself.

21 What responsibilities and what is
22 being done from the government's perspective to assist
23 in these areas?

1 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: The base
2 cleanup team could probably answer that question
3 better than I could. But I know it starts with site
4 assessment studies, finding out what's there and what
5 can be done. And I think that's the stage we're at
6 right now. And Ron and Bart could probably address it
7 better.

8 First of all, identifying whether
9 or not they're actually dangerous. And we think
10 they're dangerous. I mean, the draft environmental
11 impact statement did note that there was some leaching
12 in some of those and where they did site
13 investigation, there were contaminants that would be
14 hazardous to health and human safety.

15 So, those are issues. And how we
16 handle it really is the responsibility of the base
17 cleanup team. They have a requirement to review the
18 comprehensive reuse plan and factor that into the mix.
19 They're limited by technology and by money.

20 I think our position has been and
21 maybe not formally announced yet, but perhaps will be,
22 if we can get the U.S. taxpayers to clean it up, the
23 federal government to clean it up, then let's clean up

1 what we can, because we probably only have one bite at
2 this apple. And if we've got an opportunity today to
3 get money to help these guys do their job, then our --
4 we ought to focus our resources in that regard. Let's
5 get money and let's get them cleaned up as quickly as
6 we can.

7 In some instances, it's not going
8 to be cleaned up. I mean, it's a reality that
9 everybody needs to understand. Fort McClellan will
10 not be cleaned to residential standards. It's just
11 not going to happen. The technology isn't there and
12 the money is not there. And as much as we wish it
13 were, it's unlikely. If I've overstated it --

14 MR. RON LEVY: No. And I'll just
15 put something else in. The Army's intent is to insure
16 the health and safety of the community first. And
17 then secondly, to follow up on line or to meet the
18 community's reuse plan as best it can, given
19 technology and funding. So, our intent is to do
20 what's right for the community, protecting health
21 first. Health and safety is the first priority there.

22 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Is funding a
23 problem, though?

1 MR. RON LEVY: No, I didn't say
2 that.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Not yet. And
4 that's one of the reasons that the community has a
5 restoration advisory board, because the Army's
6 position doesn't have to be ours. And in many cases,
7 shouldn't be.

8 And we don't have decision
9 authority, but we certainly have the responsibility to
10 make it known when there is that difference, and when
11 we don't think the best interest of this community --
12 who is represented many times by the organizations
13 that Rob Richardson works with. And so I would say,
14 from the restoration advisory board community side,
15 that a lot of the priority that we're going to look at
16 is getting it cleaned up so that it meets the
17 requirements of the reuse authority. And we may
18 differ with the Army on that, and then we're going to
19 have to bring public opinion into that and that's
20 called pressure.

21 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: And, you know,
22 it's already started. That's a great point. I
23 received a phone call from Congressman Riley, himself,

1 shortly after the draft environmental impact statement
2 was published, very concerned about whether or not the
3 draft environmental impact statement met the
4 community's needs. My response to him was: We don't
5 know, because the draft environmental impact statement
6 isn't about what the Army is going to do to clean the
7 property. That's what the base cleanup plan is for.
8 When we get the base cleanup plan, we're going to lay
9 it down side by side with the comprehensive reuse plan
10 and we're going to compare notes. And we'll get a
11 much better idea of what's being funded and what's not
12 being funded, what's being taken care of and what's
13 not.

14 The Army, so far, I think, through
15 its environmental programs, has demonstrated a great
16 commitment to protect the health and human safety
17 here. It's also contributed a lot, there is no doubt
18 about it. I mean, it is -- it's contaminated the
19 property out there and they have a responsibility to
20 clean it and to protect health and human safety and to
21 remediate. But we won't really know what's being done
22 and not being done until we get that base cleanup
23 plan. And that's really the next step.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, I don't
2 want what I said to be overstated, because let's just
3 use the extreme example, UXO. We know there is not
4 technology there to clean that up. We know if it was
5 attempted, the cost would be astronomical. We don't
6 want to cause astronomical tasks and costs where it's
7 not feasible to do something. And then on top of it,
8 trying to do it with the current technology would
9 probably destroy the area and their surrounding
10 environment in the first place. And so that tempering
11 has to be utilized. We've got to use common sense in
12 our decisions.

13 MR. MARK ANDERSON: I've got two
14 real quick questions about just the status on a couple
15 of items that were on your thing. One is, of course,
16 the reserve component parcel. You know, that hit the
17 paper and the other media a couple of weeks ago, and I
18 just wondered what the status of that was.

19 Also, you still had the WAC museum
20 on the phase 1-A. Is that a -- what's going on there?

21 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Good question.

22 The reserve component enclave did
23 reemerge in the local papers recently. The issue is

1 when the guard will transition out of their existing
2 reserve component enclave to their new reserve
3 component enclave. Those of you who are familiar with
4 Fort McClellan might know what the star ships are.
5 Large, large barracks where they house what, a
6 thousand people? Is that a battalion?

7 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Close to it.

9 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: About eight
10 hundred people.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Depending on
12 the student loan.

13 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: They're really
14 large. We'd like to put -- they're too expensive for
15 us to do anything with. We would really like to put
16 the guard there. The guard agreed to go there, and
17 the guard will go there. It's just a question of when
18 the funding will be made available from the Army to do
19 the retrofits required for the guard. And we want
20 them to move at closure. They would like to take
21 their time. They would like to take a couple of
22 years.

23 And we need to work the issue. Do

1 we have a position on it, yet? No, we don't, other
2 than we have an agreement. The guard has indicated --
3 the Army has indicated that the guard will be in their
4 facilities and they will keep their commitments. I
5 believe that they will. We just have to work the
6 funding and timing questions. And we've been real
7 careful not to negotiate this one in the papers. I
8 think it's one that we'll get more mileage out of,
9 privately. But the issue is: How do we get them to
10 move fast?

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I'll ask this
12 question, but I wanted to make sure that the audience
13 knows, please, you have that opportunity to ask
14 questions, too. That's why we're here.

15 My question is: Can you give us
16 some feel for the time line on the eastern bypass,
17 your standpoint?

18 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Yes. I'll
19 try. We've got about eleven million dollars in the
20 bank for the eastern bypass today. That's federal
21 money made available through the --

22 MR. CHARLES TURNER: ISTEА.

23 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Through ISTEА,

1 exactly right. Environmental Safety Transportation
2 Efficiency Act. And that money was first secured when
3 Glenn Browder was our congressman.

4 We need another forty-eight million
5 dollars to finish the job and get that purple line
6 through Fort McClellan. You saw that first map I had,
7 that purple line, that's about forty-eight million
8 dollars worth of planning and construction money, soft
9 and hard costs.

10 We were very fortunate to have
11 Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich in town, on
12 invitation by Congressman Riley, three months ago.
13 And he promised at that time to do everything he could
14 during this session of Congress to fund that money and
15 make it available for the local community, which is
16 real exciting. Also, Bob Shister (phonetic), who is
17 the chairman of the Transportation Committee in the
18 House, which is a committee I had the opportunity to
19 testify in front of for the eastern bypass last
20 summer, has committed that he will secure the funding,
21 as well. It's kind of a check's in-the-mail scenario.
22 We don't know when we're going to get it, but it's
23 been promised. And you all know how that works. It's

1 a federal promise. So, keep your fingers crossed and
2 we'll continue to pressure them and hopefully we'll
3 get that money secured. Congressman Riley has made it
4 a really big priority.

5 If the money is made available this
6 year, you still have all your soft planning to do, and
7 ultimately construction. I don't know how long that's
8 going to take.

9 MR. RON LEVY: There is a portion
10 --

11 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Also, the
12 issue of local match money has to be dealt with.

13 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: And the
14 Governor has promised that if we get the forty-eight
15 million from the feds, they'll meet the local match
16 requirement. Again, another promise.

17 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Rob, two
18 questions. When do you foresee a conveyance of
19 property starting? And if we cannot reach an
20 agreement on a sponsoring local government, what
21 effect is that going to have on it?

22 MR. BART REEDY: Could you restate
23 the question?

1 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Yes. When
2 will the property start to be conveyed and what
3 happens if we don't get this local governance question
4 resolved? There are two triggering mechanisms a
5 conveyance.

6 The first is the record of
7 decision. You can't do anything until you have the
8 right. Okay? You all are going to be pivotal on
9 that. That in large measure is going to be your job,
10 is overseeing that, I guess, because it's the
11 environmental process and a culminating act. It's so
12 important. And the second is negotiating an economic
13 development conveyance so we own the property and can
14 begin to convey and dispose of it.

15 The ROD is due in the fall of '98.
16 I think the October time frame. So, just, you know --
17 just a few months away. That's not that long, given
18 all the planning that needs to go into it. And we
19 would anticipate having an economic develop conveyance
20 approved at closure. So, by the fall of '99, or even
21 sooner, we would be in business.

22 And the goal for us is to be able
23 to -- when the Army walks out that door, never have

1 the door locked, because we got other folks walking in
2 the front door. So, that's why the fall of '99 is
3 really a key date for us.

4 On the corporate governance
5 question, well, if you can't resolve it during this
6 session of the legislature, then those two key
7 components -- well, not the record of decision, that's
8 going to move forward no matter what.

9 But the other one, the economic
10 development conveyance application can't get
11 submitted. So, we've got to have someone sign that
12 paperwork and it's got to be the owner of the
13 property. Okay? Actually, it's the LRA that submits
14 the application.

15 But the LRA can't submit the
16 application until it's married to either the city or
17 the county or the state, someone with traditional home
18 rule authority. And if we don't get that, now, then
19 best bet is we'll get it during the next session of
20 the legislature, particularly if that's, you know,
21 sort of political people say "after the election
22 year". Which means they meet again in the summer of
23 1999.

1 And Fort McClellan closes in the
2 fall of '99, so that really puts us back. So --

3 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Don't we have
4 to make our EDC application during the twelve months
5 following submission of the reuse plan?

6 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: That's right.
7 That's a requirement that the federal government
8 imposes on us. And if we can't make it, we'll just
9 have to ask for an extension. It's not unheard of to
10 get an extension, but it certainly puts the
11 development program behind until the next session of
12 the legislature, which is the summer of '99.

13 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: The point is that
14 if the council of elected officials cannot reach an
15 agreement, the legislative delegation really were the
16 ones to determine the legislation that's introduced;
17 is that correct?

18 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Well, I know
19 that they're working the issue down in Montgomery
20 today, the legislative delegation is. Senator Ghee,
21 Mike Rogers, and the others are working really hard to
22 find the solution. And the solution on the table
23 right now looks something like this: Sort of a three

1 point plan.

2 The first is the county owns the
3 property, the City of Anniston may provide municipal
4 services, and the Fort McClellan Development
5 Commission, as an arm of Calhoun County, works on
6 development and zoning issues and establishes general
7 policy for the development. And that's what we're
8 looking at, now.

9 Those who are more familiar with
10 the issue may want to address it, but --

11 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I think that's
12 accurate. Up until now, or up until recently, it was
13 the divisive issue it seemed; that is, that the
14 Calhoun County Commission expressed a strong interest
15 in exercising political jurisdiction, and the City of
16 Anniston wanted to annex the property and exercise
17 political jurisdiction. And I believe that the county
18 commission and the Mayor of Anniston have talked at
19 length about perhaps having a compromise in which they
20 both have -- both bring different things to the
21 development. And that's reflected in what Rob
22 identified as a three point plan.

23 There are still some holdups to it.

1 For instance, the idea of exactly -- well, the zoning
2 element of it is a special -- I think, is especially
3 difficult because Anniston can provide zoning at Fort
4 McClellan, but -- if it's annexed, but it can't
5 contract away its legislative role; that is, it
6 couldn't provide services out there, but then have
7 some other body make zoning decisions. I think zoning
8 decisions have to be made ultimately by the Anniston
9 City Council.

10 And so, there is a lot of case law
11 on it. So, I hope they will be able to chisel out a
12 good, strong exception that would -- that will, you
13 know, make sure everybody in Calhoun County's
14 represented, while at the same time, not duplicating
15 essential services that are provided by The City of
16 Anniston.

17 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Just one last
18 thought on it, too. Just generally, this community
19 ought not feel like it's dropped the ball. These are
20 the typical growing pains that every base closure
21 community goes through. Everybody has to address the
22 question of who is going to own and who is going to
23 annex and who is going to provide municipal services.

1 And these are tough, tough questions. And they're the
2 tough questions that bogs every community down for a
3 few months, trying to assess the impact. And it's
4 hard, because you have to make decisions in a vacuum.
5 We don't know what's going to happen, but we've got to
6 make our best effort. And that's what those folks are
7 trying to do right now.

8 MR. CHARLES TURNER: And I think
9 that's what you're seeing now is the debate has become
10 much more mature, and the strapping elements of it are
11 disappearing and it's become more of a problem solving
12 process than one of a turf war.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any other
14 questions? Thanks again, Rob. We really appreciate
15 it. That was a wonderful briefing, very, very
16 informative for all of us.

17 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Again, we
18 can't do it without you. We're always available. I'm
19 at most of your meetings. I enjoy them. Mayor, we
20 appreciate the leadership you demonstrate every day on
21 the development commission, staying in such close
22 contact with us. We look forward to continuing our
23 relationship with, of course, The City of Weaver, but,

1 of course, the RAB, as well. Thanks.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thanks again.

3 Let's take a ten minute break and then we'll come back
4 for the rest of the meeting.

5 (WHEREUPON, there was a brief recess.)

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: What I would
7 like to do is move on with the agenda. And the next
8 item line is the community relations report. Do we
9 have any report from the community relations? Mark?

10 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Nothing new.
11 We just -- with the exception of we could not get on
12 the David Ford television show simply because David's
13 show was cancelled.

14 MR. RON LEVY: That makes sense.

15 MR. MARK ANDERSON: He would have
16 been perfectly happy to get us if we could have got it
17 in before Friday of that week. But since I saw him
18 that Thursday night at a demil meeting, it wasn't
19 really likely.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And, of course,
21 we had the report from Charles Turner on his
22 presentation. Let's move on to old business. There
23 were a couple of items --

1 MR. RON LEVY: There is one other
2 thing I need to do.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, Ron?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Let me introduce
5 Joan McKinney. Joan, you want to just stand up for a
6 second? We've contracted for community relations
7 support at the installation. Joan is going to be with
8 us for at least the year, hopefully, beyond that, as
9 long as we continue to receive funding. And she's got
10 a number of things in her contract that she's required
11 to do in support of the RAB, Fort McClellan, and the
12 community relations. I'm going to let her talk a
13 little bit about what's -- what that's all about and
14 what she's going to be doing.

15 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Let me talk.
16 That's what I do. Of course, I just signed the
17 contract this morning, so, you know --

18 MR. RON LEVY: Perfect.

19 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: But what I
20 think is one of the things -- and you all with your
21 community relations and Charles, the speaking, that's
22 very, very important, and to get on the speaker's
23 bureau in the community and get on the programs. And

1 we need to develop a nice little presentation, much
2 like we saw this evening, that we can pick and choose
3 and suit it to the audience.

4 And I look forward to that. One of
5 the things I'm going to try to do is figure out who
6 the journalist was here tonight with the camera. I
7 think it was 6. Did anybody know who it was?

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Dixon Hayes,
9 33/40,

10 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Well, then he's
11 going to go up to Gadsden. Okay.

12 So, there's a variety of tasks that
13 I do in the contract. And, of course, supporting the
14 RAB is one of the key issues.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Joan will be doing
16 the mailings and the minutes, setting up the meeting
17 rooms, providing the amenities. She will also -- as
18 she said, the speakers' bureau will be one thing.
19 Other things that get the word out to the community
20 fall in her purview, so, we're going to be relying on
21 her for a real tough job.

22 And I might mention, too, Al Reece
23 is -- he is the contract -- he is the contract

1 vehicle. His company, Reece Engineering is contracted
2 to Fort McClellan for environmental services.

3 And it's actually through his
4 contract that we have Joan working, of course.

5 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: We have a
6 couple of bosses here.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Al, you might just
8 stand up or raise your hand.

9 MR. AL REECE: I'm glad to be here.

10 MR. RON LEVY: Al is doing most of
11 the compliance work at Fort McClellan. So, you know,
12 anything and everything that we are for ongoing
13 compliance is going towards his contract. We have a
14 four year contract with Al, recently been started.
15 That's all I've got.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And on old
17 business, one of the things that was asked last time
18 was to get an update on the status of the base cleanup
19 plan.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And I can talk
21 to you a little bit about that. Lisa has brought
22 twenty copies of the environmental -- well, actually I
23 want to talk to you about the EBS first, before we

1 talk about the base cleanup plan.

2 But Lisa has brought twenty copies
3 of the environmental baseline survey. We have sent
4 out copies to the regulatory agencies. They have not
5 really had a chance to come back to us on their review
6 of it.

7 But this is the final. It's been
8 sent out. Twenty copies that are back here are for
9 the RAB. And I would tell you that -- and there are
10 two big volumes. One is nothing but references. If
11 you would really like to, take it and look at it, and
12 if you've got comments and other concerns that you
13 bring it forth to the RAB meetings. However, if
14 you're not going to read it and you're not going to
15 use it, please, don't take it with you and just use it
16 as a door stop. We can provide it to you at any time
17 through my office and through Lisa. But if you really
18 want to take a hard look at it and you're serious,
19 please, take a copy and, you know, it will help, as
20 kind of a bible of what's a historical review of
21 what's happened at Fort McClellan.

22 It also talks about CERFA map.
23 Part of it is a CERFA letter report, you remember that

1 we talked about. It's in there.

2 And we'll -- I'm sure Bart and
3 Chris will come back to us at some point with their
4 final comments on their review. And we're asking for
5 their concurrence, so we don't have -- and we do not
6 have their concurrence at this point. Still haven't
7 had a chance to really look at it.

8 Some of the regulatory agencies do
9 have it and we expect to get something back from them
10 in a couple of weeks, I would hope.

11 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Well, what's the
12 difference in that one and the one you gave us
13 previous, the environmental baseline?

14 MR. RON LEVY: We went back and put
15 additional effort into it. And there is -- if you
16 look at it, you'll see that there has been additional
17 areas identified in there from an investigative
18 standpoint and a cleanup standpoint. There is more
19 history in it. We did more work to go back and
20 interview folks and look at building facilities. And
21 I will tell you that Bart and Chris really pushed us
22 to make us do more to evaluate the property. And in
23 fact, that's what we did. So, it's a better -- much

1 better document than what you originally got.

2 Did I hit it right, Bart?

3 MR. BART REEDY: Yes. It is --
4 we've talked to the contractor that put it together at
5 great length on many occasions. And there were some
6 problems with their versions. And everyone --
7 everybody recognized that.

8 This is a better document. You
9 should -- you know, don't want to mislead anybody. We
10 -- the Army wants us to concur with that, with the
11 document, and we may or may not -- we may or may not
12 do that. There is also -- there is also, you know, a
13 kind of an in between scenario that we're looking at,
14 that might pop up, too, Mr. Parks, and that's, well,
15 we agree with this portion of it, but over here, we're
16 not really sure. We're not comfortable with saying,
17 this piece of property is good to give to Rob or to
18 Charles Turner, to whoever, to give, you know, right
19 back out to the public. We're not comfortable with
20 that, yet.

21 Keeping in mind that the job that I
22 have is to, you know, protect public health and
23 environment from the federal point of view. Chris

1 Johnson, who most of you guys know, his job is
2 identical from the Alabama point of view.

3 So, we're all coming at it from a
4 little bit different perspective and all of us have a
5 little -- just a different perspective on it, I guess.
6 I think it may speak to the good work that the base
7 closure team, which was, you know, basically the three
8 of us, and Lisa -- where is Lisa at? I can't see her.
9 Lisa. And there is -- how much work we've done,
10 because, you know, there is a possibility there that
11 we're going to agree to disagree on a few things. And
12 that's okay.

13 MR. RON LEVY: And we recognize
14 that. So, there are some non-concurrences we intend
15 to address and we will have to address them before we
16 can even transfer the property.

17 MR. BART REEDY: Right. And that
18 document now, there is going -- there has been a push
19 to get the document done. And it really is a snapshot
20 in time of what's going on in the base. And that
21 really has to fall -- it needs to fall before the base
22 closure plan becomes final. So, one does follow the
23 other. But there is work ongoing and you can address

1 that more accurately than I.

2 MR. RON LEVY: Let me mention one
3 other thing. For those members of the community in
4 the audience that are interested in the EBS, the
5 environmental baseline survey, which is essentially a
6 lay down of the environmental conditions of the
7 property, you have access through the public
8 libraries, particularly JSU, Anniston, the Anniston
9 Library, two of the libraries on post, and also the
10 Jacksonville Library, right?

11 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No. Just
12 four.

13 MR. RON LEVY: Just those four
14 libraries, to go in and view it. Because of the cost
15 of duplicating the documents, it's not possible for
16 us to give a copy to everybody who wishes to see it.
17 That's why we place it in the library. In fact,
18 within those libraries are repositories of other
19 information from other investigations at Fort
20 McClellan that are open to the public to go in and
21 review at any time. Certainly, we'll take comments,
22 mail-in comments, or just comments from the public at
23 large on any of the work that we do that comes out of

1 those documents.

2 MR. BART REEDY: We would -- as the
3 base closure team, we would encourage you to go look
4 at them. But, as Ron said, you know, in your heart of
5 hearts, if you know you're not going to look at it,
6 don't take one home with you. If there's a chance of
7 looking at it and reviewing it -- maybe you know
8 something about the base or you -- take it and look at
9 it. And if you've got comments, you got suggestions,
10 if there is information in there that you can add to
11 or beef up a little bit, we need all the -- all the
12 assistance you can give us.

13 So, I would encourage you to look
14 at it, if you can. And comments, Ron, would go to, I
15 guess, any of the three of us?

16 MR. RON LEVY: It could. I would
17 encourage you to send them to me and to my office, so
18 that we can get them quickly incorporated in. But any
19 of the regulatory agencies will accept comments, I'm
20 sure. Yes, Mark?

21 MR. MARK ANDERSON: So, if I hear
22 the shin bone's connected to the knee bone on this
23 one, the base cleanup plan, itself, cannot be

1 completed until this one is finalized. And this will
2 be finalized when?

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No, Mark.
4 This has -- it was finalized.

5 MR. RON LEVY: This is the final
6 draft.

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: January 15th.
8 This is final.

9 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Got you.

10 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Any comments
11 that you have will be incorporated into the base
12 cleanup plan.

13 MR. RON LEVY: And future work that
14 we've got.

15 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Okay. And the
16 base cleanup plan --

17 MR. RON LEVY: I'm going to get to
18 that. Status of the base cleanup plan.

19 When we contracted to do the EBS,
20 the contract required that within two months after the
21 final version of the EBS, that we would have a base
22 cleanup plan. In fact, we're actually on track with
23 that. 15 March is when we're expecting to have the

1 base cleanup plan available.

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Draft.

3 MR. RON LEVY: Well, it will be a
4 draft, draft for comments.

5 Now, one of the things that Rob
6 pointed out was their reuse plan is a phasing plan.
7 You notice the phases that they had them in.

8 The base cleanup team spent a lot
9 of time reviewing the phase -- the community's phasing
10 plan and tried very hard to gear the cleanup plan to
11 their phasing plan.

12 In fact, you'll see that there is
13 specific references as we went to each site and tried
14 to look at, you know, the phase one first and all
15 those sites within the phase one parcels, phase 1-A
16 and B and on through. So, our plan is really geared
17 toward their phasing plan. And I think that will be
18 apparent when you read the document and take a look at
19 it. I got to tell you, though, a lot of the cleanup
20 is done in Microsoft Project and you'll see these per
21 (phonetic) charts?

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Gant (phonetic)
23 charts.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Gant charts. And it
2 is huge. I mean, it's just an absolute bear. You can
3 go crazy looking at all the charts that are in there.
4 So, it's going to be a big undertaking for us, I mean,
5 a huge undertaking.

6 What Rob said about the closure
7 being one of the largest or the largest, he wasn't
8 kidding. There is a lot of stuff that we have to get
9 through and a lot of things we have to look at. And
10 that will be apparent when you look at the base
11 cleanup plan.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Approximately,
13 how many activities do you have in that, do you know?

14 MR. RON LEVY: I can't remember.
15 Lisa, do you remember how many line items were in
16 there?

17 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I don't
18 remember. Lots.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Was it five
20 thousand, ten thousand?

21 MR. RON LEVY: I don't believe it
22 was that large, no.

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Not that many.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Several
2 thousand?

3 MR. RON LEVY: No, no. It was in
4 the hundreds, I believe. But even that was -- is
5 significant in terms of the -- you know, what you're
6 trying to look at, at the time.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, you didn't
8 go down to individual task levels? You were at a
9 higher level when you --

10 MR. RON LEVY: Well, each site kind
11 of had its own project and it went through the various
12 CERCLA phases.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes.

14 MR. RON LEVY: So, you'll see that
15 it's broken down by, you know, site investigation,
16 remedial investigation, as it applies to specific
17 sites on through, you know, remedial design, remedial
18 action. And even if the site, you know, was -- even
19 if we weren't sure that the site would actually go
20 past a site investigation, we still planned it all the
21 way out on the assumption that it might be a problem.

22 So, 15 March.

23 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Is there a

1 public comment period that comes with this or no?

2 Because I just don't remember.

3 MR. RON LEVY: No. It's not --

4 when we start looking at cleanup issues, there will be
5 some -- there will be public comments at some point in
6 that. And hopefully we can do a lot of that through
7 the RAB.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Who will
9 approve the base cleanup plan?

10 MR. RON LEVY: The -- well, it's a
11 partnering effort between the three agencies, Army,
12 EPA, and the state.

13 However, it's an Army document and
14 the installation commander is the -- really is the
15 approval on that. Whether or not we get agreement or
16 concurrence, that's our intent from the state and EPA.

17 Do you want me to move on to the
18 next -- do we have anymore questions about that?

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Anything else
20 --

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Yes. What was
22 that, Ron? You said that if there is not concurrence
23 from EPA or ADEM, it still sticks?

1 MR. RON LEVY: What I said was:
2 It's an Army document and the Army does approve the
3 document. If there are -- if there are
4 non-concurrences from the state and EPA, then we'll
5 have to work through those issues.

6 But, you know, we may publish, just
7 like we did with the EBS, we may publish a final
8 document and still expect to have to go through some
9 issues. And they will be picked up as we move through
10 the process.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: So, the issues
12 have to be addressed?

13 MR. RON LEVY: Absolutely.

14 MR. PETE CONROY: But it can be
15 published with known deficiencies?

16 MR. RON LEVY: Well, it can be
17 published with disagreements. I would -- I don't know
18 that I would call it "known deficiencies". I mean, we
19 disagree on certain issues and -- and the stick that
20 the state and the EPA have, as it relates to the
21 property, is that we can't complete conveyance,
22 essentially, without their approval. So, you know, if
23 we get to a point where we say it's clean and they say

1 it's not, then we have an inability to convey
2 property. Did I hit that right?

3 MR. BART REEDY: The exact language
4 or at least a more exact language would be, in the
5 EBS, itself, maybe Ron says -- Ron being the Army --
6 the Army says, this parcel, we believe to be clean,
7 there is no evidence that -- hard evidence that says
8 the property is dirty in the environmental baseline
9 survey, maybe ADEM or EPA is going, I just -- we're
10 uncomfortable with the information we have right now,
11 giving it away for unrestricted use. So, that would
12 be a disagreement.

13 That property can still be
14 transferred, if you can find somebody that will take
15 it. What will happen is: EPA's comments and the
16 state's comments get stapled to the lease. And what
17 Ron said is pretty accurate, who is going to sign the
18 lease, when in the back of it, you know, is a
19 nasty-gram from EPA and ADEM. But the law is clear
20 and says, you know, if you can find somebody to take
21 the property, hallelujah. But they take, of course,
22 the liability with it.

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: And one good

1 example of that, Pete, would be like the asbestos and
2 lead base paint issues, that there is a known
3 disagreement in Army policy and EPA.

4 MR. RON LEVY: No, I wouldn't think
5 that is a good example, because EPA's laws, as it
6 relies on -- as a part of asbestos and lead base
7 paint, you know, don't restrict transfer of property
8 if -- as an example, if asbestos is intact or
9 non-friable and it's not going to a school, we still
10 meet the law requirements, there is nothing for them
11 to necessarily take offense to it -- or what's the
12 word I'm looking for -- or take an action against,
13 because we're meeting the requirements.

14 However, that's public information.
15 It will be fully disclosed. And if somebody wants to
16 take the property on, then so be it. You know, that
17 may come down to them to remediate it, depending on
18 what their desires are for the property.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Ron, there is no
20 recourse -- and I've mentioned this before. But there
21 is still no recourse, when it is signed off, that it
22 is cleaned to the level? For instance, if it's
23 determined to be residential, industrial, whatever,

1 the different levels, that's my understanding of
2 cleanup, right? So, when that is signed over, then
3 there is no recourse for that property owner, as far
4 as the federal government, that they've met the
5 obligation to clean that property up? Then it's left
6 to that property owner if he wants to go to a greater
7 cleanup or a different level?

8 MR. RON LEVY: Not quite. Again,
9 it's full disclosure. The property is transferred
10 knowing what the problems are with the property. If
11 we tell you that it has asbestos in it in various
12 locations, and you assume to take that, that's one
13 thing. If a property owner, after the property has
14 been conveyed and now owns the property, discovers
15 something outside of those things that were
16 identified, then under CERCLA 120-H, the federal
17 government would have to come back in and in fact
18 address or clean up the, whatever, depending on what
19 the issue is. There is a provision in there for that
20 to happen.

21 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And then my
22 favorite topic, landfill three. When the federal
23 government vacates, the property is turned over, then

1 what is the federal government's obligation, as far as
2 monitoring and if something were to happen to our
3 water source?

4 MR. BART REEDY: Ron, that -- that
5 may be kind of a hypothetical.

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay.

7 MR. BART REEDY: I'm not real -- I
8 can't really see you guys wanting to -- I can't see a
9 buyer for landfill three coming down the road.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay.

11 MR. BART REEDY: And most -- no one
12 comes to mind, off all the folks that I work with --
13 my bureau is all in this corner of the United States
14 -- I can't recall anybody, any base finding somebody
15 that was, yes, I want your landfill, you know, an
16 inactive leaking landfill. It just doesn't happen.

17 Now, you guys may luck out and find
18 somebody that wants to buy it. Probably is not going
19 to happen. If it doesn't happen, the Army is
20 responsible, you know, and maintains responsibility.
21 That, I believe, would be the answer, Ron.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Well, if it doesn't
23 get sold, obviously, it's still, you know, DoD

1 property and would have to be handled by DoD. That's
2 pretty simple.

3 MR. BART REEDY: But they would not
4 -- the Army would not sell it -- EPA would not agree
5 with it. ADEM wouldn't agree with it, selling it to,
6 you know, Bob's Rollerskate Company and Bob having the
7 liability to monitor and clean it up and all that, if
8 they didn't have the resources to, you know, take on
9 those liabilities.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay. Then
11 that's something I haven't heard then. If it is sold,
12 then whoever gets it would still have the
13 responsibility for monitoring and maintaining from
14 that standpoint?

15 MR. RON LEVY: Absolutely. In
16 fact, there will have to be some sort of remedy in
17 place for that landfill. And that remedy may be as
18 simple as long-term monitoring. Am I right?

19 MR. BART REEDY: Correct.

20 MR. RON LEVY: So, we will have to
21 address that. You know, it could be a cap, it could
22 be pump and treat, it could be pick it up and move it
23 someplace else, or it could be long-term monitoring.

1 I mean all those are possibilities. Those decisions
2 are yet to be made. But there will be a remedy in
3 place. And I know that we're not going to forget
4 about it.

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I don't think you
6 will, either. I'm here.

7 MR. RON LEVY: I personally will
8 not.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Anything else
10 on the base cleanup plan?

11 MR. RON HOOD: I've got one.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes.

13 MR. RON HOOD: I'm not sure exactly
14 how to phrase it. We just had a briefing for the
15 reuse. It says, chop this up in about fifty-eight
16 parcels with priorities on how it's going to be used,
17 etcetera, which is going to impact the base cleanup
18 plan, etcetera, etcetera.

19 And we've got, I guess, about three
20 people here, the Army represented by Ron, we got EPA
21 and Alabama -- ADEM is not here tonight. But those
22 seem to be the three that are looking at it. Is
23 anybody on this board going to be looking at it, to

1 have both those documents -- I have no idea where
2 those fifty-eight parcels are.

3 MR. RON LEVY: I can answer that.
4 Yes, yes, you will, in those documents we provided,
5 just like we're providing the EBS.

6 MR. RON HOOD: Okay. Well, their
7 reuse thing, I haven't seen and have no idea where the
8 fifty-eight parcels are to sort of overlay that onto
9 your --

10 MR. RON LEVY: It will be -- as a
11 matter of fact, we'll have that inclusive in the base
12 cleanup plan. I believe we're going to put in their
13 parcelization plan in there to show how we did it out.
14 So, you should see it in there.

15 MR. BART REEDY: Yes, it will be
16 there.

17 MR. RON HOOD: So, you're going to
18 have their seven hundred page document incorporated --

19 MR. RON LEVY: No, no, not the --
20 just that part, as far as the parcelization. I cannot
21 provide you with their reuse plan. That's available
22 also, but you need to talk to the Fort McClellan
23 Development Commission about that. But I will take

1 that parcelization plan and put it in, because we are
2 basing our cleanup on it, in the BCP, the base cleanup
3 plan.

4 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: What I can do,
5 Ron, is have copies of the reuse plan made for y'all
6 and distribute those at a future meeting.

7 MR. RON HOOD: Okay. Actually, I
8 find something on an electronic type a lot easier to
9 work with than a seven hundred page document.

10 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Then maybe we
11 need to talk to Rob about providing that.

12 MR. RON LEVY: I certainly don't
13 have any problems if the RAB wants that, to use RAB
14 monies to reproduce their document, because it is a
15 public document. If that's what y'all want. But
16 again, we're kind of at the mercy of the redevelopment
17 commission in terms of what they're going to give us.

18 MR. RON HOOD: But my point being,
19 is -- you know, is it just going to be the three or
20 are people on this board going to be looking at that?
21 Again, you said, when you publish it as the cleanup
22 plan, it will be in there.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, the

1 parcelization plan will be a part of it, yes.

2 MR. BART REEDY: The goal that we
3 have and the goal that we've always had is to be as
4 transparent as we can possibly be with the community.
5 You know, if there is something in the base closure
6 plan that gives somebody heartburn or you see a flaw
7 or maybe there is something that we -- I don't know
8 how it could possibly happen, but maybe something that
9 we've overlooked, you know, we want your input.

10 MR. RON HOOD: Well, I doubt there
11 is anything you overlooked, but --

12 MR. RON LEVY: Well, there will
13 always be. I mean, you can never be a hundred percent
14 sure that you captured everything. I'm sure there are
15 people out there that we just couldn't get to or
16 didn't know about that have some sort of information
17 that we don't -- you know, we didn't even begin to
18 address. Because again, we can only do so much. In
19 fact, we tried to interview as many people as we
20 possibly could. That's why we're constantly saying,
21 if you've got something, let us know about it. We can
22 make it inclusive into future work.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any further

1 discussion or questions on the BCP?

2 The second part of the old business
3 was to get some feedback on the eastern bypass. You
4 heard some of it from Rob Richardson already on the
5 funding levels and the unknowns that it places on
6 exact scheduling. But Mayor Kimbrough, you had asked
7 that, so, I'm going to turn it back to Ron again to
8 discuss that a little bit.

9 MR. RON LEVY: In front of you is a
10 sheet of paper called program projected UXO projects
11 at Fort McClellan. And we tried to address the
12 Mayor's concern about the funding issue and what's
13 going on.

14 If you remember, in past RABs I
15 told you that we have taken the UXO issues and we've
16 kind of divided them into three particular areas. And
17 it really does go along with what Rob was talking
18 about, in terms of the parcelization and the way they
19 projected land use to be. Eastern bypass was one.
20 There was a retirement golf community they called a
21 retirement reserve on there, but it would -- it
22 encompasses quite a bit of property in and around the
23 cantonment area. And then there was, of course, the

1 Choccolocco Mountain area, which was part of the --
2 that being defined for the national wildlife refuge.
3 And if you'll look at what we have gotten programmed
4 in and what -- what we actually have now and what
5 we've got programmed, you'll see that we did already
6 receive our money for the eastern bypass EECA and for
7 the golf course community. So, that money is in hand.
8 In fact, it's on its way to Huntsville, who is doing
9 our work. And it's over a million dollars involving
10 studies for those areas. So, we're on track with what
11 I told you we intended to do in investigating those
12 areas.

13 Now, as you move on further in the
14 out years and you see the money jumps up quite a bit,
15 you'll see there is some EECA work going to be done as
16 it relates to the Choccolocco Mountains. That's not
17 until '99. It's been requested. But you don't get
18 into the cleanup until the year 2000.

19 We were hoping to get into the
20 cleanup phase, depending upon, again, you know, what
21 the issues are and what we can do based on technology
22 and terrain. But that money has already been
23 programmed and requested.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Let me go back
2 to '98 just for a minute on that. Of that million
3 three, million three thousand, how is that broken out
4 between the eastern bypass and the retirement
5 community?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Lisa, what is the
7 breakout on that?

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Well, we're
9 not supposed to be discussing those numbers because of
10 contractors.

11 MR. RON LEVY: That's right.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I was trying to
13 get a feel. I don't -- can you say --

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I can tell you
15 --

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- more than
17 fifty percent went to the eastern bypass?

18 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I can tell you
19 that we've programmed -- no, it's less for the bypass,
20 because it's a narrow strip. The retirement community
21 is a much larger area than the bypass. So, it's based
22 on the acreage.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Only on the

1 acreage. So, what we're saying is: There is
2 sufficient there to do the work we have planned for
3 the eastern bypass in '98?

4 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: We believe
5 we've requested sufficient funds.

6 MR. BART REEDY: That is the EECA.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Not the clean up.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I understand.

10 MR. RON LEVY: And our figures are
11 based upon what we got from Huntsville and how they
12 determined cost. So, we didn't make them up. We used
13 their engineering principles. Yes, Mark?

14 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Which goes back
15 actually to what Bart just said. The fiscal year '98
16 is just the EECA. I would assume then the '99 is the
17 remediation, right?

18 MR. RON LEVY: For the two
19 uppermost --

20 MR. MARK ANDERSON: For the two
21 uppermost.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Should be aware that
23 McClellan is moving to close down its range areas, all

1 its firing ranges this summer. At the end of this
2 summer, all firing ranges will be moved out to Pelham
3 Range.

4 In fact, the national guard is --
5 will be constructing the needed firing ranges to get
6 us through closure and also provide for what the guard
7 is going to use after closure out on Pelham Range.
8 So, firing after, at least, 1 October, will cease on
9 main post.

10 MR. BART REEDY: Is that small
11 arms, as well as fused?

12 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

13 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Ron, let me --
14 my question -- the reason I ask this question -- and I
15 know we can't but -- at this time, we don't know the
16 cost. But my concern is: If this is the top
17 priority, then are we going to have to fund the
18 cleanup for this eastern bypass? And since we're at
19 the mercy of Congress, as far as passing the money for
20 the cleanup, is that going to take all the money to
21 clean that up and we're going to have to leave
22 everything else alone until we get that done?

23 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I believe that

1 we've programmed enough money and that there is enough
2 money coming to cover the cleanups as needed, I mean,
3 as we go through this phasing approach that they
4 mentioned.

5 I think if we have a problem, if we
6 had to do any cleanup, it would be with the UXO site,
7 not the contamination in and around the cantonment
8 area.

9 Those numbers out there, they're
10 soft numbers. We just really don't know what we're
11 going to be up against. And there is really no way to
12 nail that down.

13 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Just based on
14 the -- when I went to Huntsville earlier this year for
15 a briefing from them, the numbers looked real good, if
16 you get that much.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And we
18 attempted to do -- you know, do it conservatively.
19 So, they are very conservative numbers.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any other
21 discussion or comments on the eastern bypass?

22 MR. BART REEDY: Keep in mind now,
23 the numbers -- depending on who you talk to, those

1 numbers do look good and sometimes, you know, you talk
2 to another person and the numbers don't look so good.
3 It's one thing to try and locate and find a piece of
4 ordnance or a beer can buried in, you know, flat,
5 sandy, terrain, and it is an entirely different piece
6 of work however, finding it, if it's buried up in the
7 side of a mountain.

8 So, you know, the Army really has
9 their -- we're doing -- we EPA and ADEM is doing
10 everything we can do to help, which, you know, is just
11 supply what information we've got. But they really do
12 have their hands full trying to get a handle on what
13 we're talking about on UXO and what's it going to
14 cost.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Well, since you
16 brought it up, that goes back to that concern, that
17 question I had before. It looks to me like, if you're
18 going to clear these areas, you're going to have to do
19 the sand and sift process, where there is going to be
20 construction, where there are going to be people
21 working. Certainly, you're going to use technology to
22 assist that, but you're eventually going to have to do
23 it to that four foot level from where we're going in.

1 MR. BART REEDY: And there is a lot
2 of people in Huntsville that do agree with you, do it
3 in four foot lifts.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay. Ron, you
5 had your hand up. Questions or comments?

6 MR. RON HOOD: It was more concern,
7 not the eastern bypass, but his comment about building
8 a firing range at Pelham Range. Since I live close to
9 there and am very disturbed by all the noise,
10 etcetera, how about the environmental impact
11 statement, these ranges, hours of operation, noise
12 abatement, etcetera, etcetera, public comment, and all
13 that?

14 MR. LEVY: It is addressed in the
15 disposal impact statement, if you've not read that.
16 Because obviously, at closure, it's going to shift all
17 out there, anyway. So, it's in there.

18 MR. HOOD: It's very disturbing
19 when they start that late at night on the weekends,
20 etcetera.

21 MR. RON LEVY: And I can tell you
22 -- I can sympathize with you, because I've got some
23 friends out there. In fact, I will just tell you this

1 -- and this is just from my knowledge -- that at some
2 point, the guard intends to start firing artillery
3 back out there again. So -- because there are firing
4 points. And that's probably one of the bigger issues
5 -- small arms, when you look at it from a noise
6 standpoint, we've done noise studies. The higher
7 categories really don't reach off post that bad. It's
8 when you start looking at the bigger pieces like the
9 artillery and tank firing that you really start to see
10 problems. And then when you got low cloud cover, the
11 reverberation off the clouds and start to see claims
12 against the government for foundations cracking and so
13 forth, I know.

14 MR. BART REEDY: So then if there
15 were -- if there was input that wanted to be given on
16 expanding the use at Pelham Range, the artillery and
17 such on -- if there was input wanted, if he wants to
18 give input, it needs to go in this version of the EIS.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Well, the public
20 comment period ended today, I believe, 2nd of February
21 on that particular document. It's been out for
22 awhile. However, I suspect that when the -- the guard
23 -- this has already been evaluated, that type of

1 training.

2 And frequency is actually less than
3 what was evaluated presently now going on at Pelham
4 Range. And artillery had been evaluated in the past
5 in previous environmental assessments. This is not
6 new training. The level may be increased over what's
7 been going on recently, but if you look back in the
8 '70s when it was really, you know, high use -- '80s,
9 excuse me, '80s and '70s, really high use, we don't do
10 quite -- we don't do nearly as much training out there
11 as we did back in the '70s and '80s.

12 MR. RON HOOD: But it depends on
13 when you do the training, though.

14 MR. RON LEVY: That's true. You
15 know, I can't really -- I can't really address what
16 the full impacts are going to be, but I can tell you
17 that they are in the environmental documentation.

18 MR. BART REEDY: I'm a little --
19 you know, I'm -- my sense is that you might have a
20 comment you want to send the Army or somebody on the
21 noise. I would encourage you to go ahead and do that.

22 MR. RON HOOD: Like low flying
23 aircraft, etcetera, over housing areas. And they are

1 doing that, been doing it. The Air Force generally
2 didn't do that --

3 MR. BART REEDY: I think that
4 you'll find that most of the government entities are
5 trying to -- doing our darn'est to be a little more
6 sensitive to public input, just because you missed --
7 you know, oh, it's 12:00 o'clock, you missed, sorry,
8 and throw your letter away, that's probably not going
9 to happen. So, I would go ahead and, you know, get
10 your comment in, anyway.

11 MR. RON LEVY: One of the biggest
12 problems we've got at Pelham Range is -- and I know
13 this is off the subject -- encroachment on Pelham
14 Range.

15 You know, historically, there has
16 been no construction around. We even at one point
17 tried to approach the real estate part of the county
18 to talk to them about encroachment of building around
19 Pelham Range, and they didn't want to really listen to
20 us. But these things happen. When you purchase a
21 home and buy a home, you know, right next to an
22 artillery range, you're bound to get those kinds of
23 noises. And when you can't get cooperation from

1 folks, it's going to happen.

2 It's happening around a lot of
3 military installations. They're just getting so built
4 up, and there is more and more complaints coming in.
5 But realtors, you know, some of them are very
6 unscrupulous, they will build and not care and they
7 won't tell the people who live there, because we do
8 get a lot of complaints from those things. I know, my
9 office processes them. That's all I've got. I'm
10 sorry.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: No, that's what
12 that discussion was for. That was helpful, anyhow.
13 Might have been unhealthy, because I guess stress
14 brings on problems.

15 Anything else? Thanks. That
16 completes the old business. Anybody have any issues
17 or topics for new business? I have one.

18 Charles Turner brought it up to me
19 and he asked and it falls right in line with what Rob
20 Richardson briefed us on as their top priority right
21 now for this year; that is, the record of decision.

22 Next meeting it might be good that
23 we have an update on where that environmental impact

1 statement is going to reach that record of decision
2 and get into some details so this board understands
3 the process, the time lines, and really what we should
4 be looking at and knowledgeable of in that process.

5 Could we possibly do that for the
6 next meeting or have that done?

7 MR. RON LEVY: I don't see why not.
8 We can put something on that talks about the IS and
9 the record of decision. In fact, I know just the
10 person who would love to talk about it. Paul James.

11 MR. PAUL JAMES: I'm the stuckie
12 (phonetic).

13 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I was thinking
14 maybe we could have HBA down here to talk about the
15 draft.

16 MR. RON LEVY: We can do that. We
17 can request to see whether we couldn't get somebody
18 out of draft or DA to talk about it. But we certainly
19 have information locally that we can talk about the
20 document and where we're going with it.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Sounds good.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any other new
23 business? Any monkey business? That takes us down to

1 the adjournment.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Move to adjourn.

3 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Second.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All those in
5 favor, leave.

6 (WHEREUPON, the proceeding was concluded.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF ALABAMA)

3 CALHOUN COUNTY)

4

5 I, SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court

6 Reporter and Notary Public in and for The State of

7 Alabama at Large, duly commissioned and qualified,

8 HEREBY CERTIFY that this proceeding was taken before

9 me, then was by me reduced to shorthand, afterwards

10 transcribed upon a computer, and that the foregoing is

11 a true and correct transcript of the proceeding to the

12 best of my ability.

13 I FURTHER CERTIFY this proceeding

14 was taken at the time and place and was concluded

15 without adjournment.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto

23 set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,

1 on this the 13th day of February, 1998.

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: 11-14-2001.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23