

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

\* \* \* \* \*

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court  
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at  
Building 141-A, Basement Conference Room, Fort  
McClellan, Alabama, on the 12th day of January, 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 BOARD . . . . .	3-76
CERTIFICATE . . . . .	77-78

1

2

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Let's get it

3

started. Apparently, we've got some computer

4

problems, so they're making some paper copies so we

5

can go on with the presentation in a little while.

6

Let me take the roll first, please.

7

Mr. Turner?

8

MR. CHARLES TURNER: I'm here.

9

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Lisa. Ron is

10

not feeling well, so he's gone. Mark Anderson?

11

MR. MARK ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

12

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ike Brown?

13

Pete is here. Dr. Cox is here. Don Cunningham?

14

MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

15

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Jerome Elser?

16

Mary is here, Harrington. Ron Hood? Mayor Kimbrough?

17

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.

18

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Margarette

19

Longstreth? James Miller? Alan Faust?

20

MR. ALAN FAUST: Here.

21

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Jimmy Parks?

22

MR. JIMMY PARKS: Here.

23

MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think I'm

1 here.

2 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I think you  
3 are, too.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: John Johnson?  
5 James Buford?

6 MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Bart Reedy?  
8 Chris Johnson? Okay. Everybody had a chance to take  
9 a look at the minutes that Lisa sent out to you. Any  
10 comments?

11 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Move that we  
12 approve the minutes.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I have a motion  
14 to approve the minutes.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Second.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All in favor,  
17 say I. Opposed? Minutes are approved.

18 Well, today as a guest speaker we  
19 have Mr. Larry Bryant. Mr. Bryant is here to talk to  
20 us about the range rule. And would you prefer to  
21 start off now or do you want to wait for the paper  
22 copies?

23 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I can wing it a

1 little bit. I'm good at that.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I'll turn it  
3 over to Mr. Bryant and let him start off here. I  
4 notice there is a packet at everybody's place, so you  
5 may refer it for some of the things you might be  
6 working on.

7 MR. LARRY BRYANT: This packet of  
8 information was provided by the Department of Defense.  
9 So, it's their summary, the first sheet there, the  
10 summary of the Department of Defense range rule. It's  
11 the summary from their perspective.

12 The range rule is a result of the  
13 munitions rule. The munitions rule was written by EPA  
14 because Congress, in the Federal Facilities Compliance  
15 Act of 1982, mandated that EPA do something to control  
16 explosives and munitions.

17 So, EPA started in late '94, early  
18 '95, to adopt or to draft the munitions rule. The  
19 munitions rule covers waste munitions. It does not  
20 cover munitions that the Department of Defense feels  
21 is good munitions. It covers waste munitions, only.

22 Part of the rule addresses waste  
23 munitions on ranges. EPA wimped out. They didn't

1 know how to address the problem of munitions -- waste  
2 munitions on ranges. That -- munitions, that's the  
3 bailiwick of DoD. We aren't the experts. EPA is not  
4 the experts. The Department of Defense is the expert.

5 So, EPA took the easy way out and  
6 deferred the issue of munitions on ranges to DoD. And  
7 the way the rule was written was that DoD had to  
8 promulgate or had to draw up a range rule that was  
9 protective of human health and the environment, and it  
10 met the standards or the criteria that EPA would set  
11 in a review.

12 The munitions rule -- EPA is being  
13 sued right now for several issues in the munitions  
14 rule. But the main one is the deferral to the  
15 Department of Defense to regulate themselves. That  
16 military toxics project and a number of other public  
17 interest groups are suing EPA to stop the range rule  
18 -- the munitions rule.

19 It goes to -- they're starting the  
20 legal proceedings -- I don't know what you call those  
21 things -- at the end of this month. And nobody knows  
22 where it's headed. Nobody knows if the federal courts  
23 will actually hold the munitions rule up and give it

1 back to EPA and tell them to adopt something for waste  
2 munitions on ranges.

3 But let's move on to the range  
4 rule. Let me back up a step. EPA and DoD were very  
5 interested in getting stakeholder input into this  
6 process early on. EPA went to the Association of  
7 State and Territorial Solid Waste Management  
8 Officials, which is ASTSWMO; National Association of  
9 Attorneys General; Western Governors' Association, and  
10 asked them if they were willing to participate in an  
11 effort to come up with a rule that would meet  
12 everybody's needs and desires.

13 That's -- your talking fifty states  
14 here. You're talking fifty environmental agencies,  
15 fifty governors, and fifty attorneys general, so,  
16 you're -- you've got quite a number of people to come  
17 together and agree. You will never get that many  
18 people to agree.

19 EPA selected ASTSWMO to pick a  
20 number of states to participate in the process with  
21 DoD funding it. EPA could not participate because by  
22 the time the partnering effort started, their draft  
23 rule was already at O&B and this -- some kind of



1 procedures act that kept EPA out of discussing the  
2 rule that they had proposed.

3 I was one of the representatives,  
4 state representatives on that munitions rule team.  
5 There were twelve states -- eleven states, one Indian  
6 tribe, and one public interest group, plus Western  
7 Governors' Association, and NAG, National Association  
8 of Attorneys General.

9 We worked on that. We met here,  
10 there, and yon. We went to McAllister Army Ammunition  
11 Plant, looked at the demilling of conventional  
12 munitions. We went to Twenty-nine Palms Marine Corps  
13 Training Facility and observed actual munitions being  
14 used, and range sweeps.

15 And we met five times and came to a  
16 consensus on the munitions rule. The initial  
17 munitions rule was not agreeable to the states. EPA  
18 changed some things in that.

19 As we moved into a final draft, a  
20 revised draft of the munitions rule, the Army decided  
21 that this munitions rule partnering team was such a  
22 good thing, we needed a range rule partnering team.  
23 They committed to thirteen states, two Indian tribes,

1 two public interest groups, plus NAG, and Western  
2 Governors' Association, and ASTSWMO.

3 We met five times on that. The  
4 last meeting that we had was last month in Reno,  
5 Nevada. And it was a very good meeting. It was the  
6 first time that DoD had really sat back and listened  
7 to states in regards to munitions.

8 They made a very significant  
9 concession to the states. DDESB, Department of  
10 Defense Explosive Safety Board, they are empowered by  
11 Congress to regulate munitions. They have adopted  
12 regulations. I forget what CFR it's in, eighteen or  
13 fourteen or something like that.

14 But they actually have regulations  
15 that control everything dealing with munitions. I  
16 imagine there is some military retirees in here that  
17 know what I'm talking about. How far you can store it  
18 from a barracks or what kind of bunker you've got to  
19 put it in, the construction standards for bunkers.

20 DDESB has been doing this for a  
21 long time. They actually agreed to put a chapter in  
22 their standards that deal with waste munitions. That  
23 was a very big concession out of DDESB. We have

1 accomplished a lot in that partnering effort on the  
2 range rule.

3 The nutshell of the range rule is:  
4 DoD wants it to follow the CERCLA process, the Super  
5 Fund process, that's written -- spelled out in the  
6 National Contingency Plan. They want a CERCLA-like  
7 process. They don't want to just say, we're doing a  
8 PASI or we're doing a RIFS or we're doing remedial  
9 design, remedial action. They want to take the  
10 outline of those processes and call it something else  
11 that is specific to ranges.

12 Now, the range rule covers three  
13 types of ranges. It covers closed ranges, it covers  
14 transferring ranges, and it covers transferred ranges.

15 A closed range is a range that DoD  
16 has closed and has put to a use that's incompatible  
17 with a range. It's on the -- an active military  
18 installation. An inactive range, there is a lot of  
19 confusion between closed ranges and inactive ranges.  
20 An inactive range is a range on a military  
21 installation that is not being used at the moment.

22 I guess each year DoD looks at  
23 where they're headed and where they've been, and they

1 decide on what their training needs are and what their  
2 mission is going to be and how they're going to slant  
3 their forces. And there may be a need to have only  
4 ten small arms ranges for all of the Army. That's  
5 kind of farfetched, but all the -- but they can see a  
6 need for a hundred down the line, so they would have  
7 ninety inactive small arms ranges. That's an inactive  
8 range.

9 A closed range is a range that is  
10 on an active military installation, but it has been  
11 put to a use that's incompatible with the range.

12 A transferring range is what you  
13 have here. They are BRAC sites. They're transferring  
14 out of the control of DoD. A transferred range is a  
15 -- what we call FUDS, formally used defense site. And  
16 close to a hundred percent of those are out of the  
17 control of the Department of Defense, which causes a  
18 lot of concern, because DoD says they own that  
19 munition that's in the ground at FUDS, but you as a  
20 property owner, Mr. Cunningham, you might not want DoD  
21 to come out there. So, if Mr. Cunningham won't let  
22 DoD on his property, which is a formerly used defense  
23 site, DoD has no recourse. He's still got some active

1 munitions on his range that he has obtained in some  
2 manner.

3 That's the biggest issue, because  
4 the range rule speaks a lot of transferred ranges, but  
5 DoD has no legal authority to go on private property  
6 and conduct a clean-up. That's a real big issue,  
7 because we've got -- the FUDS list for Alabama -- I  
8 don't know if any of you have ever looked it up on the  
9 Internet, the Corps of Engineers' home page has a FUDS  
10 page and they -- you can call up Alabama and you'll  
11 see a very long list of FUDS, but it might be Joe  
12 Smith's Service Station down here where at one time  
13 they sent their five ton trucks down there and that's  
14 where they changed the oil, or it may be the range up  
15 the road here, whichever direction Gadsden is, at Camp  
16 Seibert. Camp Seibert was a World War II infantry  
17 training facility. There are -- if there was ever a  
18 munition used in the Army in World War II, then there  
19 is some of it up there. There are chemical warfare  
20 agents suspected up there. There are artillery rounds  
21 up there, there are small rounds arms up there.

22 But we are actively pursuing the  
23 restoration at ten FUDS sites in Alabama right now.

1 The Corps of Engineers out of Mobile is doing that.

2 But that's the -- what  
3 distinguishes the ranges that are covered. This rule  
4 does not apply to active ranges or inactive ranges.  
5 It applies only to closed, transferring, and  
6 transferred ranges.

7 Now, if you -- that's -- what was  
8 handed out to you, although it has my name on the  
9 front page, the program manager for the Army, Joe  
10 Murphy, these are his slides, and I just put my name  
11 on there just so that you would know who was giving  
12 you this presentation. These aren't my slides. These  
13 are the Army's slides.

14 There is some slants in here that  
15 goes to the Army. But let's look on the second slide  
16 there, why the range rule. It says, we're trying to  
17 find a cohesive process to handle UXO. You can't have  
18 fifty states, ten Indian tribes and territories trying  
19 to do the same thing or different processes to address  
20 something that's similar. DoD, they are the experts  
21 on handling munitions, waste munitions. And they have  
22 the area -- the expertise on doing that.

23 The next page, the philosophy of

1 the range rule. The EPA said that the rule had to  
2 protect human health and the environment, provide for  
3 public input, meaningful public involvement, and  
4 public input.

5 One of the biggest issues on the  
6 range rule -- I think, every state that commented on  
7 the range rule -- I don't know how many of you have  
8 read it -- but under each sub-heading or section, they  
9 talk about regulatory involvement and public  
10 involvement. Well almost always, the regulatory  
11 involvement is concurrent with the final document.  
12 And that's not the way we work.

13 The BCT here is a prime example of  
14 early involvement in the process. I don't think that  
15 the citizens here would appreciate it if you weren't  
16 involved, the state and EPA wasn't involved, that only  
17 -- that Army did everything and then when they came up  
18 with the final report, they handed it to you and said,  
19 well, do you like this. Well, that's what the range  
20 rule is saying is, the public's involvement and the  
21 regulatory involvement. And we have encouraged the  
22 DoD to involve the regulators as early as the  
23 regulators want to be involved.

1                   There is -- in the range rule,  
2           there is what's called a project team. The project  
3           team is made up of the installation personnel or if  
4           it's a FUDs site, it's the Corps of Engineers, and the  
5           land manager, if you will. It may be NOAH (phonetic),  
6           it may be Department of Interior, it may be U. S. Fish  
7           & Wildlife Service.

8                   It's some other federal entity that  
9           has control over that land or wants control of that  
10          land. Like back here in the back corridor, I think,  
11          U. S. Fish & Wildlife and Alabama Department of  
12          Conservation of Natural Resources want that corridor.  
13          They would be considered the land manager. They would  
14          be on the project team.

15                   There is an extended project team,  
16          which kind of is a secondary team. It includes the  
17          state regulators, the federal regulators, the public,  
18          and any public interest groups that may want to be  
19          involved in the process.

20                   We said, no, time out. Put the  
21          state, if they want to be on the project team, invite  
22          the public, if they want to be on the project team.  
23          We can't let all -- this process go on and on and then



1       they give us the final document for concurrence. We  
2       want to be involved early on.

3                       We don't know -- we aren't the  
4       experts on munitions. But we know how the process  
5       works. There may be some things that we can do that  
6       would streamline the process or make sure that five  
7       years from now or ten years from now, when something  
8       is done, that all of the requirements of the state and  
9       EPA are met. I think that that's -- that will be one  
10      concession that the Army will make.

11                      Let's go to page four there. And  
12      as I was telling you, what the Range Rule focuses on  
13      is closed, transferring, and transferred ranges. And  
14      it deals with UXO or unexploded ordnance and other  
15      constituents.

16                      Other constituents are -- it's a  
17      long list of chemicals or chemical parameters that are  
18      pollutants or of concern that are on somebody's list.  
19      And they just fall under the other constituents  
20      category. They're primarily breakdown products of the  
21      propellants or the bursters or the explosive charge  
22      that may be left in an unexploded ordnance.

23                      If you look there on the bottom,

1       you see a crosshatch in the inactive and active  
2       ranges. This rule does not cover active and inactive  
3       ranges.

4                   The next page gives you an overview  
5       of the range rule process. If you were a Super Fund  
6       expert or if you knew a little bit about Super Fund  
7       and you read what these -- identified these processes  
8       -- one of your handouts in here, this one right here,  
9       proposed range rule overview, gives you a very -- a  
10      paragraph or two to identify what these processes are.

11                  Range identification. DoD, for the  
12      first time ever, is going to inventory every  
13      installation that they have or know about or suspect  
14      and they're going to come up with this big master list  
15      of ranges.

16                  If you had sites, transferred,  
17      transferring, closed, active, and inactive ranges, and  
18      they'll have some identifier column that shows it's  
19      active, inactive, transferred, transferring, or  
20      closed. This will be the first time they've ever done  
21      that. And that range list will help DoD prioritize  
22      the work that they have to do in remediating these  
23      ranges. That's the range identification. That's part

1 of the range identification.

2 In the Super Fund process, this is  
3 when you're doing your preliminary assessment or site  
4 investigation. This is your early work. You go out  
5 there, you walk around, and you look around and you  
6 say, yes, there is some stuff on the ground. Or you  
7 review your records and they say, yes, Camp Seibert  
8 was a formerly used defense site.

9 The second part is the range  
10 assessment. That's comparable to the Super Fund  
11 remedial investigation or feasibility study.

12 Accelerated response. There is if  
13 you're out there and you actually are probing in some  
14 way, you've got your electromagnetic sensors out there  
15 and you find something and you sniff it or whatever  
16 you do and you find it, hey, we've got a problem here,  
17 then you conduct what's called an accelerated  
18 response. That's like in the Super Fund process, a  
19 time critical removal where you've got some eminent  
20 endangerment to human health and the environment, you  
21 need to take some action, now.

22 Range evaluation is like the --  
23 it's akin to the feasibility study in the Super Fund

1 process and the remedial design in the Super Fund  
2 process. This is actually where you're going out  
3 there and you're doing the investigations enough to  
4 determine what actually you will do to clean up the  
5 site and then you go on and do the site specific  
6 response.

7 A site specific response may be  
8 nothing, other than putting a fence around it and a  
9 sign saying, keep out. There's a process that we'll  
10 talk about in a minute on how they're to evaluate the  
11 risk at sites.

12 Recurring review is like a five  
13 year review in the Super Fund process. If you put a  
14 fence around it and walk away from it because you  
15 can't -- you don't have the technology to detect the  
16 UXO or the technology to clean up the UXO and you put  
17 a fence around it and walk away from it, you have to  
18 do a recurring review.

19 It's -- they didn't want to wait  
20 five years like in the Super Fund process or they're  
21 doing a three year, they're doing it at the third  
22 year, the seventh year, the eleventh year, and the  
23 fifteenth year, to look back at those ranges. If an

1 unexploded ordnance is left on a site, then they have  
2 to do recurring review.

3 And then the administrative  
4 close-out is like when you de-list a Super Fund site.

5 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Before we go  
6 on, I want to ask just real quick for clarification:  
7 There were changes to this from the summertime  
8 time-frame I would assume, which means that recurring  
9 review is only for sites that were not cleaned up to  
10 the standard that the community identified, not to  
11 some absolute standard?

12 MR. LARRY BRYANT: That's correct.  
13 There is no absolute standards.

14 MR. MARK ANDERSON: So, this last  
15 piece is where the government gets off the hook for  
16 cleaning it up on down the road if the property owner  
17 decides to change his mind on cleanup?

18 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right.

19 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Okay.

20 MR. LARRY BRYANT: That's a big  
21 issue is, who can make that change and does DoD have  
22 responsibility to come back.

23 The next two pages are hard to see.

1 I see that it's turned out black. It's just a process  
2 overview of the range rule process. And let's just  
3 skip that. You can't read it.

4 I will leave a copy of this with  
5 you and maybe you can filter it out. Let's see if I  
6 can find it. I've got a copy of that.

7 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Actually, there  
8 is a good one on the fact sheet.

9 MR. LARRY BRYANT: A good one  
10 where?

11 MR. MARK ANDERSON: On the fact  
12 sheet. You can read this.

13 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Well, the one  
14 that's on here is a little more detailed than the one  
15 on the fact sheet. I have a copy of it somewhere, and  
16 I thought I brought it with me, but I didn't.

17 MR. HARRY THOMAS: I copied the  
18 file onto one of our computers. We can clean it up  
19 and get it to you.

20 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I'll find the  
21 paper copy. It will be even a better copy than --  
22 I'll get this to you.

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Okay.

1 MR. LARRY BRYANT: The next slide,  
2 number eight, is R3M purpose. That's the range rule  
3 risk model, R3M, range rule risk model. That is how  
4 DoD is going to evaluate the risk of cleaning up  
5 ordnance or leaving ordnance in the ground.

6 The largest risk from the ordnance  
7 is not to you and I, it's to that ordnance and  
8 explosives cleanup expert. I don't know how many of  
9 those are killed every year, but I know we were at  
10 Twenty-nine Palms last year, and they actually had two  
11 of the O&E guys walking and just doing a surface sweep  
12 at a range, and the E-7 or -8 that was over that crew  
13 had told me that two of his buddies had been killed  
14 the year before, during a range clearance operation.  
15 So, that's the largest risk from a range -- a  
16 transferring or closed range is to that ordnance and  
17 explosive expert. I think we're -- at a FUDS site,  
18 I'm not sure who would be the most at risk.

19 But the model -- and I happen to  
20 have the last draft of the models here, that are --  
21 DoD actually gave us these on the range rule team,  
22 ahead of sending them out for review and other federal  
23 agencies.

1                   This is the biggest issue, is how  
2           do you determine what is an acceptable level of  
3           cleanup. Is that the death of one ordnance and  
4           explosive expert every month or is it the death of one  
5           a year or is it the maiming of his leg or is it the --  
6           can you accept the death of a hundred deer that are  
7           running out in a range that has a fence around it?  
8           You've got a human health risk evaluation and you've  
9           got an ecological risk evaluation.

10                   EPA says, unless these models are  
11           validated, they will nix the whole issue of DoD doing  
12           the range rule. And I'm not sure how DoD is going to  
13           validate the risk model.

14                   They've worked on the risk model  
15           for over a year. They've had their risk assessment  
16           experts at the Army environmental center working on  
17           it. They've had their contractors working on it.  
18           They've had the -- I'm not sure what all federal  
19           agencies that have risk assessors or risk managers,  
20           but they've involved a lot of people. They've  
21           involved all of the risk management and risk  
22           assessment experts with EPA in Washington, and they've  
23           come up with a model.



1                   And the current status of the model  
2           is -- three states have volunteered to help DoD and  
3           EPA review that. The -- let me see if I can -- got  
4           this written down on one of these slides here. Well,  
5           I can't find it.

6                   The final risk model is supposed to  
7           go on -- they will have an announcement in the federal  
8           register of its availability. They're trying to do  
9           that in April. And we'll have it available for  
10          comment for either ninety or a hundred and twenty  
11          days. And they're hoping to have the risk model  
12          finalized in April of 1999. Yes, sir?

13                   MR. FERN THOMASSY: Will the risk  
14          model contain cost and economic parameters?

15                   MR. LARRY BRYANT: No.

16                   MR. FERN THOMASSY: How do you  
17          determine what level of risk you'd go to without  
18          having those parameters involved in the process, as  
19          well?

20                   MR. LARRY BRYANT: I'm not a risk  
21          assessor, so, I really don't know how they could do  
22          that. There may be -- it may be in there somewhere,  
23          but I've not reviewed that, because it's over my head.

1 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: A similar  
2 question you're talking about in defining risk in  
3 terms of the dangerousness of the cleanup and the  
4 difficulty of cleanup, does that indicate a departure  
5 from conventional risk-base analysis that would take  
6 into context a socioeconomic risk? For instance, the  
7 danger to personnel who might happen to stumble onto  
8 it?

9 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes, that's in  
10 there. You assume -- let's say, the Choccolocco  
11 corridor is turned into a refuge and you've got  
12 walking trails. If you know the density of the UXO --  
13 I don't know if there is UXO out there -- let's just  
14 assume there is -- and they can guess at the density,  
15 then they've got factors for, how many people, how far  
16 you got to walk, and what's the likelihood of stepping  
17 on something, and what's the likelihood of stepping on  
18 it with enough force to cause it to detonate.

19 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Is there a  
20 mathematical equation that they use?

21 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes. It's a  
22 differential equation or something that's -- I was  
23 lucky enough to make an F in differential equations in

1 Auburn, so, I don't know how to interpret it.

2 We are -- we will give the risk  
3 model to -- once it comes out in final form, after the  
4 three states and DoD and EPA mull over it again, we'll  
5 give the copy of the model to Brian Hughes with the  
6 health department and ask him to look at that.

7 We don't have any people in-house  
8 that can do that. We'll let Brian Hughes look at  
9 that.

10 DoD only has a limited amount of  
11 money to do their environmental restoration program.  
12 I don't think they know where the money is coming from  
13 to clean up ranges. We -- the states have asked and  
14 they just say that they'll find the money. I don't  
15 know how they'll find the money, but they say they'll  
16 find the money. But they will -- they will prioritize  
17 their sites.

18 I would imagine that somewhere in  
19 your meeting you've heard of the relative risk ranking  
20 system. Or that's the way they're -- at installation  
21 restoration sites, they do relative risk rankings, and  
22 they do high, medium, and lows. And they're supposed  
23 to only fund highs.

1                   And then once you do all the highs,  
2           you do the mediums. And then once you do the medium  
3           sites, you do the lows.

4                   We've got some sites at some of the  
5           international guard bases that are all lows and  
6           they're not even expected to even address those until  
7           the year 2010. So, they're using their money at the  
8           high risk sites.

9                   They've got to do the same thing  
10          with all these ranges. And their primary sites to  
11          look at are FUDS. They don't have a control of them.  
12          They may be in your back yard. You may be living on a  
13          FUDS. And that's their highest priority are FUDS  
14          sites.

15                  DoD, in their budget for  
16          restoration, has never funded FUDS very well. About  
17          two hundred million dollars a year is all they've done  
18          for FUDS, except when Ted Stevens from Alaska gets an  
19          extra fifty million dollars thrown in so that he can  
20          dismantle some buildings in Alaska that aren't FUDS,  
21          but it came out of the FUDS pocket. But two hundred  
22          million dollars won't go too far.

23                  If you're going to rank -- if

1       you're going to say all of these FUDS sites where  
2       there are munitions are going to become a high  
3       priority, we've got Camp Seibert up there which covers  
4       I don't know how many square miles, and there is UXO  
5       all over that place. We could spend oh, I don't know,  
6       five, ten million dollars a year up there.

7                       And that's just at one site. And  
8       there are thousands of sites over the United States.

9                       I believe the course is they've  
10       identified eight thousand nine hundred or so FUDS  
11       sites and about two thousand of those are sites that  
12       they feel need further investigation or further action  
13       on those. And two hundred or two hundred and fifty  
14       million dollars at two thousand sites won't take you  
15       too far. You're looking at a twenty to forty year  
16       cycle to address all of those at that current funding  
17       level.

18                      MR. FERN THOMASSY: Whose hands is  
19       Camp Seibert in right now?

20                      MR. LARRY BRYANT: The Corps in  
21       Mobile.

22                      MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, but it's a  
23       formerly used --

1 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Oh, you're  
2 talking about the land owner?

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, who is the  
4 owner or owners?

5 MR. LARRY BRYANT: There's  
6 thousands of them.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: For Siebert?

8 MR. LARRY BRYANT: A lot of the old  
9 bunkers out there, people have converted to houses,  
10 and they're living in those old bunkers. But -- and  
11 some of those sites, there are floor drains in those  
12 sites, and instead of it draining, there is stuff  
13 coming up through the drains that one day may be  
14 green, one day may be blue. It's stuff.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Better than  
16 watching television.

17 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes. Hey, their  
18 air-conditioning bill is pretty low, because it's  
19 three to six feet of dirt on the top of it. But Camp  
20 Seibert is -- was reverted back to private ownership,  
21 I think, in '46. It was started up in '42, I believe,  
22 and was used, just gangbusters in '42 through -- I  
23 think the end of '44, and they started cycling down.



1 But it was reverted back to private owners, I believe,  
2 in '46. It may have been somewhere in a little bit  
3 after that.

4 But with respect -- there is  
5 hundreds and thousands of owners, because it's -- it  
6 goes like twenty miles to the west from Attalla all  
7 the way -- I don't know, what's that, Pell City over  
8 that way? And it goes six or eight miles south of  
9 Attalla, and it sweeps -- and it sweeps back up to the  
10 west like that. It's a huge site.

11 And the people from Huntsville that  
12 are doing the -- they're the ordnance and explosive  
13 center of expertise for the corps. They are -- we're  
14 meeting with them next week to discuss some O&E work  
15 that they're doing at Camp Seibert.

16 The private land FUDS are the ones  
17 that are number one priority. The last priority will  
18 be a closed range that is on an active military  
19 installation, unless there is something -- something  
20 eminent, some eminent endangerment from that range.

21 I've talked a little bit about the  
22 technology. If you can't clean it up now, you've got  
23 to come back in your recurring review. Congress has



1 given DoD, I think, an extra ten million dollars to  
2 study the technologies for a FUDS detection.

3 At Jefferson Proving Grounds,  
4 Indiana, they've gone out there over, I don't know, a  
5 hundred acres or so, and they've buried things all  
6 over and they've buried them at six inches and they've  
7 buried them at six feet. And they've -- any  
8 contractor that wanted to, could come in there and see  
9 how good they could do.

10 And the absolute best they got was  
11 eighty-five percent detection. That may have been a  
12 false detection or it may have been a positive  
13 detection.

14 The technology is not there to go  
15 out and wave your magic wand over the ground and say,  
16 oh, that's not an old can, that's a bomb. The  
17 technology is not there.

18 So, if your technology is to go out  
19 there with a mag-meter and every time you have a hit  
20 you start digging, we'll all be retired and our  
21 grandchildren will be retired before we can ever get  
22 to the point of cleaning up ranges, using that  
23 technology of every time you've got a hit with a



1 mag-meter, you start digging.

2 They've got to come up with  
3 something better. They've got things that they  
4 suspend under helicopters and they've got little  
5 robots that go out there. It's interesting to watch  
6 the films of their demonstrations.

7 But the technology is advancing.  
8 When you've got a market, entrepreneurs are going to  
9 try to find their niche into that market to make  
10 money. They are spending a considerable amount of  
11 money every year to come up with better detection  
12 technology, but that's -- that's the limiting factor  
13 right now in range clean-ups is the detection  
14 technology.

15 The range rule right now is -- it  
16 hasn't been published in the federal register. Well,  
17 I take that back. It has been published in the  
18 federal register, but I got a copy of it somewhere up  
19 here. It was published in February the 26th, 1997.  
20 And the comment period closed December the 26th. We  
21 did submit our comments, I think, on Christmas Eve.  
22 We got those in.

23 The EPA -- I mean, DoD will have to



1 undergo a massive rewrite of the rule, is the way that  
2 we see it. EPA -- yes, sir?

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: This handout  
4 you have says that DoD published the proposed range  
5 rule in September.

6 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right, yes.  
7 They published it September the 26th.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: You had given  
9 another date.

10 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Well, the public  
11 comment period closed on December the 26th. There was  
12 a ninety day review --

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes --

14 MR. LARRY BRYANT: -- and public  
15 comment period.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay.

17 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Because of the  
18 -- of the comments from the states and the interest  
19 groups and the Indian tribes from the range rule  
20 partnering team, DoD will have to rewrite the thing.

21 EPA sent each region and their  
22 headquarters offices -- and I understand they had over  
23 fifty pages of comments. And that was in November.

1 I'm sure that they received many more comments back to  
2 headquarters before the December deadline.

3 EPA is in the driver's seat. If  
4 DoD doesn't do what EPA wants, EPA won't approve it.  
5 Then, I don't really know where we are if the EPA  
6 disapproves it, because EPA is hesitant to go in there  
7 and really try to interfere with another well-funded  
8 federal agency that has the expertise in what EPA --  
9 well, DoD has the expertise in explosives and EPA is  
10 hesitant to go in there and tell them how to handle  
11 it.

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, where are we,  
13 as far as cleanup of ranges at Fort McClellan? I  
14 mean, we have a range rule that is going to be  
15 questioned, you said could possibly be contested in  
16 the court. EPA could not agree with it.

17 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right.

18 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, in the  
19 meantime, where are we with the cleanup of the range  
20 at Fort McClellan? What are we operating on?

21 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Where are we?  
22 Operating under what we have current -- we're having  
23 to use the current technology. We're using the Super



1 Fund process, and we will try to evaluate the risk  
2 using that process. It's not -- it doesn't have the  
3 -- the risk models that we use in the Super Fund  
4 aren't specific enough to address UXO. We'll just  
5 have to use the best tools that we have.

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, in the  
7 meantime what? In the meantime, we're seeing Fort  
8 McClellan closing in '99.

9 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Uh-huh.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, where are we  
11 as far as the transferal of the property goes? What  
12 kind of time line are we looking at?

13 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I have no idea.  
14 I don't -- the BCT members aren't here, and they would  
15 be the ones that would have to answer that question,  
16 because they're the ones that have to be involved with  
17 you in determining what's going to be the reasonably  
18 anticipated future land use or whatever the LRA --

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: We know that, but  
20 I'm saying, we know it can't be transferred if there's  
21 a hazard there.

22 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, if we don't



1 have a range rule that we're operating under, then  
2 what are we looking at as far as transfer of that  
3 property? Are we going to have to wait until we have  
4 a range rule?

5 MR. LARRY BRYANT: No. You can go  
6 out there and try to clean it up now, but I don't know  
7 if there is money enough to do it, given today's  
8 technology, because I don't know what the LRA wants  
9 for the use of those ranges. I don't know what the  
10 Department of the Army wants for -- what they want --  
11 what they're willing to pay for use of that range.  
12 Yes, ma'am?

13 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: Either under  
14 the current rules or under the range rule, what is the  
15 likelihood that the unexploded ordnances and the stuff  
16 that's found here would be transferred to the Depot to  
17 be burned?

18 MR. LARRY BRYANT: In the chem  
19 demil incinerator? Won't be.

20 MR. PAUL JAMES: It's probably  
21 blown in place.

22 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: It's my  
23 understanding that there has been some discussion in

1 the newspaper about bringing things in from  
2 non-stockpile sites.

3 MR. LARRY BRYANT: There has been  
4 discussion and there is some misconceptions being  
5 passed out around here.

6 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: I'm sorry, I  
7 didn't hear.

8 MR. LARRY BRYANT: There is some  
9 misconceptions. They cannot bring anything on that  
10 post and burn it in that chemical demil incinerator,  
11 period.

12 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: Well, I think  
13 that the Army has asked ADEM for an adjustment of the  
14 permit.

15 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right.

16 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: So that they  
17 can bring things in.

18 MR. LARRY BRYANT: That's a  
19 procedural thing under the munitions rule. There is  
20 some question about whether -- what was the -- what is  
21 the deadline to apply to do some of the things that  
22 they are limited under the munitions rule? Was that  
23 deadline August the 12th or is that deadline two years

1 after ADEM adopts the provisions of the munitions  
2 rule?

3 EPA has not said when does that two  
4 year or that time line start. And the Army, to  
5 protect their interests, asked the question, and  
6 that's all they had to do to protect their interests.

7 They cannot bring anything on that  
8 installation that is a chemical agent and burn it in  
9 that incinerator. They have to -- the only thing they  
10 can put in that incinerator is the material that was  
11 inventoried in their stockpile the day the permit was  
12 issued. They cannot --

13 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: As it stands  
14 now, but can't that be changed? Isn't that what the  
15 discussion was about, it can be changed?

16 MR. LARRY BRYANT: It can be  
17 changed. Yes, anything can be changed. But right  
18 now, Congress has said they can't do it, the Alabama  
19 legislature says they can't do it, our permit says  
20 they can't do it.

21 MR. GARY HARVEY: Can't they store  
22 it out there in case an emergency, if (unintelligible)  
23 something is found that's hot?

1 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes.

2 MR. BOB LAWRENCE: They can take it  
3 out there and store it?

4 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right. That's  
5 the safest place to put it. They have several tons of  
6 non-stockpiled agent out there now that they've found.  
7 They've got a ton of mustard gas out there that's  
8 non-stockpiled. But it's in an igloo. It's monitored  
9 just like stockpile material. They do the routine  
10 monitoring

11 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: Where was that  
12 brought from, the mustard?

13 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I have no idea.

14 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: How long has  
15 it been there?

16 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I don't know. I  
17 think it was already out there, it was just overlooked  
18 in their inventorying. I'm not sure how it got out  
19 there.

20 MS. VICKIE TOLBERT: Well, thanks.

21 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I've rambled on  
22 quite a bit. I don't want to take up all of your  
23 time.

1 But the rule will be changed from  
2 what was published in the federal register in  
3 September. It will have to be changed or EPA won't  
4 approve it.

5 And we're optimistic, the states  
6 are optimistic that most of what we wanted will be in  
7 there. That DoD will actually listen to us and  
8 involve us early on in the process.

9 Anymore questions? Yes, sir?

10 MR. JACK KING: That process now  
11 has to go on. What's your speculation of when the  
12 approved range rule will be there that we can react  
13 to?

14 MR. LARRY BRYANT: End of this  
15 year.

16 MR. JACK KING: End of 1998?

17 MR. LARRY BRYANT: '98. That's  
18 DoD's objective is to have a final range rule in place  
19 by the end of December '98.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But you said EPA.  
21 Is that with the agreement of EPA?

22 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes, yes.

23 MR. ALAN FAUST: Is it your opinion

1       that the finished range rule will be more stringent or  
2       less stringent than a cleanup or evaluation under  
3       Super Fund? I was thinking if there are evaluations  
4       going on in Super Fund now, why would they continue if  
5       a new rule is going to be enacted at the end of the  
6       year that may be more stringent, and make it go back  
7       and --

8                       MR. LARRY BRYANT: It won't be any  
9       more stringent. I mean, what we have now is very  
10      stringent. And it will just be tweaked to meet the  
11      need for ordnance, because it's unique. It's not like  
12      -- the Super Fund risk model has to factor in hundreds  
13      of different chemicals. You're talking about  
14      explosives here.

15                     MR. ALAN FAUST: Yes. I don't see  
16      how you can do a risk assessment without knowing how  
17      to factor in explosives.

18                     MR. LARRY BRYANT: They've got all  
19      those factored in.

20                     MR. ALAN FAUST: So, anything that  
21      doesn't have that evaluation, they can't use it?

22                     MR. LARRY BRYANT: Right. But the  
23      other constituents will be evaluated under like the

1 Super Fund process.

2 Anymore questions?

3 MR. JACK KING: Sorry about this  
4 folks. I don't want to hold you up.

5 Most of what you've been talking  
6 about is unexploded ordnance; that is, explosive  
7 conventional munitions that's out there somewhere.  
8 How much of the range rule applies to chemical  
9 munitions? Does the range rule, the way it's being  
10 discussed up to now, apply to both chemical and  
11 conventional?

12 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Yes.

13 MR. JACK KING: So, the part that  
14 -- this is kind of a conclusion right now. It may be  
15 worth every cent you paid for it.

16 But here on Fort McClellan  
17 environment, how much of chemical munitions do we have  
18 to contend with, as opposed to those World War II  
19 ranges that you have out there that aren't chemicals?

20 MR. LARRY BRYANT: I don't know.  
21 I've heard that there is probably maybe some test kits  
22 here and there, but I don't think we know out here, do  
23 we?





1 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Well, we've  
2 had -- we completed an archive search report in April,  
3 I think it was this year, '97. And we've gone back  
4 and we're having the Corps of Engineers, St. Louis  
5 district, update that archive search report to include  
6 CWM, chemical materials on main post.

7 MR. JACK KING: Now, does -- that's  
8 main post here at Fort McClellan?

9 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Right.

10 MR. JACK KING: What about the Camp  
11 Seibert property, did that have chemical munitions, as  
12 well?

13 MR. LARRY BRYANT: Suspected.  
14 Tech-escort has been down there.

15 Anymore questions? Thank you.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thank you,  
17 Mr. Bryant. Appreciate it.

18 MR. LARRY BRYANT: You're welcome.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: What I would  
20 like to do -- and I think we can do this fairly  
21 quickly without taking a break -- anybody against  
22 going on?

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Press on.

1 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: Press on.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Committees, we  
3 have charter membership. Right now, does anybody have  
4 any activity or see any activity in the future on  
5 charter membership committee?

6 What I would like to do is take it  
7 off the routine agenda. And we'll put it back on if  
8 we have any specific business for it, rather than keep  
9 mentioning it each time.

10 Do I have a motion to do that?

11 MR. MARK ANDERSON: So moved.

12 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Second.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All those in  
14 favor of taking it off until it's necessary to put  
15 back on the agenda? Any opposed? Thank you.

16 Community relations, anything to  
17 report right now?

18 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Yes, I've got  
19 something. I was -- Rodney Owens has put together a  
20 seminar for Leadership Calhoun County about the  
21 closing of Fort McClellan. And about six months ago,  
22 he asked me if I would speak at it, and I told him I  
23 would. And that was -- I was also an officer with the

1 Reuse Authority, at the time.

2 When I got my agenda that shows me  
3 on it this Thursday, it shows me as representing the  
4 Fort McClellan RAB. And so I wanted to tell y'all  
5 that in advance. And if anybody would rather do it  
6 than me, because I'm not -- I'm, of course, not an  
7 officer here anymore, that's fine with me.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Discussion?

9 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: You do it.  
10 You've got the most experience.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I don't think  
12 anybody has to be an officer to do that. That's what  
13 we have a board for.

14 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Since I'm no  
15 longer an officer, I'm subject to saying anything, so  
16 y'all might want to draw a disclaimer --

17 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: Well, you  
18 were liable to have said anything when you were an  
19 officer, so what's the difference?

20 MR. CHARLES TURNER: It was a  
21 conditional election, so --

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Hey, Charles

23 --



1 MR. PETE CONROY: Summarize what  
2 you'll say in three sentences or less.

3 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I can't do  
4 that.

5 MR. MARK ANDERSON: He's an  
6 attorney, he talks by the minute.

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Charles, Ron  
8 might be interested in attending. When did you say,  
9 where, and the dates for that?

10 MR. CHARLES TURNER: It's Thursday.

11 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: This Thursday?

12 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Uh-huh.

13 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: He won't be  
14 there. We have the EIS public hearing Thursday.

15 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Do you need  
16 copies of the canned briefing --

17 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I bet I'm only  
18 going to have fifteen minutes to talk and I'm going to  
19 be at the end. I'm the last name on the agenda, so, I  
20 figured I would just go in and show them a picture and  
21 sit down.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But do you want  
23 that, because there are view graphs with it?

1 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Sure.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: You can pick  
3 and choose.

4 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Sure, I would  
5 love to have it.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I'll send that  
7 to you by E-mail.

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Let me look  
9 for it, and if I can't find it, I'll give you a call.

10 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Have you got  
11 it on disk?

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I've got it on  
13 disk.

14 MR. CHARLES TURNER: If you would  
15 just send it to me, I would appreciate it.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All right.  
17 Well, let me ask Lisa, because I think she has it.  
18 She can send it. Otherwise, I've got to --

19 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Wait, I'm  
20 going to be out of town. I'm leaving like 6:00  
21 o'clock in the morning.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any further  
23 discussion on whether we kick Charles out or just let

1 him do it?

2 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: Let him do  
3 it.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think it's --

5 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Appreciate  
6 y'all's confidence.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think it's  
8 great. I think that's what each of us is on this  
9 board for. We're members of this community, we have  
10 assumed this position as responsible people, and one  
11 of the very important missions of the RAB is to  
12 provide that link with the various elements of the  
13 community that we represent and interface with. And  
14 so, we should each, from time to time, be working with  
15 groups that we're a part of or associated with or know  
16 people in so that we get out and do just what he's  
17 going to accomplish. Great. I'm glad you're doing  
18 it. And I hope more will in the future.

19 And the next topic we're going to  
20 go to in old business is where we're going to have the  
21 next meeting. And I think that's one of the  
22 processes, getting out somewhere, making this board  
23 available to the public and maybe we'll have more

1 presentations as a result of that.

2 And speaking of the next meeting,  
3 unless there is more discussion that you would like to  
4 have on that --

5 MR. CHARLES TURNER: No, sir.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- you're  
7 allowed.

8 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Thank you.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think we're  
10 looking for February to hold it in Weaver. And Mayor,  
11 any --

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Maybe we'll be  
13 ready.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Do you think  
15 we'll be ready there?

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yes, we will.

17 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I talked to a  
18 woman named Janet and she sounded pretty confident.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: She's not doing  
20 the work, though.

21 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Yes, I know.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Well, we'll  
23 plan to do that, unless something happens. And things



1 can always happen in that. But that's on the 12th?

2 When is that? What date in February is that?

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I don't have a  
4 calendar with me.

5 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: Is it the  
6 second Monday?

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It's the  
8 second Monday.

9 MS. MARY HARRINGTON: The 9th.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: 9th of  
11 February.

12 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: 9th sounds  
13 right.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: The 9th of  
15 February. So, the 9th of February in Weaver. And  
16 you'll give us directions?

17 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I'll get all  
18 that to you in your mail-out.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Great. I think  
20 that's wonderful. What about some advertising, some  
21 information in letting the people of these  
22 communities, especially in Weaver, know that we'll be  
23 there?



1 MR. CHARLES TURNER: One of the  
2 officers needs to go on David Ford's TV show. He's  
3 always hunting somebody to come on and talk about  
4 stuff just like this.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes.

6 MR. CHARLES TURNER: All you have  
7 to do is call him. Who is chairman of public  
8 relations, community relations? Mark.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mark has been  
10 chairing that committee.

11 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Mark, would  
12 you mind calling him and asking him --

13 MR. MARK ANDERSON: No problem.

14 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I think that's  
15 where you see results, from the TV, not the newspaper.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, I think  
17 you do.

18 MR. MARK ANDERSON: With that in  
19 mind, who do we want to be the spokesperson to go on,  
20 Mr. Chairman?

21 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I'd say either  
22 of our officers look capable. I've seen Pete on TV.  
23 Pete is an old pro.

1 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Somebody who  
2 looks awfully distinguished.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Fern, that's you.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thanks a lot.  
5 I don't mind doing it. But on the other hand, if  
6 there is other people who want to do that, please, go  
7 ahead and chime in.

8 I'll do. And I think normally  
9 we'll plan to have the chairman or the vice-chairman  
10 do that. And if somebody has a preference, we'll turn  
11 it over to the member who has a preference. Fine.

12 MR. MARK ANDERSON: Then I'll call  
13 David and David can work it out and get back with you.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Great. Any  
15 other old business? New business? And I'm going to  
16 turn it over to Lisa for that discussion, because  
17 we're going to talk about this peer review group that  
18 is being established and is going to eventually  
19 involve us, if nothing else, but from an information  
20 standpoint.

21 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: The Army's  
22 established a peer review team and they want to come  
23 to Fort McClellan the last week in February to look at

1 some of our projects. The projects and programs that  
2 they've picked out that they want to review are --  
3 they want to look at our risk-based  
4 investigation/decision-making approach. They want to  
5 review a report that we haven't received, yet. And  
6 hopefully we'll get it in January.

7 The background metals report that  
8 they've talked to you about, and its use in the  
9 risk-assessment process. They want to look at one of  
10 our chemical sites. And they've picked out T-38 to do  
11 that, because we've got some ground water  
12 contamination out there. They want to look at  
13 landfill three. They want to look at our RAD program.  
14 And they want to look at our approach to tackling our  
15 UXO problem.

16 And once they've reviewed these  
17 programs, they're going to submit a report and give us  
18 recommendations on what we should be doing better and  
19 smarter and cheaper and faster. And then we're  
20 supposed to respond with how we're going to implement  
21 their recommendations.

22 But they want to come speak to you  
23 guys next month during the RAB meeting, and let you

1 know what they plan to do.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: February?

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Right.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, they'll be  
5 at Weaver?

6 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: They'll be at  
7 Weaver.

8 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Are they  
9 planning on doing a program?

10 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: They want to  
11 do a presentation on how --

12 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I thought we  
13 were going to get briefed on the reuse plan.

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: That's why I'm  
15 bringing it up, it's up to you guys. If you want to  
16 have a presentation on the peer review, that's your  
17 call. I told them I would bring it up to you.

18 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Who is on the  
19 peer review?

20 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: There is  
21 different technical experts. I don't know where  
22 they're pulling them all from, but the Army  
23 environmental center in Edgewood, Maryland is pulling



1       these technical experts in. There's a  
2       hydro-geologist, a human health risk assessor, an  
3       ecological risk assessor, a RAD specialist, a decision  
4       analyst, and several other technical experts.

5                   MR. FERN THOMASSY: I tell you  
6       what, I'll throw a comment out to start the  
7       discussion. I don't think there is anything more  
8       important to us in this community right now than the  
9       reuse of Fort McClellan. And I think it's something  
10      that we as a board probably need to understand in  
11      order to guide our look into what's going on and the  
12      priorities that we might want to influence. So, I  
13      think the reuse presentation takes precedent over any  
  
14      peer review, which stands bureaucratic in nature and  
15      also long-term. If we delayed it a couple of months,  
16      it wouldn't hurt us, at all.

17                   MR. CHARLES TURNER: Is it going to  
18      hurt y'all?

19                   MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No.

20                   MR. CHARLES TURNER: If we put it  
21      off?

22                   MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No. We're  
23      going to go through the process. I've started





1 collecting documents to send up there for review.

2 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I mean,  
3 they're not going to give y'all like a B- because you  
4 couldn't --

5 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No.

6 MR. CHARLES TURNER: -- get them at  
7 the February RAB?

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: No, no.

9 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Well then I  
10 would prefer to put it off.

11 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It was a  
12 suggestion. They threw it out. They told me to bring  
13 it up to you guys. And maybe what they can do is come  
14 back and explain their report to you, what they found  
15 and their recommendations, rather than giving an  
16 up-front.

17 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Well, I don't  
18 think we mind talking to them, it's just, you know,  
19 all we get is an hour a month. That's easily --

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right. And  
21 it's important to utilize it.

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: What I'll do  
23 then is I'll tell them that you guys are interested in

1       hearing their recommendations, once they've completed  
2       their report.

3                   MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mayor, we're  
4       doing it in your community. You feel comfortable we  
5       ought to focus on the reuse?

6                   MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I think, you  
7       know, as far as information to the public, that that  
8       would be a lot more beneficial, because I don't think  
9       when you get into the technical aspect, I don't  
10      understand half the time what we're talking about, and  
11      I've been on here from the conception. So --

12                  MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, you're  
13      like the rest of us. So, who will be providing the  
14      reuse presentation?

15                  MR. CHARLES TURNER: I just asked  
16      Rob if he would do it and he graciously agreed,  
17      assuming --

18                  MR. FERN THOMASSY: Wonderful.

19                  MR. CHARLES TURNER: I've heard him  
20      brief it before. He does a first-rate job. I'm sure  
21      he'll do a great job for us.

22                  MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, I think  
23      it's essential, because all of us -- I can speak for

1       myself -- need to be updated on where we are with the  
2       reuse process, what your priorities are, and possibly  
3       what things can this restoration advisory board do to  
4       support what you have planned.  Extremely important.

5                   MR. ROB RICHARDSON:  In fact,  
6       Mr. Chairman, as a component of that, we have  
7       forwarded Fort McClellan some environmental priorities  
8       and we can share those with you, at that time, as  
9       well.

10                  MR. FERN THOMASSY:  Yes.  Mark?

11                  MR. MARK ANDERSON:  Actually begs  
12       the question that we asked last month, what is the  
13       status of the base cleanup plan?

14                  MS. LISA KINGSBURY:  That's a good  
15       question.  They were supposed to have the schedule  
16       completed on the 15th of January, and the document  
17       completed by the end of January.  Doesn't look like  
18       we're going to be hitting our targets.  Let's roll it  
19       out to February.

20                  MR. FERN THOMASSY:  My suggestion  
21       is that we put that on the agenda for Ron to give us a  
22       status update at the next meeting, since you can't go  
23       any further right now.

1 MR. MARK ANDERSON: So moved.

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Right.

3 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Let me ask a  
4 question. On the bypass that is being proposed, one  
5 of the -- if I remember in the last meeting, the  
6 proposed route of the bypass was -- there is a  
7 possibility that it would go through unexploded  
8 ordnance. What portion -- is there any -- what  
9 portion -- I guess that would be subtracted from the  
10 funds for Fort McClellan for cleanup. What portion is  
11 being concentrated of the funds that we have now, as  
12 far as evaluating and studying that, and is it going  
13 to affect the cleanup of the rest of the Fort?

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Could you  
15 shorten that question a little bit? I'm not sure if I  
16 understood it. Were you asking how much money do we  
17 have programmed to clean up the bypass?

18 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: For the bypass,  
19 and how will it affect the cleanup, as far as the  
20 project of the rest of the post?

21 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Can we put  
22 that on the agenda next month? And what I'll do is --  
23 I can't give you that right off the top of my head. I

1 know we've got --

2 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: My concern is:

3 Are all the funds going to go to the clean up of that

4 --

5 MR. GARY HARVEY: It is a matter of  
6 priority.

7 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Mayor, the  
8 last time I heard anything about it, the debate was  
9 between Alabama Department of Transportation and the  
10 government. The government was saying, y'all go  
11 around the UXO and just come on up and don't get in  
12 it. The Alabama Department of Transportation was  
13 saying, no, we want y'all to clean it up and we'll run  
14 it right through there. Fighting over the money. Is  
15 that --

16 MR. GARY HARVEY: No. The question  
17 to them put by Bart Reedy was: Can you still run the  
18 route, only bypass the UXO? And the state come back  
19 and said to the geometry of the highway, to keep the  
20 speed limit up, they could not do that. The question  
21 of the eastern bypass wasn't how much of a chunk of  
22 the money was, that was a priority for the community  
23 --

1 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I must have  
2 gone to a meeting you didn't, because I heard --

3 MR. GARY HARVEY: I was in on the  
4 meeting. I asked the question.

5 MR. CHARLES TURNER: I definitely  
6 heard somebody from the state and somebody from the  
7 government both standing there talking like it was an  
8 issue of cleanup dollars.

9 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Rob, the LRA set  
10 that as a priority, as a top priority?

11 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: In terms of  
12 UXO, it's number one priority.

13 MR. MARK ANDERSON: And we got a  
14 commitment from the Deputy Undersecretary that that  
15 would be something that would be funded.

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But, at this  
17 time, until we determine --

18 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It's been  
19 funded.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: -- complete our  
21 studies and all like this, we don't know what's there  
22 and how much it will cost to clean up, right?

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Right. FY

1 '98, we received the funds -- they're at Huntsville --  
2 to clean up or to do an engineering evaluation cost  
3 analysis on that eastern bypass.

4 MR. MARK ANDERSON: EECA.

5 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: The EECA. And  
6 we've got funding programmed for '99 for cleanup, but  
7 I can't give you an exact dollar off the top of my  
8 head. But I can get you that next meeting.

9 MR. ROB RICHARDSON: Mayor, the  
10 justification from our perspective was, where can we  
11 best create jobs? Do you spend the money early on  
12 remote areas of the installation that won't translate  
13 into jobs, or do you focus on areas that will create  
14 jobs early on? And that's why the decision was made.

15 MR. CHARLES TURNER: And another  
16 consideration was just the current conditions are  
17 almost intolerable, as far as traffic goes on  
18 Quintard, which we understand are of great concern to  
19 the city.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, a second  
21 report that we would expect to get at the next meeting  
22 would be information on the funding and cost for the  
23 bypass cleanup versus other cleanup costs, so we can



1 get a feel for the effect of the money that would go  
2 towards the bypass on other cleanup activities in the  
3 same fiscal year.

4 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Got it.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any other new  
6 business? Any other items that board members need to  
7 bring up before we adjourn?

8 MR. CHARLES TURNER: Move to  
9 adjourn.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I hear a motion  
11 to adjourn.

12 MR. CONROY: Second.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And a second.

14 Adjourned. Thank you.

15 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)  
CALHOUN COUNTY )

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto

1 set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,  
2 on this the 17th day of January, 1998.

3

4

5

6

7

8

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE

9

Notary Public in and for

10

Alabama at Large

11

12

13

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-97.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23