

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 15th day of June, 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	3-91
CERTIFICATE	92-93

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Do you want to
2 get started? I don't think we're going to have
3 anybody else show up, so I'll start. Mr. Anderson?
4 Mr. Brown? Mr. Buford? Pete Conroy?

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Here.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Dr. Cox?

7 DR. BARRY COX: Here.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Don Cunningham?

9 MR. DONALD CUNNINGHAM: Here.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Jerome Elser?

11 MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Alan Faust?

13 MR. ALAN FAUST: Here.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mary
15 Harrington? Ronald Hood? William Kimbrough?

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Mayor is here.

18 Margarette Longstreth? James Miller? Jimmy Parks?

19 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Here.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thomassy is
21 here. Chris Johnson is here. Ron Levy?

22 MR. RON LEVY: Here.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Bart skipped.

1 MR. RON LEVY: He didn't make it.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay. Well,
3 let's see, we have two, four, six, nine.

4 MR. RON LEVY: We need eleven,
5 right?

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes. Well,
7 let's go ahead and take a look and see what the
8 minutes were. Anybody have any comments on the
9 minutes from last time, anyhow? They're fairly
10 extensive. Very well put together. Chris?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I just noticed
12 one thing. Wherever it says Base Clean-Up Team, it's
13 BRAC Clean-Up Team.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: BRAC Clean-Up
15 Team.

16 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Miniscule but
17 --

18 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Good point. We
19 got to learn the terminology and learn to stick with
20 it.

21 MR. RON LEVY: I'll mention this.
22 And Joan McKinney is now doing the minutes for the
23 meetings, and she's still learning some things. And

1 she's pretty much captured everything.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's a good
3 set of minutes. That's very comprehensive.

4 MR. RON LEVY: Real comprehensive.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay. Well,
6 since we don't have a group here, I'm not even going
7 to go through the process of approving them. Let's go
8 ahead on to the presentation for today.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Well, let me --

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I just wanted
11 to mention for a minute before you start that
12 everybody got a copy of the peer review information
13 and some of the information about the leasing of
14 building 65. Building 65 is just a nice-to-know piece
15 of information right now. But I thought what was
16 extremely informative, and I would commend to you to
17 read again, if you scanned it up to this point -- and,
18 of course, I assume that Ron will discuss it in some
19 detail -- is that peer review report, because it
20 begins to get into some things that we're going to
21 have to wrestle with and we need to understand up
22 front. If we don't begin to understand risk-based
23 analysis and cost effectiveness, we're going to be at

1 odds all the time. And so we really need to think
2 about that.

3 The second part in there, from my
4 point of view, is that we need to begin to make lists
5 in our minds of the things that we should be getting
6 from the Army to understand where they are at any
7 point in time or from the BRAC Clean-Up Team. And
8 this helps also plant some of those seeds of the
9 things that we should be considering when they're
10 planning investigations or actual remedial actions.
11 And so, this is quite an important process.

12 I am glad -- and I would say this,
13 Ron -- that we do have or have had the opportunity to
14 go through the base clean-up plan draft, because with
15 that underpinning, it's much easier to look at and
16 understand this peer review. So, I hope that helps
17 some. Go ahead.

18 MR. RON LEVY: I appreciate that.
19 Just you also need to remember that as he talked about
20 risk assessment and a risk-based requirement, in terms
21 of our clean-up, we did offer some training in that
22 awhile back. We have money available to the RAB to do
23 additional training, since we've had new folks and

1 we'll be glad to look at that as an issue and as a
2 question to bring in some training on that aspect,
3 because we're going to get heavily into that fairly
4 soon here when we start talking about risk-based
5 clean-up. Chris is probably one of the more thorough
6 folks when it comes to that issue, and I'm sure he
7 would be glad to talk about it. But, again, I've got
8 money for training, and at some point, we may want to
9 think about whether or not we want to do that again
10 and look back at that again. I know it's kind of new.

11 Let me introduce Angela Atkins.
12 She's from the Army Environmental Center. She is
13 going to talk about the peer review and the peer
14 review process. And I think she'll introduce Chuck
15 and Gaynor. Are you going to talk, at all, Gaynor?

16 MR. GAYNOR DAWSON: No.

17 MR. RON LEVY: So, Angela, do you
18 want to start?

19 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Actually, Chuck
20 is going to start.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Chuck Lechner, he's
22 also from AEC, Army Environmental Center. However, I
23 think he's going to talk from the BRAC Office at

1 Department of the Army's point of view, first.

2 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Good evening.

3 I'm Chuck Lechner from the Army Environmental Center.

4 And just aside, I started there in 1986 when I was

5 (inaudible) and the First Commander was Colonel

6 Thomassy. And I remember I went for my entrance

7 interview with him, and it was quite impressive with

8 all the flags in his office and it was kind of

9 intimidating when you first come in, having all the

10 formality of the commander. So, good to see you

11 again, sir.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Good to see

13 you.

14 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Over the last

15 six months or so, I did a short detail in the Army

16 BRAC Office. And the Army BRAC Office is attached to

17 -- is part of the staff of the Department of the Army.

18 And that office is in charge of assuring that the BRAC

19 mission gets accomplished for the Army; that is, all

20 the BRAC money for the Army goes through that office.

21 They're in charge of assuring that money gets doled

22 out to the appropriate installations, projects, and so

23 on, to accomplish the mission of BRAC, which is to

1 accomplish the beneficial reuse of the properties
2 being disposed of by the Army through the BRAC
3 process. And that office or the commander of that
4 office, Colonel Gary Densig (phonetic) did a
5 presentation here to start a peer review last
6 February. And I'm basically just going to show you
7 that same presentation so you can see what basically
8 he told all the folks here when they got started.

9 This is me down here. As of today,
10 actually, I'm the peer review coordinator for BRAC
11 projects; that is, the Army Environmental Center is
12 also attached to the staff of the Department of the
13 Army, and we are given funding by the Army BRAC Office
14 to run this peer review program for them. So, we have
15 environmental experts who coordinate this, who hire
16 other experts of private industry like Gaynor, and who
17 set up the meetings and get the whole process to work.

18 So, why are we doing this? Well,
19 we want to assure that our program is as technically
20 defensible as possible, because there are a lot of
21 people looking at the BRAC program. Congress is
22 looking at the BRAC program, you all are looking at
23 the BRAC program, other stakeholders in the community

1 are looking at the BRAC program, other stakeholders in
2 other communities are looking at your BRAC program,
3 and you're probably looking at their BRAC program just
4 to see, you know, are they doing the same thing that
5 you're doing and vice versa. So, we're trying to
6 assure that it's defensible. It has a good technical
7 back-up.

8 Other large programs in the Army,
9 like the military construction program, they go
10 through a lot more extensive review of funding than
11 the BRAC program, the environmental projects in the
12 BRAC program do. They have mortar boards. They go
13 through several layers of technical reviews. People
14 always trying to shoot it down or to verify that it's
15 absolutely necessary. Environmental work being fairly
16 new, you know, only twenty or twenty-five years old,
17 it doesn't have that same review already
18 infrastructure already built in. And we're trying to
19 ensure that the environmental does in fact have the
20 same thorough review as other programs do.

21 We're trying to prioritize the work
22 and most efficiently use limited resources. Right now
23 there are more needs than we have funding for. I'll

1 show you a chart that just shows you the difference.
2 So, the BRAC Office is in the position of having, if
3 you will, ten holes in a board of needs and nine pots
4 or mortar to stick in those holes. So, one has to be
5 empty, basically. So, they're, every day it seems
6 like, when I was down there, trying to decide who to
7 take money from, who the bill payer was going to be
8 in, in their terminology, to pay for something else
9 that came up. So, they're always trying to prioritize
10 the limited funds that they have to go to the use
11 that's most urgent, the need that's most urgent on
12 that particular day or week that will get the most
13 reuse, that will accomplish the most useful
14 environmental clean-up, in the most expeditious
15 fashion.

16 And finally, we want to show the
17 work is cost effective, in order to conserve limited

18 resources. In some cases, there is some discretion as
19 to what you have to or don't have to do. And we're
20 trying to assure that we're doing the most cost
21 effective thing to make the most use of the limited
22 resources that we have.

23 Peer review is very important to

1 the Army. First, because it demonstrates responsible
2 stewardship of the BRAC program. Now, other people
3 questioning the BRAC program or looking at the BRAC
4 program is Congress. And I saw several instances of
5 testimony before Congress when I was in the Pentagon
6 over the last several months. And I think something
7 that seems to me is happening is they're finding that
8 environmental clean-up is taking longer than they had
9 originally anticipated and it's costing perhaps more
10 than it was originally anticipated to cost. And they
11 want to know what we're doing about it. And this is
12 something that Army leadership can go to Congress and
13 say, look, we're looking at our program very closely
14 and we're trying to do the most with what you give us.
15 So, this shows a good stewardship of the financial
16 resources that the Army is giving. It's very visible
17 to Army senior leadership. The major general that's
18 the head of the -- or the assistant chief of staff or
19 installation management is very supportive of this.
20 And this gets briefed to leaders in the Pentagon quite
21 often. And it's also discussed in congressional
22 testimony, as I just mentioned.

23 This is just to show you that we're

1 not just trying to single out Fort McClellan. There
2 are a lot of other installations that were undergoing
3 or going to undergo a peer review. And the way that
4 we're selecting sites for peer review is -- you can
5 imagine reasonably, if we're going to devote a fair
6 bit of resources to bringing a lot of folks in to look
7 at the program for a week, we want to see that the
8 program is large enough to justify that. So, that's
9 basically the reason why we pick certain sites; that
10 is, they have to have a certain amount of money to be
11 spent on a certain project over a certain amount of
12 time. So, if it's a big program, then it's worthy of
13 a thorough review.

14 And the Army BRAC Office are the
15 folks who really started the peer review. And their
16 responsibility, the reason they're doing that is,
17 they're trying to get the maximum beneficial community
18 reuse for the BRAC funds that are expended, they're
19 trying to direct those limited resources where they do
20 the most good, and they're trying to meet all the
21 legal requirements; that is, all the state and federal
22 and environmental requirements that they have to meet,
23 including protection of human health and the

1 environment. So, it's a balance. They have a lot of
2 things they have to meet and they're trying to direct
3 those -- while meeting those things, they're trying to
4 direct those funds to obtaining the best benefit.

5 And this is the quandary, the
6 funding quandary. This is the amount of funding that
7 the Army is getting for its BRAC environmental program
8 by each fiscal year. And these are the -- this is
9 fifty million, this is a hundred million, a hundred
10 and fifty million. So, you can see here is our funded
11 amount. It's on the order of just about two hundred
12 million dollars this year.

13 MR. RON LEVY: Hey, Chuck.

14 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Yes.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Could you step back
16 and point to the screen instead.

17 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: I'm sorry. The
18 funding is starting to go up over the next several
19 years and will tail off. And the reason it started to
20 go up over this period is that we're getting into the
21 clean-up phase on a lot of sites that were put on the
22 BRAC '95 list, which Fort McClellan is on that list.

23 But at the same time you can see

1 the requirements that are being identified by all the
2 installations, all the BRAC environmental coordinators
3 like Mr. Levy. Those all get added up. And the
4 requirements that we're seeing are somewhat greater
5 than the funding that we have. So, we're in the
6 situation where we're trying to satisfy all the
7 immediate needs. We're trying to -- questions being
8 asked like, if we don't fund this, will we incur a
9 penalty, things like that. We're trying to catch
10 things that we have to fund first and then the next
11 cut is things that provide the best benefit and so on.
12 And if we can find things that we actually don't have
13 to do or could defer for several years, in order to be
14 able to fund something else, then we're trying to do
15 that.

16 Finally, we identify the
17 installation's responsibilities. And number one is:
18 Continue the good job that's going on at this site and
19 all the sites.

20 Second, peer review only works if
21 there is no hindrance to open information flow; that
22 is, it's sort of an intimidating atmosphere when you
23 have eight people, the head of the team sitting on one

1 side of the table and all the folks that you work with
2 on the other side. And in some instances it sort of
3 inhibits communication. We can't have that. We have
4 to have good information flow. And we had excellent
5 information flow here, and it worked out very well.

6 And finally, we want to encourage
7 the installations to use the peer review process to
8 enhance their restoration program. They see good
9 ideas and we expect them to embrace good ideas and try
10 to implement them. And if they find that there is
11 something that's not a good idea, then we expect, you
12 know, to get the reasons why that doesn't work in that
13 particular location.

14 So, that's the overall -- that's
15 sort of the genesis of peer review. And then the Army
16 Environmental Center is executing the peer review
17 program for the Army BRAC Office. And Angela Atkins
18 works for the Army Environmental Center, and she's
19 going to describe how peer review is actually
20 implemented.

21 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: I would like to
22 express our appreciation to the installation. It
23 asked us to come down early this year, even before the

1 review, to speak with the RAB regarding the findings
2 of the peer review team. We perceive that as one of
3 our responsibilities. I was tasked with coordinating
4 and I also attended the Fort McClellan peer review.
5 And I was also tasked with coordinating the report
6 that has been generated since then. So, that's where
7 I consolidate the input from the panel members. There
8 were nine panel members on this review. And lots of
9 iterations of reviews from throughout the Army.

10 MR. RON LEVY: Let me just mention,
11 the copies of the draft peer review was sent out to
12 everybody. The folks that are sitting at the table,
13 did you all receive your copy? Okay.

14 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: To embellish on
15 what Chuck was saying, the goals and the focus of the
16 peer review feed into some of the BRAC goals that
17 we're kind of tasked with helping to address. The
18 prospect of site close-out and the expeditious
19 conveyance of the properties, we see that as forming
20 the framework in which we utilize our technical focus
21 to get the appropriate levels of risk reduction and
22 utilize those funds in the best way, the most
23 beneficial use of those funds.

1 Management objectives. As we go
2 through the process, we come at it. And this is what
3 the BRAC Office had first expressed to us as what they
4 wanted to accomplish, for us to take several tiers in
5 our approach to the reviews and starting with the
6 risk-based rationale and appropriateness for
7 production of risk at the installations that we're
8 doing. And following that, we take a more
9 cost-effective approach.

10 So, we don't just talk data points
11 and very, you know, treatment technology and that sort
12 of thing. All the other issues are brought up during
13 the meeting so that we can utilize the experience of
14 the BRAC clean-up team and the folks who are having to
15 deal with the public and other political issues that
16 feed into what is directing the restoration program
17 here at the installation.

18 We are hoping to establish some
19 level of consistency, not just bringing ideas here,
20 but also taking ideas from here back out to the field
21 so that we're not doing a whole lopsided sort of
22 approach in our restoration funding within the Army.

23 And lessons learned is another

1 aspect of that. We learn as much from the
2 installation in some cases as we bring to the
3 installation from other installations. So, the
4 consistency issue is very important to us and to the
5 regulators, as well. And we're doing our best to kind
6 of convey that.

7 This is a kind of pictorial
8 presentation of where we've been in this. There is
9 similar things that feed into the BRAC decisions, into
10 the decisions that are made on the installation level
11 as to where you're going to focus your energies and
12 your efforts and your dollars.

13 And the technical aspects in the
14 center are the -- that's our primary and our initial
15 focus. And the other pieces, the BRAC officer has to
16 pull together those pieces.

17 As far as the panel members that I
18 mentioned, I don't think we've got all of them up
19 there. We had some that had been to other reviews,
20 some were new panel members. And as you recall from
21 the map, there is -- had been four reviews previous to
22 Fort McClellan. And so a couple of them had a little
23 bit of experience with what to expect and how to best

1 engage the conversation. And there is many, many
2 years of experience.

3 MR. RON LEVY: What percentage of
4 those were DOD employees as opposed to outside
5 agencies at DOD from our panel's perspective, do you
6 remember, Angela?

7 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Three out of
8 nine, 33.3 percent.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Three out of nine.

10 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: And this is
11 kind of the how this gets done. We start with project
12 nomination. I think McClellan was nominated probably
13 the end of last year or the end of December or maybe
14 the first part of January. And that was the
15 discussion between the BRAC Office and the MACOMs.

16 And eventually, we talked to the
17 installations, once we started seeing where we would
18 probably be focusing. The MACOM was notified, you
19 know, during our first windowing of where we were
20 going. And then that's where we started our
21 discussions about where, which projects within the
22 installation would be best for us to focus on. And we
23 tried to do sort of a representative approach to that;

1 a landfill, a chemical agent site. That's how that
2 evolved.

3 We talked to the installation about
4 what was to be expected and how things were going to
5 be conducted, as far as, you know, the length of the
6 meeting, the depth of the meeting, that sort of thing.
7 And they provided information back to us on the
8 specific projects that we identified to them. And it
9 was a pretty good stack of stuff. The panel members
10 each had about probably eight or nine inches of paper
11 to get through to prepare for the review. And we
12 conference called prior to the meeting, all the panel
13 members conference called with the AEC folks to
14 discuss that information, to kind of get an idea of
15 where the review may be focused.

16 The meeting was held the last week
17 in February. We were a full week at the table. And
18 from that point, it was about six weeks getting the
19 initial draft version of the report out. That was
20 reviewed by the installation folks that talked to, I
21 believe, the BCT, as well, to identify any areas where
22 we completely misunderstood what was being said,
23 anything that we could do to dock the report before it

1 was issued in draft form. The draft report went out.
2 That's the version of the report that the installation
3 will be responding to, drawing from their BCT, from
4 the RAB members, and anyone who cares to provide input
5 to the specific recommendations. And they will be
6 consolidating that and providing it back up to us in a
7 couple of weeks.

8 Well, from that point, once we
9 receive the responses from the installation, we'll be
10 incorporating those into a final report. Let's see,
11 Chuck, I believe we were going to be the end of
12 August. No, not that one. Excuse me. I've done a
13 couple of these, trying to figure out schedules. I
14 believe we shouldn't need more than four or five weeks
15 following the receipt of the responses to incorporate
16 those into a final report. And that's what's provided
17 out to the MACOM and to the BRAC Office, where they're
18 funding decision-making.

19 MR. RON LEVY: It should be
20 beginning of August, middle August timeframe. We're
21 due to you on the 30th of June a response back.

22 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Yes.

23 MR. RON LEVY: You might mention,

1 Angela, that during the peer review meeting, Bart and
2 Chris were both part of that process from the BRAC
3 clean-up team, and also other members from the
4 installation that had some input, such as John May
5 (inaudible) for the installation, when we talked about
6 the RAD issues. And there are other people, too, I
7 just can't remember off the top of my head who they
8 were.

9 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Right. And
10 this review was considered by a lot of the folks in
11 the Army as a real success. We had a very large
12 attendance for one thing. And the cooperation and the
13 sharing of information was very good. And I think we
14 were able to develop a fairly concise report because
15 of that.

16 MR. RON LEVY: I can also tell you,
17 too, that some of the things that were recommended in
18 the report we have already implemented, such as the
19 GIS data base, a few other things on the RAD side of
20 the house. Most of the issues are still to be
21 determined and discussed some more.

22 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Right. And any
23 time that something is already going on that we're

1 recommending in the report, we hope that folks won't
2 be offended if it sounds like we were coming up with
3 the idea or that sort of thing. That's not it, at
4 all. When we make a recommendation that follows
5 directly what you're doing, then that's just total
6 justification going up to the BRAC Office saying, yes,
7 this is the appropriate approach. That's what we
8 recommended.

9 MR. JIMMY PARKS: On your phase
10 three in that last chart there that says, funding, is
11 BRAC going to approve the funding, partial or full?

12 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Right.

13 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Is that the DA
14 BRAC Office or is that --

15 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: That's right.

16 MR. JIMMY PARKS: -- TRADOC BRAC
17 office.

18 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: That would be
19 DA. And then I believe that they work with the TRADOC
20 BRAC Office quite a bit in getting additional input in
21 that decision.

22 But we're outside of that realm of
23 decision-making. We're just providing the

1 recommendations as we said. And once we have the
2 response from the installation, then the BRAC Office
3 gets a clear picture of what this issue really means.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: If that
5 decision is made at the Pentagon BRAC Office level, is
6 that funding fenced for an installation so that it
7 can't be tampered with at the TRADOC level?

8 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Chuck?

9 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: That means they
10 get a line item in the work plan. The work plan is
11 just all the line items for all the installations that
12 divvies all the BRAC money. So, it just makes the
13 decision as to whether there's going to be a line item
14 for that item, for that project or whether there will
15 not be a valid line item.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But that
17 project is installation specific?

18 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Yes.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Is that
20 correct?

21 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: It's not fenced
22 to that project. It's just that that line item then
23 goes into the pot that TRADOC would have to spend at

1 its BRAC sites. Then, I think, up to TRADOC to decide
2 whether that money would then go to Fort McClellan,
3 for instance.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, that's
5 really only part of the story?

6 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: That true.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And we'll
8 somehow have to watch that, even though we don't have
9 access to the funding lines, other than those that may
10 come out in the Congressional budget.

11 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: And that
12 decision to fund or not, that's made in coordination
13 with the installation and the MACOM. For instance, a
14 long phone call, I think, was just held last week on
15 another installation, and the BRAC Office was
16 involved, the Army Environmental Center was involved,
17 AMC -- well, the MACOM and the installation were all
18 involved, not a -- it's not a blind decision, if you
19 will.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, I
21 understand that. Our concern here, and what I mean to
22 alert all the members of the RAB to, is the fact that
23 once those things are funded at the BRAC Office, we've

1 got to assure that it gets through TRADOC, because --
2 somehow, we've got to make sure and try to protect
3 McClellan. And a couple of times we've already seen
4 that that hasn't happened at the TRADOC level. And I
5 wouldn't feel comfortable with it in the future,
6 either. I'm just being blunt as can be.

7 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: If we have any
8 questions on these site recommendations, who would we
9 direct those to?

10 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: If you would,
11 please, direct those to Gaynor Dawson, he will be
12 responding to questions. We'll chip in anywhere that
13 we need to.

14 MR. RON LEVY: I think that's what
15 we are going to do is we're going to open up for
16 questions, now. If you had a chance to look at the
17 peer review report and you want to bring up anything
18 within the report or on the process, this is the time
19 to do it. So, I'll just open for questions.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Well, everybody
21 probably knows what my question is. But I'm the mayor
22 of a small community and about two years ago there was
23 an analysis done of the leakage of landfill three.

1 And since our water supply is basically from ground
2 water or from wells, we became very concerned on this.
3 And I noticed on page thirty-two in this document of
4 landfill three that it says, from the perspective of
5 human health and ecological risk, there appears to be
6 no reason to cap or take further remedial action at
7 landfill three, provided the ground water use
8 immediately down gradient of the site is prohibited.
9 And there was some leakage diagnosed, some leakage.
10 And, of course, I've kept asking questions about this.

11 But the way I interpret this, there
12 is no recommendation of doing anything at this time
13 because of the -- said because of the removal of the
14 forest and the occurrence of this.

15 And that's my question. You know,
16 I'm sure I saw your panel of experts on there, but
17 this is a grave concern. It would cripple my
18 community, as far as providing services, if that
19 leakage ever did come into our ground water. Which we
20 were then, I think, Ron, between a mile and a mile and
21 a half at the detected leakage the first time.

22 MR. GAYNOR DAWSON: I understand.
23 We do believe that a few things need to be looked

1 into. One is: We're not aware of how deep your wells
2 are screened and what aquifer unit they're currently
3 drawing from. The water that has been contaminated
4 from the landfill is very shallow. It is very slow
5 moving. It moves approximately fifteen feet a year.
6 And therefore, it will take a long time to go a mile
7 or more. So, there is time to look at it, the
8 situation. More importantly, it only yields about a
9 gallon a minute from a well. And so, it's difficult
10 to use that unit of water for any kind of household
11 purposes. And to give you a little perspective, a
12 garden hose runs about five gallons a minute. You
13 couldn't even run a garden hose from a well completed
14 in this water.

15 The question we pose is: Is there
16 any reason to believe that water and those chemicals
17 could ever arrive at the wells and the water that you
18 all utilize in a concentration that would ever pose
19 any kind of a problem. And that can't be answered at
20 this point in time because all the data have not been
21 collected to determine if those two different water
22 bodies communicate with each other. And that's
23 something we do believe should be done.

1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Thank you.

2 That's the best explanation I've had in five years.

3 Thank you, sir.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: I apologize. Who
5 are you?

6 MR. GAYNOR DAWSON: Gaynor Dawson,
7 a member of the peer review panel.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Thank you.

9 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: There is -- I
10 hope you have this. This is one of the appendices.
11 Figure A-4 has like a step-wise decision diagram that
12 kind of walks you through the process that we
13 recommended as followed there.

14 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I understand.
15 I'm familiar with the perk network analysis and all
16 that. So, I understand the cost factor and the danger
17 factor and everything that's built in there. So, I
18 appreciate it.

19 MR. RON LEVY: One of the things
20 that we've told the mayor -- of course, there has not
21 been any decision made on landfill number three and
22 where we're going with that. And in fact, there is
23 some discussion coming up in one of the upcoming BCTs

1 on further work at landfill three, because we just
2 completed the ground water, the most recent ground
3 water monitoring. So, even though you've got your
4 recommendations in there, there has been absolutely no
5 decision in terms of what we're going to do at
6 landfill three, at this point. Now, I don't know if
7 Chris wants to add anything to that.

8 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That's correct.
9 We're going --

10 MR. RON LEVY: I think there may
11 been some additional characterization due.

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Absolutely.

13 MR. RON LEVY: But there hasn't be
14 any decision on any remedy, whatsoever. Any other
15 questions, concerns, issues?

16 There are a number of things in
17 here that -- one of the things that Angela mentioned
18 is that the intent here is to -- is to make our
19 program cost effective. I think that's the word
20 exactly. Improve cost effectiveness of the program.

21 There is another side to what the
22 peer review does, too. And in a sense it also defines
23 programs that are in need of additional work. And

1 there are some additional costs. If you look through
2 what they've recommended here that will actually be
3 something we are going to put in place. So, it didn't
4 just go ahead and start slashing our budget from the
5 standpoint of their review of technical requirements.
6 But also defined other things that we needed to do and
7 put in place.

8 So, I think that -- from that
9 standpoint, I think it's going to help me. I think
10 this GIS system that they proposed is going to be a
11 great decision-making tool for us. We can really look
12 at the data from all sides and make good decisions on
13 clean-up.

14 And they mentioned some other
15 things, too, on the RAD stuff that I wasn't really
16 aware of that helped me cut through some of the red
17 tape on getting things done.

18 MR. JIMMY PARKS: How does their
19 recommendation tie into what the Fort McClellan
20 Development Commission's priorities for clean-up?
21 They give you a list of priorities that they want
22 cleaned up first, right?

23 MR. RON LEVY: They didn't look at

1 -- they didn't look at their priorities. We gave them
2 program areas, specific program areas to look at that
3 may or may not impacted on FMDC's need to get into the
4 property. So, they didn't consider that, am I right?
5 I mean, that really wasn't a consideration in there.
6 It was strictly on the programs we told them that
7 needed to be evaluated. And that really was based
8 upon high dollar cost programs such as UXO; the KWM,
9 the chemical warfare material sites; the landfills,
10 and radiation, those were the ones that we had when
11 you looked at our budget, we had significant costs
12 associated with them.

13 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Well, when it
14 gets to applying the dollars there, which one is going
15 to be the overriding thing, what Fort McClellan
16 Develop Commission wants cleaned up first or the peer
17 group's recommendations?

18 MR. RON LEVY: See, I don't think
19 there is a link there, at all. Is what you're asking,
20 is this going to affect prioritization? I don't think
21 there is a link, at all, to prioritization. This
22 looks strictly at a program that we are working and
23 doesn't get into any of the prioritizations. It don't

1 affect us from our prioritization. We're still moving
2 forward, geared towards the the redevelopment or the
3 reuse plan. Each program, itself, they may have
4 defined better ways of doing it, but it doesn't affect
5 our prioritization.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: You going to
7 get John May from Fort Leonard Wood for a year?

8 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, one of the

9 things they recommended in there was that there would
10 be a way to ensure he comes back. So, yes, in fact
11 we've costed that into our latest work plan to ensure
12 that we have money to bring him back as necessary to
13 deal with NRC, to deal with EPA, to deal with Chris.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Question.
15 Angela. I'm not sure I understood where we were and
16 where we were going with phases one, two, and three.

17 Now, we're going into phase two.
18 We have documentation. Can you put a timeframe to
19 that and reiterate that for me? I didn't follow it
20 completely.

21 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: The review was
22 the end of February. Six weeks after that we issued
23 the interim draft report, which was what we got

1 comments back on, any glaring errors, in our
2 understanding. A week is a very short period of time
3 to develop an understanding of a program site. Then
4 we reissued that, once those had been incorporated.
5 They're to respond near the end of June, perhaps the
6 first week of July.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Is that in
8 phase one or phase two?

9 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: That's phase
10 two.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's in phase
12 two?

13 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Uh-huh.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, their
15 response will complete phase two?

16 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: I believe
17 that's correct. Well, no. Once we receive their
18 response, then we have to incorporate that into the
19 document. And any other areas that are really -- we
20 feel like we missed the point or something like that.
21 And if we need to get more input from either the panel
22 or from the installation, we'll do that. And we'll
23 try to keep that as brief as possible. And so in that

1 four or five week period, we will turn it back around
2 in final form. And that's the conclusion of the
3 period.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: End of August?

5 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: No. First part
6 of August, right.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: First part of
8 August, you'll have that completed. Then you've got
9 phase three?

10 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: The funding
11 decisions.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes.

13 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Could you
14 explain a little bit about the scheduling of funding
15 decision, Chuck?

16 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: I believe in
17 August they try to finalize the work plan, try to
18 finalize how much money goes against these different
19 line items.

20 So, August is a milestone for
21 getting that finalized. Also, in January, there is
22 another round of looking at the work plan. So, as
23 those two times, the input from this, the peer review

1 process is a technical input to that process. It just
2 helps define how urgent is a certain project. Do we
3 have to do it now? Do we have to do it later? Do we
4 have to do it, at all? Do we have to do it to the
5 extent that we originally thought?

6 So, I think in August they'll try
7 to gel, if you will, the finish to that.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: If they are
9 driving the funding for Fort McClellan, based on that
10 peer review report, then we're right back to what
11 Mr. Parks said. If it excludes consideration of those
12 items that are high priority on the Fort McClellan
13 Development Commission's plan, then they're not being
14 given proper consideration when that funding decision
15 is being made, because this is the total dollars we're
16 talking about, as I understand, for Fort McClellan in
17 that fiscal year, plus one timeframe.

18 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: Our
19 recommendations -- I'm sorry. The purpose of our
20 report is to provide the technical perspective --

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right.

22 MS. ANGELA ATKINS: -- for that
23 decision. They don't always spend money on purely

1 risk-based decision projects.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I understand.

3 And I'm not lobbying you to make those decisions or to
4 come to our aside, I'm just trying to understand it.

5 And so that statement was certainly accusatory, but
6 not to you, but to where we are in the process. And
7 I'm not sure we have a satisfactory understanding of
8 the funding process. And I think money speaks in this
9 instance.

10 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: This is a
11 technical input. And I think Angela showed that
12 jigsaw puzzle piece where the middle was the decision
13 and the other things on the periphery were the inputs
14 going into that. Technical is one of them. I think
15 local interest is one of them. Political interest is
16 one of them. Reuse plans is one of them. There are a
17 lot of things that go into it.

18 But a major question is: Do we
19 have to do this based on knowing that this piece of
20 property is going to be developed for such and such?
21 With that as the background, do the environmental laws
22 require us to do this now to protect human health and
23 the environment? This provides that answer. Yes or

1 no, do the environmental laws make us do this? Well,
2 the reuse is a factor in that. But that's another
3 factor, basically.

4 MR. JIMMY PARKS: But they're going
5 to put a lot of weight on your technical evaluation,
6 right?

7 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Probably.
8 Possibly, yes. I mean, we can't say how much weight
9 goes to each of those factors.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Well, am I
11 hearing --

12 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: In some cases,
13 a lot of weight goes to the political factors and
14 local interests.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Am I hearing
16 incorrectly or is this peer review report really the
17 fundamental basis for the funding that the BRAC Office
18 makes its decision on?

19 MR. RON LEVY: No.

20 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: It's one
21 factor.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay. And
23 that's where I need probably to get Ron to talk again

1 as to how much of a factor on the total base clean-up
2 plan is this? You talked about briefing them on the
3 high dollar values and focusing them on about three or
4 four different areas, which don't necessarily align
5 with the priorities of the LRA.

6 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: FMDC.

8 MR. RON LEVY: I can tell you --
9 what can I tell you? I can tell you that the way the
10 process works is they'll come out with their
11 recommendations. We'll go back and, you know, respond
12 to those recommendations. And it could be in a
13 positive way or it could be that no, we don't agree,
14 we totally disagree. In fact, this is the way we
15 think it needs to be done. And those responses go
16 back through channels.

17 Eventually, it's the MACOM and the
18 installation that are going to decide the impacts on
19 funding. Am I not right about this? Am I right about
20 this?

21 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: Well, they'll
22 identify to Department of the Army what the impacts
23 are. That if you don't fund this, this is what's

1 going to happen at our site, because you all know the
2 specifics at your site a lot more. It will impact
3 reuse, it will impact human health and the environment
4 and so on.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And I can tell
6 you right now from looking at what we've got in our
7 peer review packet, there is nothing that you can
8 really nail down on the funding side at this point,
9 because we're still kind of the infancy -- you know,
10 we're still the SI and the RI phase, and we don't
11 really have enough data collected to say, oh, we can
12 go this way or we can go that way. That was one of
13 the problems with the peer review that we had was that
14 we were unable to tell them exactly what the problem
15 was, because we did not have enough characterization
16 of our sites to do that with. So, it's going to be
17 very difficult for one person to say -- at the DA
18 level to say, you know, you're spending way too much
19 money for a remedy here when we're not even at that
20 stage.

21 I don't know how difficult -- I
22 don't know that there was any specific things in there
23 from the standpoint of characterization that they

1 recommended that would have impacted funding to a
2 great extent. Would you agree with that, at least for
3 McClellan? At least not our programs that are going
4 on right now?

5 MR. GAYNOR DAWSON: I think that's
6 true. I mean, it's largely talking in terms of how to
7 go about things, not the efficacy of doing some of
8 them. I think one of your highest priorities is the
9 corridor, for instance. And the peer review basically
10 said, you know, you've got the best people doing that
11 work that can do it right now, the Huntsville Corps
12 people. Get on with it. So, in that respect, I think
13 it underscores that that's a high priority and it
14 ought to move forward.

15 I think you're right, Ron, I don't
16 think there is anything in there that would suggest
17 that priorities were going to change or the funding
18 would be affected for any high priority items.

19 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know what
20 happened at other installations, but that probably
21 wasn't true for other installations where you saw some
22 major shifts in the way they were doing things that
23 would have impacted cost, right?

1 MR. GAYNOR DAWSON: Well, yes. I
2 mean, there have been installations where we
3 recommended they not go forward with a delivery order
4 or that they cancel contracts. So, there have been
5 some.

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: We don't have any
7 type of cost estimates, whatsoever, at this point, do
8 we?

9 MR. RON LEVY: Not from a clean-up
10 standpoint. We haven't reached that.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay. Then the
12 budget, I know in the bar graft, you said what '99 was
13 going be the -- am I remembering right, '99 would be
14 the top amount? So, how soon will we -- what I'm
15 saying is: The corridor, for instance, okay, is there
16 just so much money going to be provided, you know, for
17 the clean-up, and if we don't know the costs, at this
18 point, then could the corridor take the largest amount
19 of our money, our money that's allocated to clean that
20 up and then, you know, we would have to postpone or
21 put on the back burner some of the other identified
22 areas?

23 MR. RON LEVY: No. I think what

1 we, at this point, have identified -- and again, we're
2 identifying funding requirements through the out
3 years. What we have identified for funding for the
4 out years is adequate. And it's within our work plan
5 to cover the eastern bypass. And the eastern bypass
6 and the area that it's going through is a little bit
7 unique in that most of the contamination associated
8 with ordnance out there is surface, from surface use.
9 So, the difficulty of getting in there and doing the
10 clearance is less than what you would see from the
11 artillery firing.

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, the
13 archeological -- possibility of archeological sites
14 have been ruled out in which we discussed at one time
15 if we did have some archeological sites, then we would
16 have to divert -- in certain situations, we would have
17 to find another route or something?

18 MR. RON LEVY: On the archeological
19 side, that's not going to be a big issue. We've
20 essentially finished all of our phase ones. We do
21 have some phase two within that area. However, you
22 know, the phase two is not that expensive and we can
23 in fact go through the process, identify the artifacts

1 and put them away at very little expense, in the
2 scheme of things.

3 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I guess my major
4 question is: Idealistically, you like to have the
5 amounts that it's going to cost you and build your
6 budget after that. But is it going to be that we're
7 going to build the amount of money up here and then
8 come back and determine the cost and then have to fit
9 that in? And if there is twenty million dollars
10 needed for instance and we only have eight million
11 allocated, is that going to be the situation with
12 this?

13 MR. JIMMY PARKS: That's that tenth
14 empty hole that they were talking about.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes. I think
16 in parallel with that, too, is a concern that there is
17 enough money for other things that should be done in
18 that same year.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Because we will
21 still have remedial investigations going on for part
22 of the phase one activities that the FMDC has already
23 laid out. And I still don't feel that we as a board

1 have a handle on the mechanism through which we can
2 monitor that, assure ourselves that we know what's
3 happening in any fiscal year with the amount of money
4 that's needed to handle those programs, and what's
5 being left out. Somehow, we have to have that
6 visibility. And so far, we don't have a mechanism for
7 it.

8 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know that
9 anybody really has control, that type of control over
10 the funding process.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It's not
12 control, it's a knowledge of what's happening so that
13 we know by fiscal year how much has been asked for and
14 how much is going to be provided.

15 MR. RON LEVY: I can tell you --
16 and we did pass out originally -- this was awhile back
17 -- a year-by-year projection for funding at McClellan

18 that we are tracking with, for the most part, if you
19 call it a cut line or whatnot. But we have passed
20 that out and we've said, okay, in fiscal year '98, we
21 were going to receive about fifteen, sixteen million
22 dollars. In '99 it was going to be thirty,
23 thirty-four million dollars. And in 2000, it was

1 going to be twenty-three million. And I remember
2 giving out a sheet to that effect.

3 And we are tracking with that.
4 This peer review could impact on that. It could say,
5 well -- it really hasn't, but it could say, well, you
6 know, in year '99, it looks like you're not going to
7 need that much money. After we've gone through and
8 looked at your program, it's a lot cheaper than that.
9 Maybe you ought to only get, you know, seventy-five
10 percent of that.

11 But that's not what we've got at
12 this point, because really, McClellan still does not
13 have enough data to define which direction it's going
14 on a lot of its sites, on a majority of its sites.
15 That was the big thing that came out of this peer
16 review. And I think there was some frustration on the
17 part of the members, because we weren't able to
18 present them with enough data for them to say, well,
19 you got to stop your program here, you really don't
20 need to spend anymore money, because we didn't have
21 our sites characterized well enough.

22 In fact, you know, we're still in
23 the SI and the RI phase. And that's the difficulty of

1 anybody saying to me at McClellan, you don't need that
2 much money in '99. I can't tell you I don't need that
3 much money in '99, because in fact I don't know at
4 this point what my sites are going to be like after we
5 finish this round of investigation.

6 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Well, how did
7 they get those figures, then? If you don't know what
8 needs to be cleaned up and how much is going to be
9 applied to each site, how did they give you those
10 dollar figures of what you're going to get?

11 MR. RON LEVY: It was an estimation
12 based on various things, you know, the sites we were
13 investigating, the programs we had, the number of
14 acres that we had on the installation.

15 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Past history.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Past history, yes.

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: And you really
18 -- it is a guessing game when you first start out.
19 That's why we're doing just tons of SIs right now. In
20 fact, we're going to be doing probably by fall gets
21 here, eighty SIs this summer on eighty parcels. And
22 then from there, through the tiered-risk assessment
23 approach, a lot are going to fall out, we're going to

1 no-further action and move forward.

2 But until we get every parcel out
3 here, at least some form of investigation, either a
4 heavy archive search or sampling, we won't know what
5 we need as far as funding. That's why, you know, Ron
6 and Lisa really have to do a lot of just educated
7 guessing sometimes. But it's tough.

8 MR. RON LEVY: We use the best data
9 we have available to establish what the costs are for
10 our projects. And a lot of times it's not a whole
11 lot, so we worse case it and we assume that we're
12 going to go straight through from -- remember the
13 CERCLA process from SI, RI, RD and then remedial
14 action. We assume the worst case that we're going to
15 go through and do clean up for site A, which may mean
16 we're taking all the first three foot of soils off it
17 or something like that. We have worst cased all of
18 our projects. And I think that's what the funding
19 requires.

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: When we sat
21 down and looked at each individual parcel, we actually
22 sat down as a team and said, okay, look at the
23 history. And then on the schedule that you'll see in

1 the BRAC clean-up plan -- let's say it was a tank site
2 -- and we knew that probably, based on the data we
3 had, you don't necessarily full blow it all out to the
4 end. We do say an SI and then decision document and
5 then go from there. T-24 Alpha, we worst cased it as
6 far as funding, what we needed. We knew it looked
7 bad. Looked at the worst offenders in the water.
8 We're going to need a lot more money compared to other
9 sites. So, that's kind of how we took it, as far as
10 our approach.

11 Landfill three, we worst cased it.
12 Landfill one and two, well, based on the data, they're
13 probably not going to be worst cased. So, that's kind
14 of how you have to go through this process, as far as
15 knowing how much money to ask for.

16 MR. RON LEVY: I think what your
17 concern is or where the RAB's concerns is, Fern has
18 been saying is that he doesn't want to see the Army
19 pull money from McClellan to go someplace else for
20 whatever reason. And I don't have any control over
21 that, other than to say, oh, okay, if you do that to
22 me Army, these are the impacts to our program and to
23 these sites. That's the only thing I can do. It's

1 still -- it's not my decision as to, you know, where
2 the money actually goes to. I identify to the best of
3 my abilities and if they decide to pull money to go
4 someplace else, then all I can say is look, these are
5 the impacts to doing this. It may impact the reuse
6 plan in this sense. It may impact health and safety
7 issues. You know, whatever those impacts are, I'm to
8 let them know. But the decision really isn't at our
9 level.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But as a board,
11 we need to understand ahead of time what that money is
12 budgeted for, programmed for, and then if and when
13 something like this happens, we have the underpinnings
14 to understand what its impact is and do something
15 about it or accept it. And that's what I'm talking
16 about trying to get us educated on. If it is
17 possible, I would like to get another copy --

18 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, sir.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- myself, of
20 that that you laid out for that funding. I'm not sure
21 I did get it before.

22 MR. RON LEVY: It's also in the
23 BRAC clean-up plan, too.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I didn't see it
2 in there.

3 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: After some
4 meetings we had with EPA, if the peer review team or
5 whoever wants to question the risk assessment process
6 that we're working on as far as McClellan, they're
7 going to have a hard time, I think, shooting down what
8 we've got lined up for McClellan, because not only do
9 we have Region Four EPA, of course, us, the state and
10 the Army, when you got three agencies that are already
11 agreeing on the best way to go down the road and then
12 you've got an outside team coming in and, you know,
13 trying to shoot it down, to me it's more difficult.
14 But I really don't think that we're going to have any
15 disagreement with the peer review team after they see
16 our response.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And I don't
18 want to presuppose that, either.

19 MR. RON LEVY: But I got a little
20 different view than Chris, because I don't see it --
21 the peer review team was not there just to shoot --
22 and I don't think the words "shoot down." They were,
23 as a technical body, there to identify better

1 alternatives, cheaper ways of doing things, things to
2 make the program better, and they're not strictly just
3 to cut dollars. And I think they've attempted to do
4 that. So, I don't want anybody walking away from here
5 thinking that their whole job was to come in here and
6 just try to save money for Fort McClellan or for the
7 Army. That wasn't the case. I don't believe that to
8 be true, at all.

9 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Then they're not
10 the environmentally Wal-Marts?

11 MR. RON LEVY: You know, I can tell
12 you this: That we and folks in the environmental
13 community have been accused of studying things to
14 death and spending a lot of money on things that --

15 and never actually getting anywhere. And this is part
16 of a process to say, look, you know, you got to cut it
17 off at some point. Is there a impact to the health
18 and safety? Does it really affect reuse of the
19 property? And that's one of the things they're trying
20 to do.

21 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Will we ever get
22 to a stage where you got the visibility that Colonel
23 Thomassy is talking about, that there will be, this is

1 the amount of money you got and this is where it's
2 going to be applied so you have that visibility there
3 and then you can see where some of it is chopped off
4 at the MACOM level? Will we ever get to that stage,
5 knowing you've got concerns over your contract and
6 that you can't divulge the stuff out? But will this
7 board ever get to that stage?

8 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know. There
9 is a level of detail I definitely can't give you
10 because of the contracting issues. So, I don't know
11 that we would ever get to that stage. I can tell you
12 -- I can certainly tell you when money is removed from
13 -- you know, from our program, if that's what you're
14 interested in. I can tell you what our program is on
15 an annual basis. I'll certainly provide that
16 information. But project by project is difficult
17 because again, it's a contracting issue and it
18 provides information that I've been told that I can't
19 give out.

20 MR. JIMMY PARKS: But at the time
21 you award the contract, you could?

22 MR. RON LEVY: For that fiscal
23 year. But for out years, it would be difficult.

1 I can certainly show you what we've
2 spent in previous fiscal years, if that's what you're
3 interested in or what we've already awarded, at this
4 point. I understand what you were saying to me
5 before, Fern. You wanted that list showing the fiscal
6 year dollars that were programmed to the installation.
7 I was thinking something different.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, and the
9 projects within --

10 MR. RON LEVY: I can show you the
11 projects but I can't show you the break-outs of those
12 projects.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, I
14 understand that, right.

15 MR. RON LEVY: And we can do that.
16 In fact, I'll have it for you next meeting.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Any other discussion
19 on money?

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Or any other
21 items in the peer review team's reports? They spent a
22 lot of time talking about the decision-making process
23 that they would like to see Fort McClellan and the

1 base or BRAC clean-up team use. I think that was
2 quite interesting.

3 They also went into -- and I would
4 assume that we'd have some access to, if we wanted,
5 the technical aspects of the decision-making process.
6 If we for any reason feel we need to get into and
7 understand the technology that's out there to do
8 certain clean-up actions, when that comes about, there
9 is a lot of support there to provide us that
10 information if we need it.

11 MR. RON LEVY: And we can bring
12 people in from -- just depends on what you want --
13 from the peer review team to talk about those areas,
14 if you wish. We can use the RAB money to do that. We
15 can even ask ADC to pay for it, themselves.

16 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I'm not --
17 repeat what you said, now. You said you would like
18 more information regarding the decision logic that the
19 BRAC clean-up team is going to be using, as far as
20 making their decisions?

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: No. I said
22 it's in their report. Does anybody have any comments
23 or questions on it, because it was extensive

1 throughout the report?

2 In addition, they made comments
3 about the technical side, especially of clean-up
4 methodologies and technologies and the fact that they
5 have to be considered in detail and gave references on
6 where that information can be gleaned from. And I
7 wonder if anybody had any questions or comments on
8 that. I wasn't --

9 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes, I do have
10 a comment on that. And I told the peer review team
11 this when they came in and Ron that it was kind of --
12 it was kind of upsetting that they couldn't come in
13 probably a year from the date they did. Really,
14 everything was too early, because there were a lot of
15 things that are going on and were going on that we
16 knew we had to implement and are implementing now.
17 And I have -- it would have been nicer to have the
18 peer review team say come in this fall, after a lot of
19 this stuff has been --

20 MR. RON LEVY: Shh, they'll be
21 back.

22 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: -- brought
23 forth where, you know, the recommendations would have

1 been, I think, a lot more handy or usable, because
2 right now -- I just got off the phone earlier today
3 with IT Corporation, talking about the decision logic
4 and how we're going to actually go through some of
5 this. And we certainly are thinking outside the box
6 at McClellan on how we're going to develop our process
7 for bringing sites from cradle to grave. And we do --
8 there are things, though, in there that they
9 recommended that we, you know, we have disagreement
10 with, that I think you guys, you know, will know about
11 or hear about.

12 But, all and all, I think that most
13 of the recommendations were, you know, somewhat --
14 they were valid and needed to be addressed, because
15 there are a lot of dollars wasted on super fund

16 clean-ups across the nation. And Congress, as well as
17 states and EPA, are getting pounded about it. But I
18 certainly -- I want to make sure that we are
19 addressing the RAB's concerns as far as what risk
20 assessment approach we're using and how we are getting
21 through that process.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Uh-huh.

23 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: And I think

1 just we the BCT can answer those questions, as well.
2 And feel free to comment if you've got a question on
3 it in detail.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And I would
5 think a lot of it would be your presentation of your
6 rationale to us. And that's going to be a learning
7 process for us. It really is. And that's why I think
8 it's important again to go back and at least read
9 those comments, because in most cases, I think you're
10 saying that they're right in line with what you're
11 doing, anyhow. So, it's a restatement of what you're
12 doing. And if we understand the rationale behind
13 risk-based analysis and cost effectiveness, it's going
14 to make it a lot easier for us to understand the
15 direction that the BRAC clean-up team is going and I
16 think stop some of the idealistic views that might
17 easily come out, which are probably in some cases what
18 you would like to have happen, like taking something
19 back to the background levels that you can never do
20 because first you probably couldn't even define them,
21 let alone cost effectively ever get there. And so
22 those types of things, I think we need to understand.
23 Any other questions or comments? Any questions of the

1 --

2 MR. DONALD CUNNINGHAM: I think the
3 only comment I have is to realize they are certainly
4 familiar with the funding and fiscal year aspects of
5 it. I would assume that these folks are working on
6 the allocation of '99 funds, as we speak. And so,
7 given that and the fact that I'm hearing that the data
8 collection is not yet completed, that will, I assume,
9 drive our requests for funding, do we have -- are we
10 behind a power curve I guess is my question?

11 MR. RON LEVY: I don't believe so,
12 no. In fact, from a funding standpoint, I think we
13 have documented -- we've well documented what our
14 requirements are, being very conservative to ensure
15 that we don't miss anything. And in fact, there is
16 adequate funding, at this point, that I'm aware of,
17 unless things change -- and I don't believe things are
18 -- there is any plan changed upcoming. So, I could
19 tell you that I think -- I feel comfortable with our
20 funding for '99. And again, we're still doing --
21 we're moving into the RI phase in '99 for most of our
22 sites. And we will have some data back to go with the
23 decision possibly just to NFRAP a lot of sites in '99.

1 We're just not, yet.

2 Out years, I can't tell you. It's
3 a guess, it's a definite guess. But again, we've been
4 very conservative, too, even in our out years, in
5 terms of our cost.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Anybody else?
7 Why don't we take a ten minute break, give Sam's
8 fingers a rest, and then we'll come on back and go
9 into the community relations report.

10 (WHEREUPON, there was a brief recess.)

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It looks like
12 half of the group ran. So, we need to finish up with
13 those that are left. And the next item on the agenda
14 was the community relations report. Ron gave a
15 excellent presentation at the Jacksonville Exchange
16 Club. Ron.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I had an
18 opportunity to talk to the Jacksonville Exchange Club,
19 to talk to them about the RAB, to talk to them about
20 the clean-up process and some of the things that are
21 going on at Fort McClellan. I thought it was a good
22 little meeting. Didn't really get a whole lot of
23 questions. Fern was there. Barry was there, Barry

1 Cox was there representing the RAB.

2 I think we want to do that more
3 often. I know that Joan McKinney is in the process of
4 setting that up. I think she's got another plan to go
5 to Oxford and do who?

6 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: In August.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Do who in August?

8 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: You had talked
9 about going out in the community every other month.
10 So, we'll speak at the Kiwanis Noonday Club in August.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. This time
12 maybe we can get Fern to do the talking and I'll sit
13 in the crowd.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Sure, I'll be
15 glad to give some of them. But we have sixteen
16 members on this board, too, and some of the others are
17 certainly welcome to give it or others in the future.
18 I'll be glad to do it in August, as long as it's not
19 the weekend of the 21st.

20 MR. DONALD CUNNINGHAM: Do we have
21 pretty much of a canned, not a canned, but a
22 standardized briefing with slides and that sort of
23 thing?

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: We've got a
2 couple of outlines with slides that have been used.
3 And I would expect that whoever is giving the
4 presentation would look at those and then mold them
5 into what they feel comfortable saying. Ron gave an
6 excellent one that laid out the process and brought in
7 a few things that hadn't been discussed at other
8 meetings.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Let me -- before we
10 go on, I wanted to just allow Angela, Chuck, and
11 Gaynor, if they wanted to leave at this point, and
12 tell them thanks for coming down and going through the
13 peer review process with the RAB. We really
14 appreciate you doing that. We may ask you back in the
15 future for some additional information.

16 MR. CHUCK LECHNER: That's okay.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: If there is
18 anymore aquifer questions, Gaynor has to come back.
19 That was a good explanation.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: It sure was. Did
21 a good job.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thanks.
23 Presentations were excellent. Great to have you here.

1 That got us off to the right start on that peer review
2 team.

3 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: You shouldn't
4 have said if, you should have said when.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Won't go away.

6 MR. RON LEVY: Fern, the other
7 thing is, Joan, do you have anything additionally you
8 want to add to the record as it relates to community
9 relations information?

10 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: We are working
11 also to go into the Oxford community in August. That
12 will also be our quarterly community meeting. But
13 that was just it, basically.

14 MR. RON LEVY: I think what we've
15 said is we'll try to notify the RAB of these things in
16 the future. If somebody wants to step up and say,
17 yes, I would like to do that, like Fern said, we'll be
18 glad to entertain the thought of letting you do that.
19 Come out and we'll do the next briefing.

20 I think we had something written in
21 the bylaws about that, if I'm not correct, as it
22 relates to --

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes. It's a

1 community sub-committee.

2 MR. RON LEVY: I don't see anything
3 specific.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I don't think
5 there was anything more than just the fact that we
6 will have a community relations committee. We never
7 did formalize a set of bylaws for it.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. That's all
9 I've got in relation to the community.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All right.
11 Next item was old business. Which was new business on
12 the last one. And, of course, that's been provided to
13 us. Anybody have any comments on the building that
14 probably the FMDC is going to lease? Is that the old
15 DRM building?

16 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Yes, sir.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, up here in
18 the corner.

19 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Uh-huh.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Old business, one
21 thing. Just a couple of corrections on this. You got
22 a piece of paper in there that says, Fort McClellan
23 Base Clean-Up Team. It should say Fort McClellan BRAC

1 Clean-Up Team. One of the questions that was asked of
2 me last time was who exactly was on that team. And
3 there is a listing there. I would tell you that the
4 gentleman on the bottom, Mr. David Skridulis, in terms
5 of him being on the team, he is part of the team when
6 we discuss UXO issues. However, the core team really
7 consists of the six individuals, top six individuals
8 that are listed there. And Chris may want to add
9 something to that. Do you have anything you want to
10 say about that, Chris?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes, and that
12 he just -- when we're talking about UXO, he'll be
13 invited to the meetings. But it's like Ron said, he's
14 not a BCT member.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ad hoc member
16 for UXO, huh?

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

18 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Could you explain
19 how the corporation member got on there?

20 MR. RON LEVY: About the who, IT?

21 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Uh-huh.

22 MR. RON LEVY: IT is our
23 contractor. And in fact, all our contract work is

1 done through IT, so, they --

2 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Is that your SIS
3 and that stuff?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Pretty much. Pretty
5 much. For the most part. They sub things down, also.
6 But for the most part, IT provides -- because of the
7 way we've set ourselves up, they provide instantaneous
8 ability to craft and fix documents to get through
9 issues that are really going to expect the contractor
10 to do, anyways. They're also a decision maker, in
11 terms of the way certain documents fit and work. And
12 their input has turned out to be really valuable to
13 us.

14 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Where are they
15 out of?

16 MR. RON LEVY: Knoxville.

17 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Ron, where are we
18 in the process, as far as we've identified the areas
19 and we're supposed to be identifying -- try to
20 identify what particularly is in the area? And then,
21 of course, we're not to the cost area -- cost
22 analysis, yet, of -- because you have to identify
23 what's in the area. Am I correct? So, where are we

1 in that process?

2 MR. RON LEVY: In this fiscal year,
3 we were programmed to do the majority. And if you
4 remember the chart that I showed you that said SI,
5 site investigation, remedial investigation,
6 feasibility study, remedial design, remedial action,

7 we're in the SI phase. In fact, '98, majority of
8 funding was in the SI phase. And in fact, we've got a
9 lot of SI work actually going on latter part of the
10 summer, probably in August, going through until
11 probably December. The majority of our program will
12 be right there and the SI phase will be complete.

13 In '99, where our funding comes in,
14 that's when we move into the remedial investigation
15 phase, where we really look at the characterization of
16 the site. We expect to have a lot of sites drop out
17 after we've completed the SI phase. There should be
18 some cost savings, because the data just won't support
19 the need to do any actual clean-up.

20 And then there is the UXO program,
21 which is a little different. We've got a three-phased
22 approach to that. I've showed you how that works.
23 You know, the first phase being the eastern bypass,

1 the second was the areas in and around the remaining
2 development area, and the third was the Choccolocco
3 Mountains. We've already been funded to do what you
4 might call SI type work, EE/CAs in fiscal year '98.
5 Well, we've been funded fiscal year '98 to do that
6 work. And then from there, we probably move into
7 whatever clearance requirements for the eastern bypass
8 in the next year. In fact, we've already programmed
9 for clearance in '99 for the eastern bypass, also the
10 remaining development area. And then the year 2000
11 for the Choccolocco Mountains.

12 So, from that standpoint, that's
13 where we're at in the program. That's just a real
14 macro view of it, though.

15 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: But there are
16 sites that are further along. I mean, like landfill
17 three, we've gotten the ground water data back. We're
18 going to keep moving it forward. In fact, we're going
19 to have a meeting probably next month. Everybody is
20 going to review the data and see what we need to do.
21 You know, as far as, you know, are we going to take
22 more samples in the deep water and see how they're
23 interconnected, see how they're moving towards, you

1 know, Weaver wells. And so, it will -- things will be
2 moving concurrently and not just -- but the critical
3 part to me was key was the getting the EBS right and
4 making sure we had every piece of property identified
5 on this base. And then next was getting an
6 investigation done on every piece of property that we
7 weren't sure about to see where we needed to go with
8 each of them. So, there was kind of a somewhat delay
9 in the RIs that were currently going on, like landfill
10 three and T-24, just to kind of get everything else
11 moving.

12 And I think now that we are going
13 to be doing a bunch of SIs up here. In fact, if you
14 got time, I think it would be nice if some of them
15 could come out and just see some of the fieldwork from
16 a distance.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. There will be
18 a lot of field work going on in the fall through the
19 winter. And what I'll attempt to do is try to
20 coordinate some visits for some folks to see what's
21 going on out here.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: See how many
23 people you can get out in August and get them to suit

1 up.

2 MR. RON LEVY: Level one.

3 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, you got
4 your forty hours, so you can probably come on out and
5 help.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Thanks.

7 Any other old business? Any new
8 business?

9 The next meeting. I don't have a
10 date for it.

11 MR. RON LEVY: I've got it. Let's
12 see. Next meeting in the month of --

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Month of July.

14 MR. RON LEVY: -- month of July,
15 third Monday would be the 20th of July. And that's
16 going to be here in this building.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay.

18 MR. RON LEVY: 6:30.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Do we have a
20 topic?

21 MR. RON LEVY: No, we don't.
22 However, one of the things we discussed was going back
23 to the BRAC clean-up plan and going back through that

1 again.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right.

3 MR. RON LEVY: If you would like,
4 we'll go back in and we'll start looking at that some
5 more.

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I would.
7 Anybody here have a different view or have a different
8 need?

9 MR. DONALD CUNNINGHAM: Sounds good
10 to me.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think the
12 BRAC clean-up plan is really the foundation for what
13 we need to understand right now.

14 MR. RON LEVY: I would ask you to
15 bring your BRAC clean-up plans with you. And, Joan,
16 in the note that goes out the next time, would you put
17 a little reminder there to bring it with them?

18 MR. FERN THOMASSY: One question,
19 Chris. I saw in the peer review document that there
20 was a comment about putting more on the radiological
21 investigations and studies and work that has been done
22 into the environmental baseline study. Is that
23 something that's going to be added into it then?

1 MR. RON LEVY: What we've done --
2 in fact, we're going to do what we're calling an
3 archive search report to try to gather in all of these
4 sites into one concise document similar to what we've
5 got in the baseline.

6 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes. A lot of
7 the information was just in John May's head and we
8 were like trying to get it on paper before he leaves
9 the base, that way, there is more details in the EBS
10 on each of the sites.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's what was
12 behind it. So, a lot of that stuff is not down on
13 paper.

14 MR. RON LEVY: Well, we -- it's
15 captured in the EBS, but not to the level of detail we
16 intend to go into and have a concise document that
17 looks at all the RAD sites on McClellan.

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: We do have
19 three RAD sites that we're NFRAP'ing already. In
20 fact, we got a letter coming. Bart has already got
21 his letter to Ron. And I got a confirmation back from
22 radiation control three. So, we've already --

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And that's

1 something that this board needs to understand, because
2 it's not just us providing information on what's
3 going, but I think, also, we need to tell the
4 community what's been done, because there are a lot of
5 people that think this place closes at night. And
6 those things that have happened two and three decades
7 ago, in many cases been cleaned up, but a lot of
8 people in this community that know about the accident
9 over at the reactor and the tanks that were leaking
10 and things like that. And those -- that will help us,
11 I think, as we go out and talk. I would like to put
12 it into the Oxford presentation.

13 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, what I'll
14 do for you, if I get copies of those letters, I'll
15 provide them as information. Also, we've gotten
16 letters back from Chris and Bart, ADEM and EBS, in
17 concurrence with the exceptions that we've talked to
18 you about before, as it relates to the ranges and lead
19 base paint and soils issues. So, I'll provide those,
20 copies of those so that you have those, as well, and
21 know where our regulators stand on that document.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: All right.

23 MR. RON LEVY: But we do consider

1 that a success. We just have other issues we've got
2 to get to.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Any other new
4 business? Any other comments? Would anybody like to
5 quit? I'm not going to adjourn. This meeting can't
6 vote anything.

7 (WHEREUPON, the proceeding was concluded.)

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 18th day of June, 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