

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 16th day of November, 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	3-111
CERTIFICATE112-113

1 MR. PETE CONROY: This is the
2 November meeting of the Fort McClellan RAB. And I'll
3 call the roll. Mark Anderson? Ike Brown? James
4 Buford? Barry Cox? Don Cunningham? Jerome Elser.

5 MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Alan Faust?

7 MR. ALAN FAUST: Here.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Mary Harrington?

9 Ron Hood?

10 MR. RONALD HOOD: Yes, sir.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: Ed Kimbrough?

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: Margaret

14 Longstreth? James Miller?

15 MR. JAMES MILLER: Here.

16 MR. PETE CONROY: Jimmy Parks?

17 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Here.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Fern Thomassy?

19 Charles Turner? John Johnson? Chris Johnson?

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Here.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Ron Levy? And

22 Bart Reedy?

23 MR. BART REEDY: Here.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: Does anybody know
2 if anybody is coming that is not here at the moment?

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I didn't get
4 any calls.

5 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Where is Ron?

6 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Ron is sick,
7 ill.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Would you all
9 care to introduce yourselves, even though I know who
10 most of y'all are. Don?

11 MR. DON WALTERS: Don Walters, I'm
12 the outdoor writer for The Anniston Star.

13 MR. HARRY THOMAS: I'm Harry
14 Thomas. I work in the Directorate of Environment.

15 MR. JEFF ROBERTSON: I'm Jeff
16 Robertson. I work for Reece Engineering.

17 MR. PAUL JAMES: I'm Paul James. I
18 work in the Directorate of Environment.

19 MR. MCGUIRE: Paul (phonetic)
20 McGuire. I work in Public Affairs, Fort McClellan.

21 MAJOR MIKE JOHNSON: Major Mike
22 Johnson for the Chemical School, the Environmental
23 Proponency Officer.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: Good to have
2 y'all here. A little bit of a light turnout this
3 evening. I'm glad we don't have too many heavy votes
4 this evening. In fact, maybe the reason there is a
5 light turnout is because we didn't have an organized
6 speaker tonight. But we do have a couple of issues
7 that we wanted to talk about.

8 So, with your permission, the first
9 thing I would like to do is ask for members of our BCT
10 to tell us in your words where you think we are as it
11 relates to cleanup. And any preference? Bart, do you
12 want to give an informal review of where we are right
13 now?

14 MR. BART REEDY: Yes. Right now,
15 the contractor IT is out doing the SIs that we've
16 talked about. They ran into a problem that all of us,
17 the contractor and Chris and Bart and everybody else,
18 anticipated, and that was that one of the little
19 gizmos we were going to use to poke holes to get
20 ground water wouldn't work in some locations. So,
21 they've got a couple of drill rigs out, putting, you
22 know, permanent wells in.

23 We would expect to get -- start

1 getting data back in within the next month, depending
2 on what -- how IT is going to massage that date.
3 "Massage" meaning, how they're going to run the QA and
4 the QC. We know how they're going to do that. But
5 how they're going to report that and then how they are
6 going to present it.

7 So, we're expecting data by the --
8 well, I would expect it by the end of the year,
9 wouldn't you?

10 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Some of it.
11 Some of it --

12 MR. BART REEDY: It's going to
13 start trickling in.

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: -- will start
15 trickling in.

16 MR. BART REEDY: And then when it
17 does, the data that we take right here goes through an
18 extremely rigorous QAQC.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: Tell everybody
20 what that means.

21 MR. BART REEDY: Quality assurance
22 and quality control. A number -- we send spikes, we
23 send blanks and matrix blanks. We'll send a clean

1 test tube out there, disguised. And they won't know
2 what it is. And then we'll check, make sure they
3 didn't get it dirty, you know, from the exhaust of the
4 truck, things like that.

5 And there is an extremely rigorous
6 chain of custody. Bart gave it to Chris at this time
7 and this date and Chris gave it to Mr. Kimbrough,
8 Mayor Kimbrough on this date, so we can track it all
9 the way down the line.

10 And that's part of the -- that's
11 just built in. And that's part of the delay from
12 taking the sample and running the analysis until we
13 get a piece of paper that says, sample fifteen at site
14 eight, and here is what we found.

15 But once that starts coming, it's
16 going to be coming in the -- the data is going to be
17 coming in very hot and very heavy, a lot of it. And
18 --

19 MR. PETE CONROY: When do you
20 anticipate more or less -- when is that going to be?

21 MR. BART REEDY: I would imagine it
22 will start trickling in some time right before
23 Christmas and then after the first of the year, most

1 of it will be ready to come in the door. And at that
2 time, we'll be able to start the evaluation process on
3 all of the gray sites, the category seven sites, and
4 be able to say, it's clean, it's dirty, and make a
5 decision at that point.

6 We've had oversight from EPA and
7 then we also -- EPA has a contractor. And Chris and I
8 worked out an arrangement that I've got a -- I've got
9 a contractor on EPA payroll really. And Chris has
10 some things he wants them to watch for. I've got
11 things I want to watch for. And then we've got a
12 standard suite of things to watch for, to make sure
13 that they're doing what we all thought we were talking
14 about doing.

15 And that's ongoing, now, as well.
16 That's a big effort. And that's nearly -- nearly
17 continuous oversight, so that when we do get the data
18 back, we won't have any unanswered questions. Well,
19 the data is good or the data is bad or we weren't
20 there or where was the truck parked, we'll have all
21 that covered, already. So, it won't be a -- there
22 will be minimal second guessing.

23 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Does that feed

1 into your base cleanup plan?

2 MR. BART REEDY: Oh, absolutely.

3 That's part and parcel of it, sir.

4 MR. JIMMY PARKS: And then that
5 will feed the budget --

6 MR. BART REEDY: Yes, exactly.

7 MR. JIMMY PARKS: -- of how you're
8 going to clean it up?

9 MR. BART REEDY: Right. When we --
10 let's say that this, the data is all in next summer.
11 Let's say in June it's completely in and in black and
12 white. We will be able, as the BCT then, to say, we
13 -- this site is clean, you can transfer it now,
14 whatever transfer mechanism. This site, we're not
15 really sure about. We've got some hits here that are
16 causing -- that we think we ought to look at a little
17 bit closer.

18 And based on that then, we'll get
19 Lisa and Ron -- and Lisa, to go to the -- go back to
20 the Army and go, we've got this many sites and here is
21 what we think is wrong with them. And our best guess
22 right now, based on the information we have is: It's
23 going to cost this many dollars to come to a -- to

1 complete an RI, the remedial investigation, should one
2 be warranted.

3 But your point is absolutely
4 accurate. At that time, then the budget process comes
5 back on our screen again.

6 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Okay.

7 MR. BART REEDY: Anybody got
8 anything?

9 MR. PETE CONROY: How many new
10 wells are being put in right now, more or less?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: The problem --
12 the problem on the wells, see, what we're doing with
13 that direct push is that that -- it's been so dry here
14 and really so dry in the southeast, that this was
15 probably the worst time in the last twenty years to go
16 out and take ground water samples and surface water
17 samples, because there's not -- the ground water is
18 deep right now, and there is no surface water.

19 The problem is, is that we have to
20 have that data to make decisions. So, luckily, this
21 rain event, I think, is going to help some. We've had
22 some good rains. It should help bring the water
23 levels back up, start getting some water back in the

1 creeks that we originally were going to sample. So,
2 that's another reason why a lot of this data is going
3 to trickle in, because really we don't want them to
4 put the report together until we get all the data for
5 all --

6 MR. BART REEDY: That' true.

7 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: -- for each
8 media that we're sampling on these sites. So, that
9 way it's a complete package. And they send it. And
10 we review all the different media from ground water,
11 surface water, sed, you name it. And you can be able
12 to say, there is a release here, there is not, and
13 move forward.

14 So, that's why there is certain
15 sites where we are putting in permanent wells versus
16 not using the direct push, just going down there and
17 grabbing a sample and coming back, because the direct
18 push just can't get down in that -- in those hard
19 zones, rock zones, like, you know, a rotary drill can.

20 MR. BART REEDY: And they're --
21 like you said, they are having to go deeper than --

22 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes, than they
23 normally would.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: I'm sorry. How
2 is that done? Is it you go until you get water?

3 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, I mean,
4 there is a point where, you know, obviously you
5 wouldn't want to go two hundred feet. I mean, either,
6 if you're not going to -- you know you're not going to
7 get water -- and it's really the geologist's call on
8 site. But if you're not getting water typically
9 around here, you know, I would -- thirty, forty foot,
10 you should be hitting water. If not, pick up and
11 maybe we need to relocate the sample location.

12 Because, you know, normally in the
13 past, we're hitting water on the average, main post
14 down in this area, probably in the twenty, twenty-five
15 foot depth.

16 So, it's -- I believe with the rain
17 events and at least, even if we have to push some of
18 the ground water, get all the other media and push
19 some of the ground water sampling over into the
20 spring, we'll get the water we need to make the
21 decisions we need.

22 I wanted to add one thing on the
23 UXO site, is that we are -- we're moving there, too.

1 We're reviewing -- actually, we've just completed our
2 review of the draft EECA for the bypass. We're
3 meeting Friday --

4 MR. PETE CONROY: Everybody
5 remember what the EECA is?

6 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Environmental
7 Evaluation Cost Analysis. It's just another work plan
8 that says, this is how we're going to sample and
9 investigate the corridor.

10 MR. BART REEDY: And that is coming
11 out of Huntsville.

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right.

13 MR. BART REEDY: That's where --

14 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: It's ZAPATA
15 Engineering was contracted by Huntsville to do this
16 work. So, IT is not doing UXO investigations here.
17 It's from another contractor.

18 We're going to meet Friday to hash
19 out our differences on that work plan and work for a
20 final work plan, hopefully, you know, within a couple
21 of weeks to three weeks after Friday. And that way
22 they can start work on the bypass and get it going
23 with that.

1 So, it's really, as far as the work
2 plans and scheduling, everything has been going to
3 schedule. We're going to be doing some removal
4 actions. In fact, right up here, we're going to be
5 removing these pistol ranges in building 141. And is
6 it 143?

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: 143.

8 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: We're going to
9 be doing that, hopefully before the year is out.
10 We've got a couple of little things to work out on the
11 work plan there. So, we'll actually be, you know,
12 seeing some -- you know, seeing some diesel smoke, as
13 Bart puts it.

14 MR. BART REEDY: If you're -- you
15 know, I had a family issue to come up, and I've been
16 gone a couple of months, so you guys may have already
17 talked about this. But, we could, if you want to go
18 out and see what it is that we do, we can probably
19 make that happen, get you out on site and see how --
20 see how the -- see how a hole is drilled, see how a
21 well is put in, see the sampling, see how it's taken
22 care of, and put -- you know, put a face with the
23 phone you've been talking to, so to speak. And it

1 really would kind of bring things to life for you.

2 And we can make that happen some way or another.

3 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I would like to
4 see Pete in level A, wouldn't you?

5 MR. BART REEDY: Yes.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Are you a friend
7 or --

8 MR. BART REEDY: Yes, we are. We
9 like you.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: We've talked
11 about that before. And actually, that offer has been
12 made before by yourselves and Ron. But I think it's
13 really gotten kind of a well, whatever, let's see
14 response. Do you want to get out calendars? Do you
15 want to actually set up a date and do that? Is that
16 something that would be of interest to you all?

17 MR. JAMES MILLER: Would it be any
18 different today than what it was a year, year and a
19 half ago? Because I know I went on one of these on a
20 Saturday.

21 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Was that just a
22 site tour, now? We're talking about --

23 MR. JERRY ELSER: We only went on a

1 site tour.

2 MR. JAMES MILLER: We went on a
3 site tour.

4 MR. BART REEDY: Now, this is
5 totally different.

6 MR. JAMES MILLER: And they showed
7 us where the wells were and the pipes going into the
8 ground.

9 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: This is really
10 more getting in there and seeing how they take a
11 sample, how they put in a well, you know, how you
12 sample a stream, more on the physical aspects of the
13 investigation, not really just a whirlwind tour of the
14 site.

15 MR. BART REEDY: Now, what you went
16 on was a bus tour of the sites.

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yeah.

18 MR. BART REEDY: What we're talking
19 about is the crew actually out there, doing what we
20 told them -- what the BCT told them to do, taking the
21 samples the way we said to take them. And you can see
22 how all that works. And if you haven't seen it
23 before, it's interesting.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: Let's set a date.

2 MR. JAMES MILLER: Yes, I would be
3 interested.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: What are the
5 parameters of when a good time would be?

6 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Really, we
7 ought to get with IT and find out when they're going
8 to be doing, you know, some --

9 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: If y'all
10 would, if you're interested, call me.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: We're interested.

12 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Well, I need
13 some names. Who? How many people?

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Let's do a show
15 of hands right now. First of all, would it be
16 possible -- my preference, and this is personal -- but
17 my preference would be during the week and not a
18 weekend.

19 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: IT usually
20 works Monday through Friday and they go home Saturday
21 and Sunday and come back out.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: So far, so good.
23 Have we lost anyone based on work week?

1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Friday, I would
2 prefer Friday. I don't work on Fridays.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay Fridays are
4 best for you. That's good with me. Show of hands so
5 far who is with this.

6 MR. RONALD HOOD: Except for
7 Friday. The only day I can do it is a Thursday.

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Ron, you can
9 give me a call and I can set something up separate for
10 you.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: So far, are --

12 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Friday. Now,
13 do they stop sampling at 3:00? I mean, is there --

14 MR. BART REEDY: The last -- yes,
15 we would need -- if my memory is correct, we had a big
16 issue of just because we happened to be kind of off
17 the freeway here, the samples have got to be handled
18 absolutely perfectly or when they get to the lab,
19 they're no good. And the issue was: Can't get them
20 to the Fed Ex people to get them on the airplane to
21 get them where they go.

22 So, they -- as last word I heard,
23 Lisa, was: They were twisting off somewhere in the

1 neighborhood of 2:30 to 3:00 o'clock on Fridays. So,
2 we would probably -- maybe noon.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: I would like to
4 propose December 4th or 11th.

5 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Because other
6 RAB members, too, probably need to have the invite --

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Exactly.

8 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Or any --
9 really, I guess anybody could --

10 MR. PETE CONROY: In fact, what I
11 would like to do is if we can get a consensus, I mean,
12 hey, if you show up at a meeting, you make some
13 decisions. And so why don't we decide on what date is
14 best. And then what I would like to do is invite
15 others. In fact, you know, the environmental club --
16 there is a brand new environmental club at JSU. So,
17 maybe some of the movers and shakers of that new club
18 --

19 MR. BART REEDY: That's fine.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: -- get some
21 college students to come with us. And why don't we
22 just set a date amongst ourselves right now. And the
23 4th or 11th, is that within the parameters of what

1 might work?

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: That's fine,
3 yes.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: And then what I
5 would like -- would it be possible, Lisa, to send out
6 or could we send out a notice to the others and say,
7 it is set for such and such a time? And then, of
8 course, they would have to contact y'all and confirm
9 their attendance.

10 MR. BART REEDY: We need to -- we
11 need to get with Jeannie and find out what sites
12 they're going to be working on so we'll know what kind
13 of a buffer you need to keep away, you know, because
14 we don't want something to happen. And we want to
15 ensure that whatever site that we go to -- and they're
16 working two crews, so -- but we want to ensure that
17 the sites that they're going to be working on will
18 have the things going on that, you know, that you'll
19 find interesting and revealing. There will be a drill
20 rig running, we'll be taking stream samples, and all
21 of those things, but I -- Jeannie can -- we can get
22 with her and tweak her schedule a little bit, one way
23 or another, to accommodate that, don't you think?

1 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Yes, if y'all
2 will leave me the two dates to work with, I can get
3 back with you.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

5 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Or Joan can
6 send out a notice on whichever day is best for IT.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Would there be
8 any objection to extending this to the general public
9 as a RAB invitation and relying on Don to make an
10 announcement or have someone at The Star make an
11 announcement? I see you look a little --

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: As long as they
13 are in the right zone and the site safety health
14 officer keeps you guys where he should, I don't think
15 it's going to be a major issue.

16 MR. PETE CONROY: And let me add to
17 that that they have to call ahead and so you would
18 have an idea --

19 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yeah.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: -- as to who is
21 coming.

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: How many?

23 MR. PETE CONROY: If we have like

1 three hundred, well obviously, that's of a different
2 management scenario and a community that I don't think
3 I live in. But the point being, if we had people
4 reserve a slot on the tour, then it would be more
5 manageable, wouldn't it?

6 MR. BART REEDY: We could get --
7 yank a section out of the work plan that would, you
8 know, bring -- that would have a site map on where we
9 intend on sampling and what we're going to sample for,
10 you know, so they can get a picture -- you know, so
11 you guys can have a picture in your mind of what it is
12 that we're trying to accomplish with all this
13 sampling. And then you go out and see the rigs, that
14 might add a little life to it, as well. You know,
15 just a site map with a sample location.

16 MR. PETE CONROY: Sounds great.

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Definitely, the
18 direct push, the drill rig operations, the mag
19 surveys, will definitely be things they want to see.

20 MR. BART REEDY: So, Pete, then the
21 target dates are 12-4, 12-11.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: 12:00 o'clock
23 noon. We'll hear back from Lisa when she confirms

1 that one day being better than the other.

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: And I'll work
3 on that tomorrow.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay. And then
5 we got a general notice out to everyone? Is 12:00
6 o'clock -- what's best, if they shut down at 2:30?
7 12:00 okay?

8 MR. JAMES MILLER: Sure, that will
9 be fine.

10 MR. BART REEDY: I would -- just as
11 a --

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Do they take
13 lunch?

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Good question.

15 MR. BART REEDY: Before you, you
16 know, run it in the paper as a --

17 MR. PETE CONROY: We're not going
18 to run anything until we hear back from Lisa, but --

19 MR. BART REEDY: Why don't we see
20 how many people are going to show up, including the
21 folks that you were talking about from Jacksonville
22 State, because if it gets --

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: If it gets

1 more than about ten or fifteen, you're not going to be
2 able to see anything, you're not going to be able to
3 hear, you're not going to get anything from the
4 experience.

5 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: If they have to
6 break it into a couple of tours --

7 MR. PETE CONROY: I would be
8 ecstatic if we had ten or fifteen people. And if we
9 had thirty --

10 MR. BART REEDY: Oh, we could
11 certainly get more than that, couldn't we?

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Yes.

13 MR. BART REEDY: Thank you.

14 MR. PETE CONROY: I would like to
15 think --

16 MR. BART REEDY: Well, we're going
17 to have to run ads in the paper, Pete.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: We may have to
19 actually provide financial incentive. Folks need to
20 know what's happening.

21 MR. JAMES MILLER: Free lunch.

22 MR. BART REEDY: But I really would
23 -- if we can get this set up -- and I don't see why we

1 can't -- I would really encourage you guys, y'all to
2 come out and see what it is that we're doing.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Yeah. And, Ed,
4 your very logical question is: Do they take a lunch
5 at 12:00 o'clock noon. But, Lisa, I know you'll check
6 on all that kind of stuff.

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: They can eat
8 lunch earlier.

9 MR. BART REEDY: Yes, that will
10 work.

11 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: We can work
12 around that.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: Chris, one other
14 thing. Your meeting on Friday, what are some of the
15 issues that are going to be on your plate Friday,
16 relating to UXO?

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: To UXO. I
18 think the -- mainly, there is some questions from our
19 end, lending to really some of the things in the
20 report on how it's written. It's a little unclear, as
21 far as where they're going to be doing their -- some
22 of their actual intrusive sampling, you know, in the
23 footprint. I think really it's -- from talking to

1 David at Huntsville, based on the comments I had, he
2 didn't foresee there being really any major issues
3 that we were going to have. I don't know from Bart's
4 -- I haven't had a chance to look at all EPA's
5 comments on the document. But I really, at this
6 point, can't foresee any major issues, yet, other than
7 trying to understand where they're actually going to
8 be doing the work. If they're going to physically
9 survey the entire footprint.

10 When I say "footprint," see, the --
11 see the footprint of the road there. If they're
12 actually going to geophysical and come down and do the
13 whole thing or bits and pieces of it within there.
14 And that right now, based on reading it, it's a little
15 confusing, the way it was written. So --

16 MR. PETE CONROY: So, this Friday
17 meeting is really a preliminary meeting then, in terms
18 of identifying where the work will be done?

19 MR. BART REEDY: I wouldn't
20 characterize it as that. I think, from the
21 conversations, Pete, that I have had with --

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: David
23 Skridulis, Valerie Clinkenbeard.

1 MR. BART REEDY: -- Valerie, the
2 questions that Chris and I and some of the other folks
3 have been looking at it, the questions that we had
4 were not on what you're doing, but where are you going
5 to do it, and how much of it are you going to do. And
6 when I talked to them on the phone, they were kind of
7 -- the lady that I spoke with, was kind of dumbfounded
8 that we couldn't pick that up from the report.

9 So, you know, it's just -- and
10 that's the way writing goes. You write something, it
11 sounds perfectly clear to you. And then when you send
12 it to somebody else, they can't make heads or tails of
13 it.

14 So, I think that -- I think I'm in
15 agreement with Chris here. I don't think it's a
16 preliminary meeting. I think we're pretty much on
17 board with what they're going to do. We just want to
18 make sure that we understand where -- where all
19 they're going to do it.

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: We want to
21 basically do a realtime review Friday, get the
22 document ready for final print, and work out our
23 issues there.

1 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: We expect to
2 have them out in the field in December, mid-December.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Good.

4 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: And I got the
5 EA sent to me. It was either the EA or EIS from ADOT.
6 They finished that. Barge-Wagner (phonetic). They
7 did another one for the footprint for the road that
8 they have to do. Which a lot of the information will
9 be similar to the one that was done for the base. I
10 mean, it's just for smaller, obviously, section, in
11 that particular reuse.

12 So, I don't know if -- I don't know
13 -- they're going to have a meeting soon. Do you know
14 the dates of the meeting? If y'all want to go to that
15 --

16 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: What meeting?

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Department of
18 Transportation is having a public meeting.

19 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: December 3rd.

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: December 3rd.

21 The topic --

22 MR. BART REEDY: Public meeting.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Where and when?

1 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: They all have
2 to have --

3 MR. BART REEDY: In the meeting
4 hall.

5 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: At the
6 Anniston Meeting Center. But I don't remember what
7 time. Joan, do you remember?

8 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: No, I'm sorry,
9 I don't remember the time.

10 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: We could get
11 that out to you.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Yes, that would
13 be very useful.

14 MR. BART REEDY: Not to -- well, I
15 guess stir it up a little bit. I don't -- I'm a
16 little fuzzy, exactly the status. And maybe you can
17 help me out here, if you've had, you know, much
18 communication with the new reuse authority. The
19 status of the proposed interchanges here, are those
20 still in the works?

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Being planned for
22 but without any detail that I'm aware of.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Well, I think we

1 need to probably -- I was going to suggest and I can
2 do it right now. I was going to wait until they did.
3 I'm on the MPO, which is transportation. We had to
4 report. Ron and then the people from ALDOT, plus the
5 people from Huntsville were there and did a very good
6 job. And it was asked at our last meeting about the
7 time line. And it was very apparent that ALDOT and
8 the people from Huntsville and the environmental are
9 all working together.

10 I think it would be very good for
11 us to ask them to come and make a similar presentation
12 to us, because I wasn't aware of the coordination that
13 was going on, and it really enlightened me and it
14 helped -- we had a letter, I guess y'all saw, that was
15 written from the MPO about -- a letter that was
16 published and said that they assumed that there were
17 no funds appropriated for the clean up of the eastern
18 bypass, which was totally false. But they cleared all
19 that up.

20 But -- and I'm trying to remember
21 -- everything is on go. And I brought to Ron a kind
22 of a financial time line and I brought it to his
23 secretary. But I was hoping it would be here tonight,

1 showing the financial breakdown of when they have the
2 right-of-way acquisition and the construction and the
3 time line that they're looking at. But they could
4 provide that information. And the fellow from ALDOT
5 really, I thought, did a good job. Do you remember
6 what his name was?

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Terry
8 Robinson.

9 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yes, Terry
10 Robinson was -- he was the one that's been
11 coordinating the -- I think it would be good for this
12 committee to see that. I wasn't aware of it.

13 MR. JAMES MILLER: What two
14 interchanges are you speaking of?

15 MR. BART REEDY: Early on, when
16 that map was put together, that map was based on input
17 from a year ago or more.

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes, from Rob
19 Richardson.

20 MR. BART REEDY: Yeah, really. And
21 that was -- that map was kind of drawn up in a perfect
22 world, here is what we'd like, not just the highway
23 coming through with no way to get off of it, but a

1 possible couple of interchanges to, you know, get the
2 traffic to stop and buy burgers or whatever they're
3 going to do.

4 And those blue circles up there
5 represent that. Where did that come from?

6 MR. HARRY THOMAS: That's me.

7 MR. BART REEDY: That's what those
8 blue circles are, are -- those are topographically --

9 MR. PAUL JAMES: In the
10 comprehensive reuse plan, the one further south was
11 designated to be a truck route, supposedly to feed
12 into the industrial park in the northern part of the
13 -- you know, the ground, if you will, once they got
14 going.

15 As far as I know, that's still a
16 part of their comprehensive reuse plan, both that one
17 and then the one that -- that would be kind of the
18 main drag through --

19 MR. BART REEDY: Okay. Well, my
20 question goes to this is -- the reason for that is:
21 I'm a little fuzzy here. Do we need to plan on those
22 two interchanges happening? If we do, then maybe we
23 ought to get the UXO people out there while we're

1 here. But, you know, they're just down the road. And
2 it didn't take long to get them spun up over here the
3 first time. So --

4 MR. PETE CONROY: I tell you, one
5 of the answers to your questions -- that's exactly why
6 we've asked for the representative from the JPA to sit
7 in on all future RAB meetings, because probably
8 someone from the JPA could best answer that question.
9 But as you know, they're just warming up right now and
10 may not have the answers, themselves. So, timing is
11 maybe not too good.

12 MR. BART REEDY: Well, again, I
13 don't think that it's -- if we knew for sure, then it
14 might be decent to go ahead and plan for that right
15 now. But it didn't take a great deal of time nor
16 energy to get Huntsville spun up, to get a contract
17 out the door, to get them to do this. So, that's not
18 a make or break, I don't think, Pete.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: Anything else,
20 Ed?

21 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: (Shakes head.)

22 MR. PETE CONROY: At an earlier
23 meeting, I had asked about some smoke testing that was

1 going to be done, due to a number of phone calls that
2 I had received up at my office at Jacksonville State
3 University. And this is a smoke testing as usual, but
4 with a little bit of a different twist. This would be
5 smoke testing that contains -- that would actually
6 have graphite in the smoke. And graphite hadn't been
7 used in this way before. And I just wanted to know a
8 little bit more about it.

9 And so what we were going to do at
10 this meeting was just discuss this a little bit more.
11 The public concern was that, hey, Fort McClellan is
12 closing and there has been certain levels of
13 environmental contamination over the years, and what
14 are the ramifications of this last-moment testing, and
15 why is it being done. And I think there probably are
16 some pretty good answers. But I know there is some
17 questions regarding this.

18 But, Major, are you in a position
19 tonight to give us kind of a little bit of an overview
20 as to -- I know John Esson is on the way. And one of
21 the -- John Esson is flying into Atlanta to be with us
22 tonight specifically to address this issue. And his
23 plane got in late. And you know me, I'm a stickler to

1 end these meetings in an hour. So, knowing my luck,
2 he's going to walk in the door --

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: At 7:30.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: -- at 7:30, just
5 when I'm saying good night. And I, for the record,
6 really feel bad about that.

7 But nevertheless, since he's not
8 here, Major, are you in a position to kind of give us
9 an overview in terms of what's being planned?

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir, what we're
11 trying to do from the Chemical School perspective is
12 to conduct graphite -- you say "testing," but it's
13 actually training with two new smoke obscuration
14 systems --

15 MR. PETE CONROY: I apologize. As
16 I was saying it, I -- it's training as has been done
17 for a long time.

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right. What the
19 objective is, is to continue to conduct fog oil
20 training like we've been doing for the past several
21 years, since the early 1980s. We want to introduce
22 graphite in with that mix, because this -- the two
23 systems that are out today have a dual capability of

1 producing fog oil smoke and graphite smoke.

2 And I provided you all with an
3 information sheet that goes into the detail of what
4 graphite is, basically the purpose, what we're trying
5 to do with the systems. And here is the makeup of the
6 graphite, which is nothing more than synthetic carbon
7 is what we're using, 99 percent carbon, 1 percent
8 quartz.

9 But as you mix the fog oil and the
10 graphite, if you think about smoke traveling away from
11 a smoke source, the graphite -- in the sense to make
12 it very simple -- is laying on the fog oil smoke, and
13 it's carrying it down range, in order to prevent
14 infrared targeting devices from being able to see us.
15 Basically, protecting us from enemy detection and
16 target acquisition.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Does the graphite
18 also interfere with radio signals, maybe? Is that
19 another part of it?

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: I don't -- I don't
21 -- you're getting into a different area, millimeter
22 wave, which uses a different type of material that we
23 do not want to introduce here.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

2 MAJOR JOHNSON: But we have gone
3 through an extensive analysis or environmental
4 assessment right now on what we believe are the
5 effects or no effects or insignificant effects of
6 graphite, if introduced into this environment. We
7 have conducted several meetings, we've done some
8 studies, or we've done some research on existing
9 studies that are out there that basically says, here
10 is what graphite is like, here is how it's going to
11 affect the public health or no effect to the public
12 health and the surrounding environment.

13 We've gone as far as looking at
14 effects on bats, other mammals, fish, reptiles, the
15 effect of it in the waterways or the wetlands and the
16 area where we want to do it on the eastern side of
17 main post.

18 And so, based on that assessment,
19 we were going to release it or request for it to be
20 released today, in order to go out to the public for
21 review. But since John Esson is not here, yet, we
22 wanted to make sure we dotted the Is and crossed the
23 Ts on everything before we submitted it to the

1 Directorate of Environment here to make sure that we
2 had everything in order so that when it is in fact
3 released, that it is at -- it is in places where the
4 public can get access to it to review it.

5 And so basically, that's where we
6 are today with it. We have an analysis that we
7 believe is the best layout of what we think graphite
8 will do to the environment. And we've looked at every
9 aspect out at range 24A on the eastern side of the
10 main post and looked at the travel of the smoke.

11 We're doing air modeling. We have
12 some data on that. And basically, we're saying in the
13 area where we want to conduct the training, there is
14 no expected release of fog oil graphite off the
15 installation or it will not come into any areas where
16 there are public facilities, communities, or whatever,
17 where there would have any exposure to it.

18 Yes, sir.

19 MR. BART REEDY: In the
20 conversations that you and I had a couple of months
21 ago --

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right.

23 MR. BART REEDY: -- one of the

1 things that I meant to ask and didn't get it done was:
2 Have y'all done any kind of analysis of the fog oil
3 after it is mixed with the graphite and atomized?

4 MAJOR JOHNSON: We have not --

5 MR. BART REEDY: I've know you've
6 got enough graphite and you've got fog oil separately
7 but --

8 MAJOR JOHNSON: We have data on
9 effects of fog oil alone, effects of graphite. We've
10 done the research for the fate of fog oil and graphite
11 mixed. And we have some data that's incorporated in
12 that site specific EA that addresses the mix and the
13 effect on the environment.

14 MR. JAMES MILLER: How about the
15 effect on humans? Does it have any noxious effect if
16 breathed in?

17 MAJOR JOHNSON: Depending upon the
18 location of where you're at, there are protective
19 measures that we will put in place. Just like what we
20 do now with regular fog oil smoke. If you're near the
21 actual source, meaning within the vicinity of the
22 exhaust where it's coming out, you have to wear your
23 protective equipment, protective mask. So, any

1 respiratory device that can prevent any of the
2 particles from penetrating, from getting into your
3 respiratory system.

4 And we've looked at that. There is
5 not a lot of research that is out there that goes into
6 very minute detail about the effects of graphite on
7 humans. There is some data. But there is no
8 long-term studies that are out there.

9 What we've come across is
10 short-term effects. And that's basically what we're
11 saying here, we want to do short-term training. And
12 the effects that come from that, we are saying in our
13 assessment, is insignificant, at this time.

14 And I mean, we've done an extensive
15 search for data, and it's just not available.

16 MR. RONALD HOOD: I got a couple of
17 questions for you, along his lines, toxicological
18 effects of it. Isn't it going to be very similar to
19 the effect that coal dust has on miners?

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir, I can't answer
21 that.

22 MR. RONALD HOOD: The particle size
23 looks about the same to me. Of course, it's been

1 awhile since I've looked at that stuff. But it seems
2 like it's the size that would be entrained into the
3 lung very easily.

4 MAJOR JOHNSON: We've requested the
5 studies or any studies, information, from the coal
6 mining industry on carbon effects. We have not
7 received any of that, yet. And we still -- we have
8 taken the existing studies of graphite and looked at
9 its effect.

10 So, what we have in there is based
11 on the information that we have found. We're still
12 researching.

13 MR. RONALD HOOD: And the other
14 question I've got is: Where do you intend to do this?
15 And I can imagine, if you started doing it on the main
16 post, it will be picked up by the National Guard and
17 continued --

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, sir.

19 MR. RONALD HOOD: -- long after you
20 leave out on Pelham Range.

21 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, sir. Our
22 intent is not to use main post as a jumping-off
23 staging for the National Guard to go out and conduct

1 the same training at Fort McClellan.

2 The National Guard and the Reserves
3 have in fact asked the Chemical School what we were
4 doing for them in order to pave the way after the
5 school closes and the Reserves and the National Guard
6 are here. And we told them, we're not doing anything,
7 because after we finish or complete the training on
8 main post, that stops all smoke training.

9 We also provided them with
10 information, points of contact within forces command,
11 which is the higher headquarters, that really needs to
12 do some of the work and assist them, in order to
13 conduct the training out at Pelham Range. But there
14 is things that they're going to have to do,
15 bio-assessments, environmental impact statements.

16 MR. RONALD HOOD: My point being:
17 If you do it here, they will think that they sort of
18 have the green light to continue doing it at Pelham
19 Range.

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, sir. That is
21 not the intent. And the Commandant at the Chemical
22 School, Major General Wooten, has made that clear,
23 that we're not paving the way for Reserves and

1 National Guards after -- units that come in after we
2 leave, to pick up where we left off.

3 MR. RONALD HOOD: And the last
4 question, because of the extremely small size of these
5 particles, how long does it take for those to be
6 washed or fall out of the air and how much of an area
7 do you expect it to cover before they will be released
8 from the air?

9 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir, that's one of
10 the data gaps we have right now. And through the air
11 modeling that we've been working on in the past couple
12 of days and a what we will do tomorrow, hopefully we
13 can wash that out. Because there is a concern about
14 resuspension after it's released and it's on the
15 ground what effect it will --

16 MR. RONALD HOOD: Again, due to the
17 very small sizes, I would think that it would cover a
18 much larger area than Pelham Range, the Fort, and all
19 combined.

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: Depends on
21 consumption, the rates of consumption. And in the
22 assessment, we have our consumption rate charts where
23 we have said, this is the minimum that we can use

1 without causing any large area effect or what we think
2 may have -- may be some effect in a particular area.

3 And so, we're not saying we want to
4 go out and go at the same rate that we're currently
5 going with fog oil. We've actually asked our trainers
6 to go back and say, what are the minimum amounts that
7 you can use both in fog oil and graphite, in order to
8 conduct a training without any degradation to the
9 training, but also without impacting the environment,
10 as well, to include the public health.

11 So, I think we've gone through that
12 and looked at it very closely and said, that based on
13 these consumption rates, we can minimize the actual
14 release of the smoke in the area.

15 And you asked where we want to do
16 it. And it's on range 24A, which is on the eastern
17 side of the installation. And you have -- on the
18 eastern side of that range, you have the Choccolocco
19 ridge line that goes across. And based on historical
20 data, we have never had any smoke go over the
21 mountain. Okay. And there was only one instance
22 where smoke was pushed back toward the cantonment area
23 a couple of years ago and it was because too much fog

1 oil was used and the stability category was changed,
2 which caused the smoke to travel in a different
3 direction.

4 And part of the air modeling that
5 we're doing, we're looking at all that. We're looking
6 at every stability category. We're looking at how far
7 the plume is going to go and the effects or how much
8 graphite is falling and settling where. And then the
9 resuspension issue, which was an issue with the Fish &
10 Wildlife Service, as far as what happens if you leave
11 and you walk around an area, hikers walk through the
12 area, hunters walk through the area, what happens. We
13 have data that --

14 MR. RONALD HOOD: Or the wind blows
15 and knocks it off the leaves.

16 MAJOR JOHNSON: Wind blows. We
17 have data that shows that graphite will stay in an
18 area for two years in some of the studies. But we
19 can't tell you what happens at two years and one day,
20 two years and six months. That's a gap that we have.
21 And in order to fill that gap, you'd have to do some
22 long-term surveying to do that or studies.

23 MR. JAMES MILLER: I was going to

1 ask: Are we presently doing that training now or is
2 that going to be something that's --

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: Presently doing it
4 here?

5 MR. JAMES MILLER: Yes, sir.

6 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, sir, we're not
7 doing it here, now. We're currently doing just fog
8 oil smoke. We have done it at Pelham Range for
9 de-processing of systems, in order to bring them on
10 board, in order to turn in our older systems.

11 MR. JAMES MILLER: But we are going
12 to be doing it?

13 MAJOR JOHNSON: We are going to do
14 it, yes, sir.

15 MR. JAMES MILLER: Well, let me ask
16 you this: Why in the world, if we're closing a
17 chemical school here, if we're closing a fort, that
18 somebody would make a decision to bring something like
19 that in there?

20 Why don't they take it to the forts
21 that the chemical school is going to?

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir, I can't answer
23 that for the senior leadership in their decision

1 making. The only thing I can say to you is that we
2 have two new pieces of equipment that has a dual
3 capability. I understand the post is closing, the
4 installation is closing, but we still have to maintain
5 the standard. And in --

6 MR. JAMES MILLER: Well, they're
7 going to do that in the future, aren't they?

8 MAJOR JOHNSON: They're going to do
9 it in the future, but --

10 MR. JAMES MILLER: Well, take it to
11 the place where they're moving the other stuff.

12 MAJOR JOHNSON: I hear what you're
13 saying, sir. But on the flip side of that, we still
14 need to train. And part of that study that will be
15 released, you'll see where we have really looked at
16 that hard and figuring out some alternatives on the
17 best one that best suits the Army and the training
18 aspect and the community, after this installation
19 closes.

20 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Do you have a
21 last date for when the training will be conducted?

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: Our objective, sir,
23 is to start the training January of '99 and end it in

1 August of '99.

2 MR. BART REEDY: How many events?

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: We're talking five
4 events per month. So, we're talking maybe six -- six
5 -- anywhere from six to eight months of actual
6 training.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Chris, let me --

8 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And this is not
9 used anywhere else?

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: At force com units
11 like Fort Hood, Fort Bragg, Fort Polk, they're in the
12 same situation as we are with the exception of the
13 installation closing. They are currently doing their
14 environmental NEPA documents.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But this is the
16 first time that it will ever be used?

17 MAJOR JOHNSON: This is the first
18 time, first time ever been used. It has been used in
19 testing at Yuma Proving Grounds, Aberdeen Proving
20 Grounds, and Dugway Proving Grounds for testing.
21 Those are the only places. However, for training, it
22 has not happened yet.

23 Fort Hood is currently in the

1 process of doing the same type of environmental
2 assessments that we are. And so, they're trying to
3 kick it off at Fort Hood and Fort Polk.

4 MR. BART REEDY: Have you heard
5 anything from the State of Missouri, yet, at Leonard
6 Wood, on your request there?

7 MAJOR JOHNSON: We have provided
8 them with data that we have collected through our
9 research. And their concerns is that they want to see
10 our assessment that we have. And that will drive what
11 actions or activities that they need to do, as far as
12 testing, studies, or whatever on their --

13 MR. JAMES MILLER: In fact, they
14 want to find out if there is negative effects. And if
15 there is negative effects, they don't want it at their
16 place.

17 MAJOR JOHNSON: You're probably
18 right, sir. You're probably right.

19 MR. RONALD HOOD: So, where have
20 they conducted any training, using this method?

21 MAJOR JOHNSON: They have not
22 conducted any training anywhere, because the system is
23 new. Fielding was stopped because of the programmatic

1 environmental assessment was challenged by one of the
2 regional EPA headquarters. And have gone back and
3 rewrote the programmatic at the Army level, DESOPs
4 level, and they submitted that document, document back
5 out.

6 Which in turn drove us to start our
7 process back in November of last year.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Chris, are there
9 any state permit issues here? And then secondly, you
10 have an ongoing investigation. Does this complicate
11 your ongoing investigation in any way?

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: The concerns we
13 have at ADEM and which Mike and the Army, they realize
14 that from a permitting compliance standpoint, ADEM,
15 you know, we don't have any -- we've already told them
16 that we wouldn't -- it wouldn't be a permitted
17 compliance issue. In other words, introducing the
18 graphite, they don't have to have a permit to do the
19 fog oil training. Introducing the graphite would not
20 change that from our agency.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: You use the term,
22 fugitive emission, right?

23 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: It's considered

1 a fugitive emission. And so again, with just adding
2 the graphite, it's not covered under our, what we call
3 HAPLS, hazardous air pollutants list, so it wouldn't
4 -- from a compliance standpoint, the air division, you
5 know, would not regulate the Army.

6 On the flip side, though, from our
7 end on the investigations and cleanups, what we're
8 worried about is one, there is no data anywhere that
9 shows what the long-term effects of graphite are.
10 Whether -- specially to -- you know, our ecosystems.
11 As far as the loading in the creeks, I have a problem
12 with really understanding and knowing the long-term
13 effects to our SINAs and our seep areas or sensitive
14 habitat areas.

15 We don't know those impacts. The
16 Army does not know. We merely -- it's one of the
17 situations where, you know, we kind of have a gut
18 feeling that maybe it wouldn't, but we don't have the
19 data to make a decision one way or another, if it will
20 cause impacts to the environment. From a human health
21 standpoint, I really don't think it's much of a
22 problem, because as long as they use the appropriate
23 gear, whether it's mask or whatever, and it stays away

1 from folks, it's not -- I'm not really worried on
2 that. And it's more on the ecological side.

3 Another concern I have is this is
4 -- where they're wanting to do the training is where
5 we're currently doing investigations. It's T24A.
6 We're currently in a remedial investigation phase
7 here.

8 With the Army coming back on to
9 main post and doing this training in T24A, it can
10 impact our scheduling of investigations in these
11 areas, it can also impact some technical problems,
12 speaking with our chemist, from having matrix
13 interference. In other words, when you go in and take
14 a service oil sample, the graphite in the soil can
15 cause some reading problems and with all the organics
16 and semi-vault organics, potentially.

17 With the metals, I don't think it
18 will be a problem, according to our chemist, but it
19 could introduce, in other words, some false positive
20 or negative hits out there in these areas that we are
21 going to be investigating. We were going to be
22 investigating them under the current SIs. In fact,
23 we've already had approved work plans in these areas

1 that I'm talking about.

2 So, from a programmatic standpoint,
3 as far as logistics and possibly some technical
4 issues, it causes concern to me from investigation and
5 clean up. But from a compliance standpoint, the
6 department, you know, they'll treat it as they have
7 the fog oil.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: With two minutes
9 remaining, we're glad to see you, John.

10 MR. JOHN ESSON: I just went
11 planes, trains, and automobiles.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: John, we've been
13 talking about the graphite issue just a little bit and
14 got a good summary from the Major. And we were saying
15 that we're enforcing our one hour meetings, which
16 gives us another minute and a half. But with y'all's
17 permission, let's stay just a little bit longer,
18 because, John, we really appreciate you coming down
19 and talking with us.

20 Not knowing what we just talked
21 about, how would you like to chime in right now?

22 MR. BART REEDY: Not to catch you
23 flatfooted.

1 MAJOR JOHNSON: The concern is, is
2 about some of the data gaps that are out there
3 concerning graphite, particle size, for example,
4 resuspension, the Army wanting to train with graphite
5 when the installation is closing and moving. And,
6 sir, your point is: You know, the Army is leaving,
7 move the Army, start the training somewhere else and
8 not here. I mean, to sum it up, you know, quickly.

9 MR. JAMES MILLER: Uh-huh.

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: So, there is
11 concerns with that. And I was talking about the --
12 our EA and where we were trying to assess the best
13 alternative to use. And basically we're holding the
14 position that impact is insignificant and that there
15 are in fact a lot of data gaps that are out there and
16 that we have attempted to bridge those gaps. And if
17 you do not have long-term study results, there is no
18 way to really assess the impact.

19 And then Chris was talking about
20 ADEM's position on conducting the training out in the
21 area where they're actually going to do some site
22 sampling or investigative work out there.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Major Johnson,

1 that was an excellent summary.

2 MR. JOHN ESSON: Well, all I can
3 say is: It's true there isn't any -- there isn't a
4 lot of long-term data like effects on amphibians,
5 birds. I'm John Esson from TRADOC Environmental. I
6 wrote part of the EA for Major Johnson.

7 And I think I've told many people
8 that one of the projects that's going on here, the
9 refuge project, is an excellent project. And I
10 wouldn't want to be involved with something that would
11 hurt that environment. I wrote part of this EA.

12 I can't find anything that, you
13 know, that's significant. It's carbon and it's
14 relatively inert. In fact, the studies say it's inert
15 in one of the terrestrial ecological risk assessments,
16 relatively inert, up to two years. That's as far as
17 they've studied it.

18 The main thing is: There is six
19 alternatives in this EA. And this commander here has
20 a choice among six alternatives. And when the EA goes
21 up for public review, gets the comments back, and
22 they'll be able to make a better decision. So, that's
23 the thing behind this EA.

1 There is no decision. There are
2 six really good alternatives. And that's the main
3 point.

4 MR. ALAN FAUST: What are the
5 alternatives?

6 MR. JOHN ESSON: Well, it ranges
7 from continuing to do what they're doing, which is
8 just fog oil only, and no graphite. By the way, when
9 you use some graphite, some of the fog oil goes down.
10 So, there is kind of a trade-off. They're really
11 isn't much of a difference. So, that's one, is to
12 continue to do fog oil.

13 Another one is a full optimum
14 training level. And after meeting with Chris Johnson
15 and some of the agencies, the Chemical School came
16 back with another alternative that basically cut from
17 the optimum training level, cut the fog oil and
18 graphite in half.

19 And they have another one that's
20 just a demonstration, where just one of the six
21 graphite generators is just -- they demonstrate it for
22 about two to five minutes, people in the bleachers and
23 are outside just watch, you know, until they get --

1 they don't get to use the graphite or anything.

2 And there is a combination. It
3 gets a little confusing from then. Then on, there is
4 two other alternatives.

5 But what I like about this and why
6 I would really like to be involved with it, they have
7 some real alternatives that they're going to make a
8 decision on. It's not we're going to pick that first
9 one and send it out for public review. It really is
10 -- really going to use this AE for a decision, because
11 the EA announced the point of view, the way they set
12 up the alternatives.

13 And I did struggle finding any
14 impact with the graphite. It's hard to find
15 information. Forrest fire information, volcano ash
16 information, there isn't a lot just on graphite, the
17 (inaudible) graphite.

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I had a
19 question -- and this really goes back from the meeting
20 we had last month about -- it was almost a month ago
21 today. It was my understanding that that was -- we
22 were in the preliminary draft EA. We were having some
23 informal agency conversations about that. And the

1 next milestone would be, you guys would submit a draft
2 EA for agency review. And we would kind of make sure
3 where -- you know, where you guys were going. Because
4 I didn't really know where -- what the next move was
5 until I got the new draft EA, which you guys said
6 would come out probably around -- I'm showing October
7 30th here.

8 And today I was told that you guys
9 are going to go ahead and go -- send the FNSI and, I
10 guess, the final EA out for public review today. And
11 I was -- I guess I'm asking: Is that your intentions,
12 to go out with the final before another agency review?

13 MAJOR JOHNSON: Yes.

14 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: And if so, what
15 is the alternative you plan to choose in that?

16 MAJOR JOHNSON: When you say,
17 submitting it out for public review, are you thinking
18 that we are going to submit to the public, here is the
19 alternative that the Army has selected?

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right. Well, I
21 guess I'm just going off the milestone sheet that you
22 guys gave me. And it says that you're going to --

23 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right.

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: -- and it says
2 that you guys are going to E-mail the draft EA for
3 informal agency review and comment. And today I was
4 told that you're going to go ahead and finalize the EA
5 and the FNSI and send it out for public notice. In
6 other words, the step that you stated here was going
7 to happen, I was told today wasn't going to happen.

8 MAJOR JOHNSON: I guess what is
9 happening -- it changed. You're right, sir, it
10 changed since that last meeting. What the school is
11 thinking is submitting to the public the EA and the
12 FNSI with no decision on an alternative, in the sense
13 to make that the opportunity for the agencies to
14 review and make their comments on on the document.

15 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: You're going to
16 put it out there, but you're just going to say, here
17 are the five --

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: Here is the six --

19 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: -- the six
20 alternatives --

21 MAJOR JOHNSON: Here are the six
22 alternatives, please, agencies, public review and
23 provide us with your comments. We have not made a

1 decision on an alternative. We have not briefed the
2 commanding general on the best alternative, because we
3 -- because the school belief is that, let the public
4 see it, because we're not hiding anything. Let them
5 see it, let it generate questions. Puts the "on us"
6 back on the school, the Army, to come back to the
7 public and do its best at answering those questions or
8 concerns that you may have.

9 And then, based on that, adjust
10 where we need to adjust, send it back to you. If you
11 agree to those -- if you believe that we have done our
12 very best to answer your questions, and you're
13 satisfied with our response back to you, that you
14 would say, okay, we understand where you're coming
15 from, and then we would -- we would actually conduct a
16 decision brief to the decision maker, General Wooten,
17 and say, sir, based on the EA, submission out to the
18 public and the response back, my recommendation to
19 you, sir, this is the best alternative to use as an
20 approach to say, sir, this is the decision you need to
21 make now, and let him make that decision, based on
22 what comes back from the agencies and the public.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Bart. And then

1 Don Walters has a question from our audience.

2 MR. BART REEDY: Major, let me
3 parrot this back to you and make sure that I'm
4 tracking with you here. There is going to be an EA
5 come out for agency and public review.

6 MAJOR JOHNSON: Correct.

7 MR. BART REEDY: And that EA,
8 however, is going to lack the desired alternative,
9 which --

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right --

11 MR. BART REEDY: -- ever
12 alternative it is --

13 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right.

14 MR. BART REEDY: -- that y'all
15 want. How, in your mind's eye, do you see EPA or the
16 state being able to approve an EA with no preferred
17 alternative run up the flag pole?

18 MR. JOHN ESSON: Well, actually,
19 there is a proposed action.

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: Yeah.

21 MR. JOHN ESSON: The proposed
22 action is the optimum training. That's the proposed
23 action. The second alternative --

1 MR. BART REEDY: Well, that's --
2 well, what we were talking about just a few moments
3 ago was not that that indeed. What we were talking
4 about a few moments ago, unless I misunderstood --

5 MAJOR JOHNSON: What I understood
6 was, was that I thought that you all were thinking
7 that the school is going to put out an EA that says to
8 you, that the proposed action alternative one and the
9 proposed action number six, the no action, you know,
10 there is a set of alternatives in there.

11 MR. BART REEDY: Right --

12 MAJOR JOHNSON: And that the school
13 is going to come out and say to you, that this is the
14 best action, number three.

15 MR. BART REEDY: Okay.

16 MAJOR JOHNSON: And then have you
17 assess it. What we're saying is, is that based on the
18 Army reg 200-2 that says, you have to have these
19 alternatives in here, our view was to submit it to the
20 public and to the agencies and let them look at that
21 and say, okay, based on these alternatives and the
22 rest of the data, the impacts on it, as agency A, we
23 believe that alternative number four is your best --

1 your best solution, in order to conduct the training,
2 to get the training started.

3 MR. BART REEDY: Well, maybe I'm --
4 Major, I'm sorry, if I'm not -- if I'm not picking up
5 on it. But I understood what you just said.

6 But the question I was trying to
7 ask was this -- I don't think I would -- maybe I
8 misunderstood you. But what I heard awhile ago, I
9 thought was, that your opinion, your thinking right
10 now is that as opposed to the maximum amount of
11 graphite and smoke, probably down step it from that.
12 And then what I heard you just say is: Nah, we're not
13 thinking that. We're thinking to go ahead and use
14 alternative one, which is --

15 MR. JOHN ESSON: That's the
16 proposed optimum training option. That's what is
17 proposed.

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right. What --

19 MR. BART REEDY: That's what's
20 proposed. Then the EA alternative one is proposed
21 action, alternative two is the -- so, there is six
22 alternatives that truly there is no bias, you know,
23 well, there is no EAs written, so there is no bias.

1 The decision maker is going to be briefed on the
2 environmental impacts, the costs, the mission, all
3 those together, and he'll make a decision with that.
4 And surely we have six alternatives.

5 MAJOR JOHNSON: And based on that,
6 we have the consumption charts that are in there that
7 are tied to each alternative that shows you exact
8 quantities of fog oil and graphite that's recommended
9 for use for each one, for each one of those
10 alternatives. And based on that, you can see that the
11 Army is saying that this is the best case and this is
12 the worst case and here is what's in the middle.

13 MR. BART REEDY: Thank you.

14 MR. JOHN ESSON: And, Chris, when
15 you asked about the time, I wish that we had more
16 time. I wish I had more time to write it, but we
17 really ran out of time. I wanted comments from before
18 it went public from you and from others, but that's --
19 I wish I had that, but that's going to go public
20 without that.

21 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, that's
22 all -- it was just --

23 MR. JOHN ESSON: It's harder.

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That's what you
2 guys -- that's what was stated, that that's, I
3 thought, the route we were taking. And it just kind
4 of caught me off guard that you guys are going ahead
5 and going to the public.

6 MAJOR JOHNSON: Well, we can do
7 that. We can do that. You know, those --

8 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I understand
9 what you can do.

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: -- those dates are
11 not locked in stone. And this is a good example. If
12 you believe that what we're doing is not the
13 appropriate thing to do, and it might cause us some
14 trouble, I need to know that. Because then I have to
15 go back to my boss and tell him we can't submit it, we
16 can't put it out for the public. And that this in
17 fact delays our effort to attempt to get this training
18 started, because there are some concerns from ADEM or
19 from Mr. Smith or whoever.

20 I mean, I'm flexible with that. I
21 don't have a problem with that.

22 We ran out of time, because when we
23 did the last scoping meeting with you and some other

1 individuals, based on the comments that came back, we
2 looked at the information that you all provided as a
3 basis for us to really nail this -- this thing down.
4 And our intent was to in fact put it back out there to
5 you for one final look, adjust fire, whatever on it,
6 and make the necessary changes, and then submit it
7 back out. Which would have in fact met that time line
8 of, I believe, 28 or 30 October of '98 to get it back
9 out for release to the public.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Let me ask: Can
11 your objective not be met by introducing this training
12 in other forts, other facilities in that Fort
13 McClellan is going to be closing and this is going to
14 probably be public land or the public is going to be
15 using this? Your other bases are not going to be
16 closed. And since you have some gaps in there, as far
17 as research and whatever, if there is ever a small
18 percentage that they can be some harm done, you know,
19 these forts will be open and will not necessarily be
20 public land. This will be converted back to the
21 public, this property will. Can the objective not be
22 met in not introducing it here?

23 The fog oil training -- my

1 understanding is, the particles are in there for
2 infrared or whatever purposes.

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: Right.

4 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Correct?

5 MAJOR JOHNSON: Correct.

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And so, this is
7 not as essential as this personnel training to
8 introduce them to that. It's to see maybe the effects
9 it will --

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: Well, it's a
11 training issue, because you're not training the system
12 towards full capability. You're not introducing
13 materials that are designed to go into that system.

14 The other issue is that when you
15 look at the Chemical School as a TRADOC unit or
16 organization and you look at forces command and the
17 different organizations where you have those chemical
18 units at Fort Polk and Fort Hood, it's a totally
19 different process. I mean, they all have to go
20 through this NEPA process as well, and they'll
21 probably experience more -- more pain with the process
22 because of what they have to do. They have to start
23 just like we're starting.

1 The only issue or problem is that
2 the installation is closing. If the installation did
3 not close, we still would have to go through this.
4 And it might be more extensive, I think, in our
5 efforts to get this training going, if the
6 installation was remaining open.

7 So, I think the objective would be
8 missed if we did not start it here, because it's a
9 training issue. I can't concern myself with forces
10 command, because what they do at their installations
11 are different. The environments are just totally
12 different.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: Excuse me. I'm
14 going to have to run in just a second. And so, Ron,
15 if you don't mind conducting the rest of this meeting.

16 Two things that come to mind first
17 is: I'm inherently and relatively comfortable with
18 the use of the graphite from an environmental point of
19 view. And secondly, I'm inherently comfortable with
20 anything John Esson tells me I should be comfortable
21 with.

22 But this is probably some of the
23 healthiest dialogue this RAB has ever been involved

1 with since the inception of the RAB.

2 MR. BART REEDY: Concur.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: And I'm excited
4 about our involvement. And I hope this discussion
5 will continue.

6 MR. JAMES MILLER: The only point
7 I'd like to bring up --

8 MR. PETE CONROY: One second,
9 because I really am going to leave. John, are you
10 going to spend the night tonight?

11 MR. JOHN ESSON: Yes.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Can you call me
13 in the morning?

14 MR. JOHN ESSON: Sure.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay. Lisa has
16 all my numbers, because I would love to get with you
17 in the morning.

18 MR. JOHN ESSON: Okay.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: I know Don
20 Walters has a question. And you asked to speak a good
21 long while ago, so, with your permission, Don, why
22 don't you ask your question. And good night.

23 MR. DON WALTERS: I'm the outdoor

1 writer for the newspaper here. And my concern is the
2 long-term effects of -- I'm reminded of the fact that
3 each spring I usually get a consumption advisory
4 report from the game and fish, fishery section, and
5 publish it in the paper for people to see that they
6 can't eat the fish that come out of our rivers and
7 reservoirs around here.

8 People, at the time that they
9 started using PCBs and Mercury, did not know the
10 long-terms effects, so we're stuck with that, now.

11 And my concern here is: We talked
12 about the hikers and the hunters and the general
13 public not being affected, and the people that were
14 using the equipment wore masks. Well, what about
15 things like the deer and the turkey that have to eat
16 the grass where this graphite is going to be settling
17 out there? What's going to be the long-term effect --
18 is graphite like -- I think you said it would be there
19 for maybe two years or something to that effect.

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: I said there's a
21 study that indicated that graphite had remained in the
22 soil for two years. But that you could not determine
23 the effect, long-term effect after two years.

1 MR. DON WALTER: We don't know
2 what's going to happen -- see, this place is abundant
3 with wildlife. And that is one reason the Fish &
4 Wildlife people want it. So, what's going to be the
5 long-term effect on the wildlife here? I mean, they
6 can't wear masks or go back to their homes. They're
7 going to live out there where this stuff is settling.

8 MR. JOHN ESSON: Well, the
9 graphite, it's pure carbon. And ingestion really
10 won't happen. In fact, there won't be -- they're only
11 doing it from a period of up to three months, three to
12 eight months. And the study you're talking about,
13 which was two years, they stopped it because there was
14 no purpose of going any further. It's not as if -- it
15 is an inert -- the study came to the conclusion that
16 it's inert. There was no effect.

17 Respiration is the one thing that
18 -- bird respiration, turkeys, if they're out there and
19 if they were -- if they were blowing smoke every
20 single day, early in the morning, and/or when the
21 turkeys are roosting at night, I would say there would
22 be an effect in that area without smoke (inaudible).

23 But it's only short term. It's

1 only five times a month. And it's -- I don't know how
2 long they blow it -- thirty minutes, and it stays in
3 the area up to two, three hours.

4 MAJOR JOHNSON: Two, three hours.

5 MR. JOHN ESSON: So, it's five
6 times a month. And with that kind of -- I'm a hunter
7 and I'm -- that is not a period that I would worry
8 about. It's carbon. And if they do control burning,
9 it's the same kind of thing, it's releasing carbon
10 into the atmosphere. And I -- you know, it's a
11 synthetic carbon. It's not quite like the ash, but
12 it's synthetic. Because it's actually synthetic, it
13 doesn't do much when it gets into the soil. And it's
14 an irritant to the lungs.

15 And I don't know what else to say.
16 And there are some data gaps. Like you said, you
17 know, sometimes we don't know. And if it was
18 long-term, if it was long-term they're going to do
19 this every single year, I would say, we need to do
20 some monitoring, if you're going to do it, if the Army
21 needs to do it, then we need to do some long-term
22 monitoring. But it's a short-term situation.

23 MR. JAMES MILLER: Like I said:

1 The only point that I have on it -- and it's probably
2 the same as Mayor Kimbrough's -- is: Why does
3 Anniston, Alabama, Fort McClellan, have to be the
4 guinea pig for a process that's never been done
5 before, a closing fort that's going to be closed and
6 turned over to the public? The decision-making
7 process that they made on doing that here is a
8 terrible decision. Why in the world wouldn't they
9 take it to one of the forts that the chemical schools
10 and the other things are going to, the other training?
11 To do it at the one that's closing is absolute
12 asinine. That's all I have to say. You know, get
13 that in the minutes.

14 MAJOR JOHNSON: Like I said before,
15 sir, I can't answer what the decision makers make.
16 I've been tasked to work this. And that is the
17 training issue. And, you know, your point is taken.

18 MR. BART REEDY: It's a shame that
19 you have to be the --

20 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: The messenger.

21 MR. BART REEDY: Yes, the messenger
22 here on this, Mike. It's just a darn shame.

23 MAJOR JOHNSON: You taught me well.

1 MR. BART REEDY: I want to parrot
2 something that Pete brought up. These kinds of things
3 that Mike is bringing up -- and we're going to start
4 bringing them to you, as well, when we start getting
5 data, this is what you -- this is why you guys are
6 here and this is why we -- this is why the feds and
7 the state spends time and effort to get y'all here is
8 so we can hear, no, we don't want to hear it, carry it
9 over here, and Pete's point of view, I think it's
10 okay. You know, so we got two ends of the seesaw
11 here.

12 MR. JAMES MILLER: Once that's
13 through and they do that, what's next? What's next
14 month? Well, we got that one through, let's do
15 something else, something a little bit more dangerous,
16 you know.

17 MR. RONALD HOOD: And I'm with you.
18 I suspect that once they start it here, that the
19 National Guard or Reserve will be continuing to do it
20 at Pelham Range. It won't be a short-term anything,
21 it will be long-term.

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: That's probably
23 true, sir. It probably is a long-term. But the

1 Reserves and the National Guard have to come on line
2 and say what it is that they want to do and present
3 their case. They can't use the data that we have.
4 They can't use any of that, because where they want to
5 do the training, it's going to be at Pelham Range.

6 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: So, then that's
7 the same for Missouri? Missouri can't use your data
8 --

9 MAJOR JOHNSON: Missouri has a
10 whole set of different rules that they're going to
11 force the Army to comply to. And if we don't -- no
12 matter -- if we get the training started here, no
13 matter what data is collected at Fort McClellan, it's
14 going to be totally different, if not close to useless
15 at Missouri because of the way they look at, you know,
16 fugitive emissions here, articulate PM10, PM2.5 up
17 there, there is a whole set of different rules that
18 the Army is going to have to face. And it's a
19 training issue for me. Okay?

20 And in trying to fit that and show
21 to the State of Missouri what we're doing down here at
22 Fort McClellan, it's next to impossible to show a good
23 case, a good argument to say, okay, here is this

1 fugitive emission, now we're going to fit it into this
2 little widget here for the State of Missouri. I can't
3 do that.

4 We're going to start all over
5 again. We're going to start from ground zero.

6 And we're going to have to face
7 comments like yours. Yours are valid and I understand
8 where you're coming from. But that's just the
9 challenge that the Army has. And I hate to see that
10 -- go ahead, sir. I'm going to shut up.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But if my
12 recollection is correct, and what they're saying is,
13 the National Guard -- and I was in the Reserve for
14 eight years, so -- and I was in the training section,
15 and we used the same TMs and FMs that the Army uses.
16 And if this is a required training, then they're going
17 to have to do it one way or the other, correct?

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, there is --
20 there is a probability --

21 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir --

22 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: -- that that type
23 of training could continue to be used by the National

1 Guard, coming in here, if it is contained in the TM.

2 Is it contained in the TM?

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: Sir, I'm not
4 disagreeing with you on that point. But what I'm
5 saying is: Is that Chemical School is not going to be
6 the foundation --

7 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I understand.

8 MAJOR JOHNSON: -- for that. I
9 can't control the Reserves and National Guard, you
10 know, because I'm thinking, they're going to do the
11 training because in fiscal year 01 to 04, they're
12 going to get filmed (phonetic) at the systems. All
13 the chemical units in the Reserves and the National
14 Guard are going to get the same systems that we
15 currently have.

16 Now, if it's here at Pelham Range
17 where the National Guard wants to do the training,
18 they have to be the lead agency to step up and say,
19 I'm going to do it, because they've got to do some
20 coordination -- coordinating effort with forces
21 command that's higher headquarters to say, here is the
22 process. The Reserves and the National Guard don't
23 have a clue of your concerns that you're presenting

1 right now.

2 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: But the
3 reality, Mike, is that the Army and the Chem School
4 will set precedence for the entire nation and the
5 Army, as far as the graphite smoke. You are setting
6 precedence to use the graphite smoke in Alabama.

7 Missouri is going to try -- they
8 will look at that. And I'm sure the Army Chem School
9 will use that leverage, going into Missouri, to get
10 the graphite smoke training passed in Missouri.

11 Secondly, as far as the Guards and
12 the Army Guard Reserves, again, the Chemical School
13 Army is setting precedence for the Guard and the Army
14 Reserve with the regulatory agencies to use the
15 graphite smoke at Pelham Range.

16 MAJOR JOHNSON: But there is just
17 --

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That's the
19 reality of it.

20 MAJOR JOHNSON: But there is
21 competing effort here, too, because what we're doing
22 here, Fort Polk is doing the same thing. So, Fort
23 Polk is going to essentially set precedent for the

1 Army. Okay. We're talking two different lines here.
2 And we're talking forces command organizations, TRADOC
3 organizations. I think that it doesn't really matter
4 about the chemical school setting precedent or a
5 forces command unit. One of those two organizations
6 is going to set it. Who's to say that tomorrow Fort
7 Polk will not get through -- that they will get
8 through the NEPA process and that they've done all the
9 things in that particular region and with the state
10 and they're granted approval to start the training?
11 That sets precedence for the Army.

12 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, one point
13 that needs to be made here -- and I'm going by Dan
14 Carney -- who is doing the permitting for (inaudible)
15 -- is that Missouri is going to permit the Army. It's
16 my understanding now -- this might be wrong -- but I
17 talked with Dan and he said, the Army will be
18 permitted for fog oil training and the graphite and
19 like here, and they don't treat fog oil and graphite
20 as a fugitive emission like we do here. They treat it
21 as a particulate.

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: That's correct.

23 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Therefore, it

1 will be permitted. So, there is a difference here
2 from a regulatory standpoint.

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: The only thing I
4 see that's different, sir, in that regard is that the
5 state has -- is developing an issues of graphite
6 studies, long-term effect data gaps that have not been
7 filled. There is an ongoing effort right now to
8 modify the air permit for just fog oil. And that we
9 may end up having to take additional cuts in fog oil
10 to even get graphite in right now. So, we really
11 don't know. We know that we're going to do fog oil
12 and we know that we have reduced our consumption rates
13 significantly from how we do it here.

14 And so, when you start looking at
15 introducing graphite and fighting the same issues like
16 here, data gaps and whatnot, we might reduce it even
17 more in order to get it in under a particulate.

18 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Does --

19 MAJOR JOHNSON: It's just an
20 unknown.

21 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: You're saying
22 that it would not have to be permitted. So, does
23 anybody have any say so in whether it's used or not?

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, if you're
2 wanting to know whether ADEM has a hammer here, as far
3 as -- no, we really don't. That's why it really --
4 it's more -- this is an issue that boils down to issue
5 of facts. It boils down to professional judgment
6 here. We don't even have criteria for graphite to
7 regulate it. And so it's just like we're discussing
8 these issues here. And that's really -- in the
9 management decision, as far as what the Army wants to
10 do, they certainly need to take into account the
11 public's opinion on it.

12 MR. RONALD HOOD: But even if the
13 public comes up with a completely negative opinion,
14 they could still go with the full tray?

15 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That's true.

16 MR. BART REEDY: Correct me, Mike,
17 if I'm wrong. That can happen if the training is
18 considered by the -- and declared by the Army to be --
19 what is the term -- there is a term above critical.
20 And my understanding is: If it meets the criteria for
21 being really critical, whatever the term is -- and I
22 don't know what it is -- then they can go ahead and do
23 that regardless of the input that you would get on

1 your impact statement.

2 MR. RONALD HOOD: Like it's --

3 MR. BART REEDY: If it falls below
4 that criteria, by the Army's own declaration, then it
5 doesn't -- it doesn't meet your own self --
6 self-imposed loopholes. And if the public says, no,
7 we don't want it, then you don't really have the
8 wherewithal to well, we're going to do it, anyway. Is
9 that -- can you add some clarity to that?

10 MAJOR JOHNSON: There is a memo
11 that Carolyn Browner sent to the Secretary of Defense
12 -- what's his name -- Kohen -- where she said to apply
13 the different standards of particulate from PM10 to
14 PM2.5 would not be in the best interest to the
15 national security, the national defense, and that
16 there was no way that the EPA would cause the Army to
17 degrade itself in its mission -- it's wartime mission
18 or training mission and that there are -- there are
19 ways or means to create a range in order to fit this
20 type of training, graphite into this range and not
21 violate any of the regulatory laws. And that if the
22 public -- if there is a general consensus of the
23 public that says, we do not want to conduct the

1 training -- we do not want the Army to conduct the
2 training, then the Army has to go back and do a little
3 bit more work and assess the impact. And it's left up
4 to the decision maker, whichever general officer in
5 the chain, to take the public's comments, the agencies
6 comments, and his or her best estimate on the impact
7 on training and the degradation of soldier proficiency
8 to determine if he's willing or if she's willing to
9 actually conduct the training or start the training.

10 So, even if you do say that
11 two-thirds of the public here says, no, we do not want
12 it, we have to be able to present that to General
13 Wooten and say, sir, the public is deeply against
14 this, and here is the reasons why.

15 And he's got to be able to say, the
16 impact, is it really worth the risk to start this
17 training. And we have a lot of questions out there
18 that we can't answer to the satisfaction of the
19 public. He's got to be the individual that finally
20 says, we're not going to do it or we are going to do
21 it.

22 I don't know if that answered your
23 question but -- I don't think we would accept comments

1 and not look at them honestly and wholeheartedly and
2 just disregard what the public thinks, even though we
3 know the installation is closing. You may have a
4 different dealing, but that's not the way I do
5 business.

6 And I only can present the facts
7 and present that EA to you. This is the best
8 information that I have. I have looked, Mr. John
9 Esson has looked everywhere, and this is the best that
10 we have, and we want to present it to you.

11 As I told your guys down there in
12 your office, I'm an honest guy. I only can present to
13 you what I know. And I'll do my best to answer your
14 questions. And if I can't answer your questions, I
15 owe it back to you.

16 MR. RONALD HOOD: Anybody else have
17 any other questions?

18 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I guess what
19 scares me is that over the years, over my lifetime,
20 you know, we've seen different things come about and,
21 you know, it wouldn't harm your health or wouldn't --
22 and then all of sudden, they come up and say, no, we
23 were wrong. And that's, I think, what -- where there

1 are unanswered questions, that's what hangs above my
2 head. It's not an attack against anybody, it's just
3 that, you know, in the 60's when I grew up, you know,
4 marijuana wouldn't hurt you. And then research has
5 shown that marijuana does do brain damage and does
6 have effects on the brain. And I'm not comparing this
7 with marijuana, but there has just been a lots of
8 things that have come out. Well, you can't really eat
9 or drink anything now that it doesn't have some effect
10 on you, I understand that.

11 MR. RONALD HOOD: And all the inert
12 substances, too, that were unarmful like freon, PCBs,
13 all those things that were inert, and they're still
14 with us and doing harm.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: So, we appreciate
16 you coming. It's not anything directed towards you,
17 please, understand that.

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: I understand.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: It's just that
20 question out there that we have it hanging over our
21 head. And this base is going to be closed and it's
22 going to be public use. And our charge is to try to
23 look after the best interests of our community and

1 this area.

2 MR. BART REEDY: To kind of fast
3 forward, present a couple of scenarios. What would
4 happen if, let's say, you know, you guys run this up
5 the flag pole, and everybody comes up and says, well,
6 go ahead and do it, okay, well then you would go ahead
7 and do it. If everybody comes back and says, you
8 know, we've really got some problems with this, how
9 long do you think it would take the Army to go through
10 the hoops to satisfy Fort Leonard Wood's problems,
11 Missouri's problems at Fort Leonard Wood? You got a
12 guess? If you don't do it here, how long would it
13 take you to get up and running in Missouri?

14 MAJOR JOHNSON: Eighteen to
15 twenty-four months.

16 MR. BART REEDY: Again.

17 MAJOR JOHNSON: Eighteen to
18 twenty-four months.

19 MR. RONALD HOOD: Why would it take
20 so much longer if it starts going at Leonard Wood than
21 it would if --

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: Because the
23 requirements of fugitive emissions versus articulate

1 and --

2 MR. JOHN ESSON: And long-term --

3 MAJOR JOHNSON: -- and long-term

4 effects --

5 MR. RON HOOD: So, they have

6 stricter --

7 MR. JOHN ESSON: I think they'll do

8 an EIS there.

9 MAJOR JOHNSON: And then you're

10 going to have to establish the baseline, you're going

11 to have to do air monitoring, you're going to have to

12 do all type of samplings, and that's just -- that's a

13 larger challenge.

14 MR. JOHN ESSON: And they have some

15 endangered species that --

16 MR. JAMES MILLER: I don't mean to

17 put you on the spot, but the basic reason they're

18 coming to Fort McClellan is because it's easy?

19 MAJOR JOHNSON: Who?

20 MR. JAMES MILLER: The particular

21 training that we're talking about.

22 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, not because

23 it's easy.

1 MR. JAMES MILLER: Because it's
2 easier to get it through here than it is any other
3 fort.

4 MAJOR JOHNSON: No. It's the way
5 -- one region versus another region -- it's the way
6 they look at emissions. If you have a fugitive
7 emission here, there is certain things that will not
8 apply to a region like Missouri where they're focused
9 in on particulates, the size of a particle, traveling
10 X number of meters downrange, settling somewhere. And
11 then you have the threatening endangered species,
12 which is a -- which is a very tough thing right now
13 out there because of where it's located in their
14 training area, gray bats, Indiana bats, same bats that
15 are out here, but they're not located on Fort
16 McClellan, they're not located on Pelham. But when
17 you look at Fort Leonard Wood, you have ninety minute
18 meter exclusion areas around these areas. These areas
19 where these bats and bald eagles sit, they sit right
20 in the training areas.

21 The training space is greatly
22 reduced because you don't have a Pelham Range out at
23 Fort Leonard Wood. There is not freedom of mobility,

1 as far as size, to be able to go to a certain spot and
2 know that you're not going to affect any of the
3 threatened and endangered species. But yet you're
4 faced with that at Fort Leonard Wood. And it's a
5 tougher --

6 MR. JAMES MILLER: I understand.
7 And I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

8 MAJOR JOHNSON: No, sir, you're not
9 putting me on the spot.

10 MR. JAMES MILLER: You know, it's
11 just a situation for the life of me, I can't figure
12 out that we have a fort that's closing here, it's
13 being turned over to the public, we have a board here
14 that's been charged with restoration advisory, to
15 clean this place up, make it ready for the public, and
16 then somebody makes the decision to do more of that
17 type of training that they don't have the information
18 on, adequate information on. To me, that's a very
19 poor decision-making process to do that. And for the
20 only -- for the life of me, I rationalize in my mind
21 and I go, well, why would they make that decision?
22 Well, they're making that decision because it's easier
23 to get it across at Fort McClellan than it is any of

1 these other forts. They're going to say, no, we don't
2 want it. Fort Hood has already said that they don't
3 want to do it until they find out what the effects are
4 here.

5 MAJOR JOHNSON: That's news to me,
6 sir.

7 MR. JAMES MILLER: Once they know
8 that, they'll take it on.

9 MAJOR JOHNSON: That news to me.
10 We have not heard that.

11 MR. JAMES MILLER: I thought that
12 was the one statement that you said that -- maybe it
13 wasn't Fort Hood, but but one of the other forts.

14 MAJOR JOHNSON: Fort Leonard Wood.

15 MR. JOHN ESSON: Fort Lewis, Fort
16 Drum, Fort Polk, Fort Stewart, I think they're all
17 starting --

18 MAJOR JOHNSON: They're all
19 starting --

20 MR. JOHN ESSON: -- the NEPA
21 process right now.

22 MR. BART REEDY: Stewart in
23 Atlanta?

1 MR. JOHN ESSON: Stewart, yes.

2 MAJOR JOHNSON: Savannah.

3 MR. BART REEDY: Oh, okay.

4 MR. RONALD HOOD: Again, are there
5 anymore questions? And maybe we can end this meeting.

6 MR. ALAN FAUST: I just want to say
7 that in my top ten list of acronyms, FNSI, what's a
8 FNSI?

9 MAJOR JOHNSON: Finding of no
10 significant impact.

11 MR. RONALD HOOD: Everybody is
12 aware we won't have a meeting next month, and our next
13 meeting is in January. Do we have a date? I forget.

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I don't.

15 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: 21.

16 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I don't have a
17 calendar with me.

18 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: The problem was
19 that it falls, regularly scheduled falls on a holiday.
20 You know, that's Martin Luther King, and we were going
21 to have to take a look and see when we were going to
22 do it.

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: What we've

1 done in the past is have the meeting on the second
2 Monday of the month. And that happened in January and
3 in February.

4 MR. RONALD HOOD: Okay. So, that's
5 when we're planning is having the January meeting is
6 the week prior?

7 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: If everybody
8 is in favor of that.

9 MR. RONALD HOOD: Before everybody
10 hops up and leaves.

11 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Second Monday
12 will be on the 11th.

13 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: 11th of
14 January.

15 MR. RONALD HOOD: If there's no
16 objection, let's go home.

17 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned.)

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 23rd day of November, 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

