

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 19th day of April, 1999,
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	3-65
CERTIFICATE	66-67

1 MR. PETE CONROY: How about we get
2 started? Hello. Shall we go ahead and do the roll
3 call. This is April.

4 Ike Brown? James Buford? Barry
5 Cox? Don Cunningham? Jerome Elser?

6 MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Alan Faust?

8 MR. ALAN FAUST: Here.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: Mary Harrington?
10 Ron Hood?

11 MR. RONALD HOOD: Here.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Mayor Kimbrough?
13 Margaret Longstreth? James Miller?

14 MR. JAMES MILLER: Here.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: Jimmy Parks?

16 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Here.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Fern Thomassy?

18 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: Charles Turner?

20 Tom Turecek?

21 MR. TOM TURECEK: Turecek.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: It's nice to meet
23 you. In just a minute, how about you introduce

1 yourself to us and tell us who you are.

2 MR. THOMASSY: Sure. It's Turecek.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Pardon me?

4 MR. TURECEK: That is the
5 pronunciation, it's Turecek.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Where is your
7 family from?

8 MR. THOMASSY: New York.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: What's the --

10 MR. TOM TURECEK: Czechoslovakia,
11 originally.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay. Bobby
13 Weston? You say he may be joining us in a little bit?

14 MR. LEVY: Later.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: Bart Reedy?
16 Chris Johnson?

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Here.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: We have some
19 minutes before us. Everybody got them? Motion to
20 approve the minutes?

21 MR. THOMASSY: So moved.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Second?

23 MR. JAMES MILLER: Second.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: All in favor?
2 Terrific.

3 Tom, you want to tell us about
4 yourself just a little bit.

5 MR. TOM TURECEK: Sure. I'm
6 retired military, chief warrant officer, ordnance
7 corps. I live in Jacksonville. I'm currently in the
8 middle of finishing a graduate degree.

9 I moved here because my wife's
10 family lives in Jacksonville. They're all military
11 people.

12 When I found out the base was
13 closing and that this opportunity was offered up, I
14 immediately went for it, because I'm concerned about
15 it. And I think that little towns like Jacksonville,
16 even though they are so close to the post, don't a lot
17 of times get the inside track on what's going on. And
18 I'm interested in the correct cleanup of the base.
19 Regardless of how it's used after it's turned back to
20 the community, I think the Army owes the community to
21 clean it up. So, that's where my interest lies.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Well, we're real
23 glad you've joined us.

1 MR. TOM TURECEK: Thank you.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: How about if we
3 introduce ourselves out here. Paul?

4 MR. PAUL JAMES: I'm Paul James.
5 I'm from the Directorate of Environment Office. I
6 work for Ron Levy.

7 MS. KAREN PINSON: I'm Karen Pinson
8 from the Directorate of Environment, also.

9 MR. BILL GARLAND: I'm Bill Garland
10 with the U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

11 MR. WAYMON PENCE: I'm Waymon Pence
12 with the Directorate of Environment. I manage the
13 hazardous waste program.

14 MR. AL REISZ: I'm Al Reisz, Reisz
15 Engineers.

16 MR. ALVIN CRAWFORD: Alvin Crawford
17 with Reisz Engineers.

18 MR. MIKE ROGERS: Mike Rogers with
19 Reisz Engineers.

20 MS. BRIDGET MINIARD: Bridget
21 Miniard with Reisz Engineers.

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Lisa
23 Kingsbury, Director of Environment.

1 MR. BILL KERN: Bill Kern with Roy
2 F. Weston.

3 MR. BILL LONG: Bill Long with
4 Sudegar.

5 MR. ROBERT LINDSAY: I'm Robert
6 Lindsey with Roy F. Weston.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: And here is Mary.
8 I'm glad everybody is here tonight, and I'm sorry some
9 others aren't.

10 Old business. Since Charles, I
11 guess, is not here tonight, he did not bring bylaws.
12 And how about we take that up next month?

13 And the next issue on old business,
14 I guess is the topic of the evening. And, Ron, are
15 you going to talk to us about the big issue?

16 MR. LEVY: Yes. What I would like
17 to do instead is maybe do the graphite smoke status
18 first, and then we can go into that next. And what I
19 would like is for Karen to come up and kind of briefly
20 talk about what you've got in front of you.

21 Karen? In front of you Karen has
22 put a piece of paper, status of graphite training on
23 Fort McClellan. You might want to take a minute to

1 read that. And Karen might want to talk a little
2 about it, as well.

3 MS. KAREN PINSON: Hi. I just put
4 together a few issues on the graphite training. And
5 the first three paragraphs are kind of some -- well,
6 the first two paragraphs are some history behind the
7 national -- the NEPA work that's been done on graphite
8 training. And then what I really wanted to tell you
9 tonight was where we are now with the graphite
10 training.

11 The chemical school here did their
12 environmental assessment for graphite training, and
13 they sent it out to the public and to the various
14 regulatory agencies for some comments. And we did
15 receive some significant comments from ADEM and EPA
16 and the Fish & Wildlife Service. So, they took a good
17 hard look at it. And we appreciated that and
18 appreciated their comments.

19 And what -- based on the comments
20 that we were getting back, we decided that -- the
21 chemical school decided they needed a monitoring plan
22 for the graphite, something -- some tool that they
23 could monitor the amount of graphite deposition in the

1 streams and in the environment. So, they contracted
2 with the waterways experiment station of Corps of
3 Engineers Group to do some monitoring. And the WWES
4 people -- we call the water waste experimental
5 station, WWES -- they developed a monitoring plan.
6 They are going to come and monitor the first graphite
7 training event, which is scheduled for this Thursday.
8 And they will, in addition to that, they will be
9 monitoring some future graphite training events for
10 graphite deposition.

11 When the chemical school briefed
12 the graphite -- the graphite training alternatives to
13 the commanding general, the commanding general had
14 some concerns about the various agency comments and
15 about the comments from the public, because the CG was
16 also briefed on the RAB -- comments made by the RAB
17 members. And the CG decided to allow the chemical
18 school to do what they call graphite demonstration.

19 Under this training scenario, the
20 chemical school will blow graphite from one generator.
21 Uh, they will blow for about five minutes and a
22 maximum of ten pounds of graphite per minute. So, it
23 will be about a fifty pound blow of graphite per

1 training event.

2 There are only, I think, a total of
3 twelve training events scheduled before the chemical
4 school leaves Fort McClellan. So, they feel that this
5 significantly reduces the amount of graphite that they
6 are going to blow over what they originally intended
7 to blow. They were planning to use -- I think I've
8 got the figures in here for you -- but their original
9 plans were to use up to five hundred pounds of
10 graphite for each day of training.

11 So, they have significantly reduced
12 that to fifty pounds for each day. And they'll only
13 have twelve -- twelve training days with graphite.
14 They may insert a day or two. It depends if they get
15 another class or two along the way, they may have
16 another couple of training days.

17 So, with the reduced amount of
18 training, the demonstration only, and the monitoring
19 plan that they're going to institute, they -- the CG
20 felt comfortable with going on and recommending the
21 graphite demonstration alternative. And he was
22 insistent that the chemical school monitor for some of
23 the graphite training events, so that they could

1 determine if there was any deposition of graphite.

2 Does anybody have any questions or
3 have I --

4 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Is this on main
5 post? What range --

6 MS. KAREN PINSON: This is. It's
7 on range 24A. That range has historically been used
8 for smoke training and other types of training. It's
9 generally considered low quality habitat for
10 endangered species.

11 It is near some low to moderate
12 quality foraging habitat for the gray bat. The Fish &
13 Wildlife Service had asked that the chemical school
14 monitor for the graphite deposition. And so that's
15 kind of what spurred the monitoring plan. So, the
16 chemical school is also working with Fish & Wildlife
17 Service in this to be sure that they don't endanger
18 the gray bats foraging habitat. The gray bat is one
19 of our endangered species here.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: We have the
21 luxury of having Bill Garland here from Fish &
22 Wildlife Service. Bill, you're comfortable with this,
23 now?

1 MR. BILL GARLAND: Well, I think
2 the determination will be made after the first
3 monitoring. If it turns out bad, then the following
4 ones will probably not occur. If it turns out that
5 there is very, very little graphite shows up in the
6 environment, then we probably will be satisfied with
7 it.

8 MS. KAREN PINSON: These people
9 from WWES will bring field microscopes. And so they
10 have indicated to me that they will know pretty much
11 right after the first training event. They will be
12 looking at the -- they're going to take sediments from
13 the streams and leaf packs, you know, where leaves and
14 things kind of gather up in the stream. And they'll
15 be lifting these leaf packs out and they'll be
16 checking for sediment. They'll look for graphite in
17 those. So, with their field microscopes, they will be
18 able to pretty much know by Friday whether they've got
19 -- you know, whether they see any deposition at that
20 time or not.

21 There are plans for future
22 monitoring events, also. So, they'll be looking at
23 this pretty carefully.

1 MR. PARKS: Is the demonstration
2 stationary or are they going to use those M58 smoke
3 systems on -- the systems are mounted on a track
4 vehicle.

5 MS. KAREN PINSON: That's right,
6 there is --

7 MR. PARKS: Are they going to go
8 out the area or is the demonstration going to be
9 stationary in one point?

10 MS. KAREN PINSON: It will be
11 stationary. It will be static demonstrations,
12 stationary from -- yeah, right from the M56 or M58s.

13 MR. LEVY: They won't be moving the
14 vehicle. It will be in one spot as they blow it.

15 MR. ALAN FAUST: Will any of that
16 demonstration be observable or is it off-limits to
17 non-military?

18 MS. KAREN PINSON: Ron --

19 MR. LEVY: I don't believe it's
20 open to -- it will be a range activity. And range
21 activities generally are not open to the public.
22 There will be folks that represent the chemical school
23 and the Army and WWES out there, observing, but, no --

1 MS. KAREN PINSON: And Fish &
2 Wildlife, Mr. Garland.

3 MR. LEVY: The plan is to have
4 somebody from Fish & Wildlife there, as well. And I'm
5 sure if the regulatory agencies wanted to attend, we
6 could do that, as well. But, no, it's not going to be
7 open to the public. It's typical training; we don't
8 open military training to the public.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: Any other
10 questions? ADEM on board?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I think I was
12 pleased with the results. We had a lot of concerns.
13 Mainly, you know, that there just wasn't enough data
14 to know whether there were going to be impacts, more
15 so to wildlife than human health, because, obviously,
16 with the appropriate donning of PPE, protective gear,
17 you know, you're pretty much safe, you know, and they
18 would be.

19 But with the wildlife, it was just
20 the data. There wasn't much out there, so we were
21 concerned and voiced those concerns. And I think that
22 -- I think this is kind of a -- you know, a win-win
23 situation for everybody.

1 The only thing -- you know, I did
2 wish that, you know, we could -- this could have been
3 done at Pelham, but we had bigger concerns over there,
4 I think, just to mainly just keep the activities over
5 there instead of over here, where we could go ahead
6 and finish up some of our investigations at 24A for
7 closure.

8 But I think in the big picture, I
9 don't think that one -- one acreage spot is going to
10 hopefully impact our getting the space investigated
11 and cleaned up too bad, so --

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Weren't there
13 some studies done by Edgewood when they developed this
14 and did a lot of their 64 engineering tests? And I
15 was wondering what that found to be the deposition
16 rate, and then the problem with those depositions, if
17 any?

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yes, there were
19 some studies done. The problem was they were limited
20 in scope. A lot of them just, you know, either used
21 graphite only and didn't use -- didn't study the
22 effects of smoke and graphite together, oil and
23 graphite combined.

1 MS. KAREN PINSON: Those EAs were
2 geared mostly toward the testing of the equipment, not
3 for long-term training, but for just the testing of
4 the equipment at those sites. They did testing at,
5 you know, Yuma and, I think, Dugway and Cold Regions
6 and at the --

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But didn't they
8 do it in combination with the fog oil, in order to
9 show the efficacy of the whole system?

10 MS. KAREN PINSON: For those EAs, I
11 don't know. I don't know if --

12 MR. BILL GARLAND: It was a
13 different environment out there, that's not really
14 comparable to our environment.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right. What
16 I'm getting at, though, is: At least some
17 quantitative measure should be available of what type
18 of deposition and to what densities over what area are
19 accomplished. And then, those who have some concern
20 with it can translate that to what they're looking
21 for. Because right now, I don't hear anybody saying
22 anything about what they're looking for. What I'm
23 afraid of, if you find something, it's wrong and --

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: No --

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- and I don't
3 want it to get to that point.

4 MR. BILL GARLAND: It's been
5 modeled before, but the problem is nobody knows what
6 the impacts of the model deposition rates are.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, if you find
8 something, what are you going to do with that
9 information?

10 MR. BILL GARLAND: We're hoping
11 we'll find very, very little at the rates that are
12 being used.

13 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: I don't think
14 -- I think from the standpoint -- you got to look at
15 it from a water quality. So, you wouldn't just be
16 measuring graphite. You would be measuring your total
17 solids and changing say a BOD (phonetic), and oxygen
18 demand.

19 You look at a lot of your water
20 quality aspects, how is that graphite affecting, you
21 know, the ground and the water that may impact, you
22 know, the insect and micro-vertebrates and so forth in
23 the water, and therefore impacting the higher food

1 change. So, that's where we would be concerned about
2 it.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah, that
4 makes more sense, because if I find a clump of
5 graphite somewhere, I don't know if that's meaningful
6 or not.

7 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right, right.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I don't want it
9 to end there.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Were many written
11 comments sent in?

12 MS. KAREN PINSON: Well, yes from
13 EPA Region 4 and ADEM and the Fish & Wildlife Service
14 had significant ones. But now, the Sierra Club, the
15 Alabama Conservancy, Alabama Ornithological Society,
16 those people didn't -- the major comment, I guess,
17 from -- there was sort of a group that sent in their
18 comments under one letter. And their comment was they
19 were concerned with the nesting of the migratory
20 birds. And they wanted to try to stay away from
21 graphite demonstrations as much as possible during
22 that -- during the nesting season.

23 But since the graphite was cut back

1 so severely to just this demonstration, we -- the
2 chemical school believes there will be very little
3 impact.

4 MR. RON LEVY: Let me point out to
5 everyone the EA only covered operations by the
6 chemical school while they're still located at
7 McClellan at 24A. Didn't go beyond that, didn't go
8 beyond the time frame that they're here. Didn't apply
9 to Pelham Range or any other portions of the
10 installation.

11 Any additional training with the
12 use of graphite will have to go through a whole
13 separate NEPA analysis and discussions to look at
14 impacts there. And the Guard, National Guard and the
15 Army Reserve are aware of this. In fact they called
16 me up to specifically ask me if they could do it out
17 here. And the answer was, no. It only applied to the
18 chemical school and what they're doing out there. And
19 it only applied to -- as the decision was made to do
20 it as a demonstration.

21 This information -- in fact, the
22 comments we got back from EPA and ADEM, as well as
23 Fish & Wildlife, are going to be used by Fort Leonard

1 Wood when they start to craft their own NEPA document
2 to support graphite training out there, if in fact
3 they can get that far. So, I think it's going to be
4 helpful to them. Obviously, a lot of issues that are
5 raised here are going to be -- they're going to be
6 able to -- well, at least they'll know what they need
7 to address out there, as they start to look at
8 mitigating factors for smoke. That doesn't mean that
9 they'll actually get to that point, because they've
10 got other issues with just fog oil. But at least, you
11 know, we at McClellan have started the process.

12 There are several other
13 installations across the U. S. That are pursuing this,
14 too. I don't know where they're at in their status,
15 but I don't -- a lot of them are -- a lot of them are
16 FORSCOM installations, I believe.

17 MS. KAREN PINSON: Yes, they are.
18 I think Fort Stewart has gotten some approval to do
19 graphite. They did some limited NEPA work there and
20 got approval.

21 MR. LEVY: Because it's all
22 site-specific. You cannot assume what's going on at
23 one installation will be the same for another. So,

1 that's the requirement. All of them are going through
2 the same process of defining what the impacts are and
3 then looking at what mitigation factors they can go
4 through.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Thank you.

6 Ron, do you want to get started?

7 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. A couple of
8 things. One is I'm going to ask Lisa to come up.
9 Lisa, do you want to come up here for just a second?

10 In front of you -- I know it's
11 going to be hard to read -- got a little white chart
12 there -- a little spreadsheet. Y'all see the
13 spreadsheet?

14 DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I can't read
15 it.

16 MR. LEVY: We're all getting too
17 old, huh?

18 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It's better if
19 you flip the pages. I made it bigger.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, Lisa made it
21 bigger.

22 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I did that on
23 purpose.

1 MR. RON LEVY: But I also put in
2 front of you an article out of the Defense
3 Environmental Alert that may be of interest to you.
4 It was -- and this is not a DoD newspaper, this is an
5 independent -- independent newsletter that comes out.
6 In fact, it's pretty -- as you look at DoD, they're --
7 they take -- they take aim at DoD quite a bit in their
8 environmental programs. But I thought you might be
9 interested in that, since there was some concern. But
10 the newsletter comes out and says -- basically quotes,
11 some sources within Congress and within DoD may be of
12 some interest to you, basically saying that they're
13 really concerned about this funding. They call it
14 incremental funding as you start to read through it.
15 But you might want to take some time and read that.

16 And I'll let Lisa -- do you want to
17 take some time and read that first? Let Lisa go
18 through her spiel.

19 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Okay, this is
20 my best shot at what I think I heard Fern requesting
21 during the last meeting. I tried to be as specific as
22 I could without providing any contracting sensitive
23 information on here.

1 On that first page, I know it's
2 hard to read, so what I did was I broke -- I broke our
3 program into different -- into let's see, well, one,
4 two, three, four, five different program areas. And
5 if you look on the following pages, each one is got
6 its own chart. And it's a lot easier to read.

7 That first page, I guess the one
8 thing it shows that the other ones don't show is on
9 the last two lines where it says what we were funded
10 and then what we were originally programmed.

11 So, I've broken it out into program
12 management dollars, the CERCLA dollars -- which you're
13 particularly interested in -- the UXO program, our
14 compliance program, and the radiological program.

15 And then if you'll look on -- let's
16 take the program management page for instance. I
17 broke up the projects the best I could, like I said,
18 without providing any contracting sensitive
19 information. And I totaled -- we started in '95, and
20 we're going out through 01, so I've totaled each --
21 each line item in that column to the right, and then
22 I've brought each -- each -- the total for each year
23 down to the bottom for each row.

1 If you've got any specific
2 questions, I can try to answer those.

3 MR. RON LEVY: The dollars are in
4 thousands, just remember that.

5 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Is this before or
6 after the deferrals?

7 MR. FERN THOMASS: This is after.

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: This is after.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Well, yeah, the
10 backup pages are after the deferral. The total on the
11 bottom of the first page for fiscal year 00 shows you
12 what the Army has in their request, which was 7.7
13 million, which I mentioned at the last meeting.

14 Although that's not -- not been
15 finalized, yet. Still waiting on Congress to make a
16 decision. And what we originally had programmed,
17 which was 32 million at the bottom of the sheet.

18 And you'll see that what -- the
19 impact or the deferral is the movement of that amount
20 of dollars into the 01 program. Where we originally
21 had 9 or almost 10 million, we now are looking at a
22 total of a little over 40 million in funding.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It looks like a

1 big bubble in the year 2000 with the CERCLA program.
2 And looking at that quickly, you can see that --
3 through the historical ranges and the landfills --
4 what's the CWM areas?

5 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Chemical
6 warfare material.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, those are
8 all the areas that have potential -- okay. And --

9 MR. RON LEVY: And for those of you
10 that you look at it under project status, where it
11 says, PA, preliminary assessment, SI, site
12 investigation, if you remember, as we talked to you
13 about the process and where we're at. So, you --
14 where you see two of the same project titles, you'll
15 see that there is a different status for those as we
16 move out. And we move from preliminary assessment,
17 site investigation, remedial investigation,
18 feasibility study, remedial design, remedial action,
19 or DRA.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And so we just
21 stop RIFS in the year 2000 is what happens. And that
22 can have a significant impact on the JPA's plans.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Well, actually,

1 Fern, we have 3 million dollars in our RIFS monies for
2 the year 2000.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: No, I'm looking
4 at those specific areas, landfills, chemical warfare
5 material areas, and then your site investigation for
6 the historical ranges stops.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Well, the landfills
8 will be at the RD stage, RDRA stage.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's not what
10 it says.

11 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Well, that
12 landfills agent training areas, the reason I stuck
13 that in there the way it's in there is because SAIC
14 started a project on seventeen sites back in 1990. It
15 was three landfills, two possible disposal areas, that
16 was Old Water Hole and Lima Pond and then all the
17 agent training areas. Well, to capture those dollars,
18 we've pulled those out and put them into different --
19 under different programs now or different -- they're
20 captured somewhere in here under category seven
21 parcels or in one of those -- those areas, now. But
22 in order to capture those dollars, I had to pull that
23 line item back in because of the way everything's

1 separated.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Well, then
3 going back to what Ron said, remedial design, remedial
4 action, you know, there's several scheduled there.
5 And it looks like the intent is to pick it all back up
6 in the year 2001. And so, you're not going to be able
7 to do anything on that in the year 2000.

8 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: That is one of
9 the impacts.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right. And I
11 think eventually what we as a board have some
12 responsibility to try to do is understand what the JPA
13 or the Fort McClellan Development Commission, however
14 we want to refer to them, has phased and which areas
15 it's going to want to get its hands on and whether or
16 not this is going to impact what they plan to do. And
17 we need to work with them so that they understand it
18 once we understand it. And that's why this is an
19 invaluable tool right now, I think, to begin to
20 identify in more detail what these areas are that have
21 that blank space in the year 2000, because there is
22 going to be nothing done for a few RIFs and a number
23 of RDRAs.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Let me go back to
2 what Chris had mentioned during the last meeting, and
3 that's the way we follow this process and the fact
4 that we're doing a hundred and fifteen sites, which
5 are in the SI phase, and won't go to -- or won't have
6 complete reports until probably the end of the summer
7 -- and because the majority of those were -- and when
8 we designed this budget, in a very conservative
9 manner, we assumed that all of those would move into
10 the RI phase. So, we really do not know -- we
11 honestly do not know what percentage of those are
12 going to -- or what percentage of those are going to
13 move into the RI phase. We kind of put a wedge in
14 there, so to speak.

15 So, the numbers, as we moved them
16 out of 00, may not be as significant an impact as you
17 might want to believe, you know, the movement of the
18 dollars from RIFS into the 01 side of the house,
19 because we really don't know, honestly don't know what
20 the actual impact is going to be to us.

21 If we had a lot of work coming out
22 of the SI phase, I could say, yes, there will be a
23 significant impact, but at this point I can't tell you

1 that.

2 In fact, although we don't have the
3 analytical back on a lot of our sites, we kind of
4 believe that there is not a whole lot out there.
5 There are some discoveries that are going to occur,
6 landfills is one of them, as I mentioned to you at the
7 last meeting, or old fill areas is one of them. And
8 there are sites out there that are going to continue
9 to move on. But the overall impact, can I tell you
10 that it's going to be significant for 00, at this
11 point I can't say that, because we don't know until I
12 get the final on our SIs as to what the BCT is going
13 to -- feels necessary to move into the RI phase. And
14 that's kind of a big question.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Now, you put
16 the bulk of the money, 3 million dollars, in 2000
17 category seven parcels. Was there a reason for that?

18 MR. RON LEVY: Because most of
19 those parcels are inside of the cantonment area here,
20 which is the property that --

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Good --

22 MR. RON LEVY: -- the JPA is --
23 excuse me -- the community is going to want to get to.

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Is everybody
2 familiar with what a Cat 7?

3 MR. RON LEVY: Do you remember the
4 CERFA categories that we've got that up on this map
5 here that we talked to you about before?

6 MS. KINGSBURY: That was all these
7 gray parcels that require further evaluation.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, and Category 7
9 is unevaluated, meaning we don't know what's out
10 there. We know that there was a history of some use
11 that would say, there could have been an impact, there
12 could have been a release. Don't have that history
13 saying that there was a release, but, no, that it was
14 used -- as an example, motor pool operation was used
15 as such, so, we're investigating those sites and
16 they're unevaluated right now. Do you want to add
17 anything to that?

18 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Well, I mean, I
19 really -- I think we're going to have a better
20 understanding this summer of what -- where we are
21 going to need the money and not have it in the RIs.

22 I think just as far as the
23 landfills, I do think it is going to create delay, as

1 far as let's say for example we wanted to -- these SIs
2 come back -- and to understand this, there is -- we've
3 got really four landfills that RIs have been done on.
4 We've got another probably five or six -- I'm just off
5 the top of my head -- that are in the -- the SIs are
6 getting ready to be completed on them. So, we really
7 don't know what the condition of other landfills are.

8 But if we wanted to go ahead and
9 execute say some capping or some consolidation or
10 whatever, we wouldn't have the money to do it, if we
11 wanted to start that right now. So, that would be the
12 -- to me, cost delays on some of those that we know
13 we're going to have some long-term remediation on.

14 How that affects the reuse, I think
15 the JPA has had a pretty good understanding to stay
16 away from landfills, as far as development, which, you
17 know, is going to be good. But if there are areas out
18 there that they're wanting and we find in the SI that
19 it's grossly contaminated, we're not going to have the
20 dollars to execute, you know, say a removal action if
21 we need it or move to an RI. So, that's where I see
22 there being some downfall.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Will you be

1 publishing a new version of the base cleanup plan late
2 this summer, once you get a lot of these results back
3 from some of the SI and RIs?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I don't think
5 --

6 MR. JIMMY PARKS: You took all the
7 money out of the base cleanup plan over here, I see.
8 We were supposed to be through with that in '98.

9 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It's funded.

10 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: My spin on the
11 BCP is that's really not what that document's going to
12 do for you. I think you can get that better just us
13 having -- giving you a presentation on the status of
14 the SIs, after we review the reports, basically sit
15 down and tell you the ones that we feel are no further
16 action, the ones that are the problem, the ones that
17 we need a little more data on. I think that can be
18 done in a meeting. But as far as the BCP verbalizing
19 that to you, I don't foresee that document doing that.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It comes after
21 the fact, it's too late.

22 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yeah, so --

23 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Will we ever get

1 to a stage where -- I know this is probably silly --
2 but will we ever get to a stage where we say, these
3 are the contaminated areas, this is what's wrong with
4 them, these are the priorities for cleaning up, and
5 this is the dollars that will be applied against them?

6 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Oh, yes.

7 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Will we ever get
8 to that stage where we have a document that will show
9 all contaminated areas, what's wrong with them, what's
10 the time frames for cleaning them up?

11 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Now, the BCP
12 will do that, as far as schedule. As far as each
13 site, what the problem, and what's the phase, the
14 cradle to grave for each site, that will be in the
15 BCP.

16 MR. RON LEVY: There will be an
17 ever changing table in there that will, you know, as
18 we move through the thing, so we'll have to keep
19 updating it to the status of that particular site.
20 So, yeah, that will be in there.

21 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Well, when will
22 we get to that stage? Like we've been meeting since
23 1996. When will we get to that stage where we have

1 this document that will show what is wrong, what needs
2 to be cleaned up, what's the corrective action to be
3 taken, what's the priorities, what's the dollars?

4 MR. RON LEVY: I can't tell you,
5 Jimmy, at this point. There has been a lot of
6 discussion within the BCT, base cleanup team, about
7 the BCP, and there are issues between agencies on that
8 document. You probably heard them before, lead base
9 paint and soils is one. Defining UXO as a CERCLA --
10 as a CERCLA -- hazardous substance under CERCLA is
11 another. And we're still trying to work through
12 those. We're working it. It's just been
13 disagreements among agencies. And it's not just at
14 our level, it's big Army, it's DoD, where EPA and DoD
15 are talking, as well. So, we --

16 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: But I don't --
17 you know, those are policy issues. But on the other
18 hand, as far as the site's condition -- the problem is
19 -- and I know it seems like it's taken awhile -- but
20 we've basically -- most of the sites at Fort McClellan
21 have not even been evaluated. We don't know what's
22 out there. All we've got is what we've looked at in
23 documents and records and interviews and aerial

1 photography and you name it. And until we get out
2 there and physically sample it and get that data back
3 and look at it, then we'll know, do we have a problem,
4 do we not. How much money do we need. And that will
5 be accomplished after these SI reports get done.

6 Now, IT has just -- in fact, you've
7 got the data -- but they've gathered the data for
8 pretty much every unevaluated site out there, and then
9 they're getting ready to go and do another forty
10 something USCs. And that's going to be just about the
11 bulk of all the unevaluated sites. We've got another
12 handful that we've discovered along the way. But I
13 feel that once all those SI reports come in, your
14 questions and ours, too, about the status of these
15 sites will be answered.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Then I guess
17 the next question is: When will we start getting
18 consolidated briefings on these results and forecasts
19 on what's going to be needed? And will they come out
20 of the BCT or is that going to come out of your shop,
21 Ron?

22 MR. RON LEVY: It will come out of
23 the BCT, which is representative of all of us. And

1 what I would expect to see is that starting in the
2 fall, as we get the information -- or as we get the
3 reports on the SI and we can start presenting to you
4 those reports, you know, the ones that fall into the
5 no-further-action category and the ones that are being
6 recommended for further work, that you could start
7 looking at the no-further-action ones and say, well,
8 you know, what's your -- get the input from the RAB on
9 their concerns or questions as to whether or not we
10 did an appropriate job.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Whether or not
12 you did an appropriate job, you're starting to ask us
13 to evaluate whether it was done right or not?

14 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I mean --

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's -- I
16 don't know how we can do that.

17 MR. RON LEVY: I'm responsible for
18 taking any and all concerns on as it relates to the
19 work we did. And we'll listen to any feelings that
20 the RAB members have about the work that's been done.
21 So, I mean, if you don't feel comfortable, you don't
22 feel comfortable. But if you've got a concern about
23 the work, we'll listen to it.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah, but if we
2 get diverted to that, I believe the board is not
3 paying attention to the broader picture of what the
4 results say, what they dictate, and when those things
5 need to be done in order to support the reuse plan.
6 If we try to delve down into the technical
7 efficiencies, sufficiency of activity, we're never
8 going to look at that broader picture.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Some RABs actually
10 want to do that.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think we
12 probably need to discuss that as a board then.

13 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, they have
14 their own separate technical review committees and
15 they actually want to look at the data and see what
16 the Army is saying.

17 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Ron has
18 mentioned this to y'all several times and you've
19 turned -- you've turned away from that idea.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: We only meet
21 once a month. We have tried to get some training
22 under our belt in order to be able to understand this
23 massive paperwork and the terminology and the

1 activities that are going on, but I think we need to
2 have a discussion on whether or not we want to get
3 down into the technical details or whether or not we
4 want to look at -- and maybe in a time frame, whether
5 or not we want to look at what the plan is, where it's
6 going, what the decisions are.

7 MR. RON LEVY: I don't want to
8 overwhelm you with the technical details, if that's
9 what the RAB doesn't want. I'll do whatever it is
10 that you want. It's available. I'll present it that
11 way. If you don't want to see it that way, I won't do
12 it that way.

13 But my plan was to show you what's
14 come out of the SIs and the no further actions and
15 take your input, based upon that. Now, we can do that
16 in a broad sense or we can, you know, get down to the
17 nitty-gritty and actually hand you the reports and
18 say, let's hear from you. I'll do it any way that
19 this RAB wants to do it.

20 MR. ALAN FAUST: I think for the
21 majority of us, Ron, until we get one under our belt
22 to see what you consider detailed as opposed to what
23 we on a Monday evening one night a month consider

1 detailed, we're not going to know.

2 MR. RON LEVY: If you get one of
3 these reports --

4 MR. ALAN FAUST: Just to turn just
5 a blank report over to us and say, read it and come
6 back with comments, you're not going to get much --

7 MR. RON LEVY: And I --

8 MR. ALAN FAUST: -- review by you
9 and --

10 MR. RON LEVY: And I can come back
11 and kind of highlight the report for you, and I'll
12 bring my contractor in and they'll highlight the
13 report and the findings from the report and the reason
14 why it was felt to either go no further action, why
15 the BCP felt that way, or why it's going into its next
16 phase in the RI phase. I can do that that way, as
17 well. It just depends. And whichever way this RAB
18 wants to go, I'm prepared to do that, to leave the
19 options open.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: You're talking
21 about a large volume of reports.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, sir,
23 absolutely.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And we're
2 talking about fifty or a hundred and twenty.

3 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Oh, yeah.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: In that range,
5 coming in groups of what, five, ten, fifteen at a
6 time? Maybe more.

7 MR. RON LEVY: I feel badly for EPA
8 and ADEM because we're feeding them with a fire hose.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right. And I'm
10 not sure we should be working those one at a time as a
11 board. I think it would just bog us down.

12 MR. RON LEVY: Or we may want to
13 take some of the more significant ones and let you
14 look at them as opposed to trying to look at the whole
15 group and then synopsise or present them, broadly, the
16 rest of them.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And the other
18 discussion, should we look at these things in groups
19 and what's coming out of them, have you tell us what's
20 coming out of them and where you're going with it and
21 how that fits into the overall program for reuse or
22 does it, and at the same time, defer getting into the
23 technical details until we can get through the big

1 picture of all of these that will be coming through
2 here in the next six months?

3 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: You won't
4 start getting a grasp on the big picture until
5 probably around December, January, the big picture.
6 The little stuff will start coming in and we can give
7 you short updates on what we're discovering each
8 month, you know, maybe a ten or fifteen minute, but
9 big picture, you're not going to get until around
10 December, January.

11 MR. RON LEVY: It's a long,
12 laborious process. And it's designed that way to make
13 sure that we cover everything, the details.

14 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: But I think
15 there is like right now things going on that I feel
16 you guys will probably, you know, want to know about,
17 that maybe we need to inform you about. For example,
18 the FOSTs and FOSLs that are taking place, are getting
19 ready to take place, the transfers that are being
20 worked on right now, you know, uh, I guess kind a ten
21 minute update on things that are going on.

22 MR. RON LEVY: That's a good point,
23 Chris.

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Because I think
2 sometimes we get in here and we get to talking and you
3 think, geeze, you know, are these guys doing anything.
4 And there is a lot more that is going on --

5 MR. ALAN FAUST: You better be
6 doing something --

7 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: It doesn't get
8 --

9 MR. ALAN FAUST: -- is the budget
10 that you're expecting to expend this year, the twenty
11 --

12 MR. RON LEVY: There is a lot of
13 money spent to --

14 MR. ALAN FAUST: -- twenty-five
15 million?

16 MR. RON LEVY: -- prove the
17 negative. There is a lot of money spent to prove the
18 negative, surely is.

19 MR. ALAN FAUST: Well, I realize
20 that, but I'm saying, twenty-five million in a year is
21 a lot of money on non-remedial projects, study, so,
22 there ought to be something going on.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Well, as we

1 discussed it and the program was set up, it was set up
2 so that we would go through, by year, the phases, the
3 PA, and then the following year, move into the SI
4 work, the following year, move into remedial
5 investigation, and then move into remedial design,
6 remedial action from that. So, I mean, that's the way
7 it was set up.

8 And, yeah, there is a lot of money
9 being sent in a fiscal year for investigations. And
10 we, the environmental folks, always get beat up about
11 that. But unless our data is substantial and --
12 what's the word --

13 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Definitive.

14 MR. RON LEVY: -- definitive, you
15 know, people will come back and say, well, you didn't
16 capture it all, you just didn't do it right.

17 One thing I want to -- there was
18 something else. This schedule obviously does not
19 reflect the out years. There will be additional work
20 in the out years. We expect there will be additional
21 work in the out years. In fact we've got requests in
22 for additional funding in the out years. So, don't
23 assume just because 01 shows up as a last year, that

1 there isn't additional work going on after that.

2 There will be, depending upon what the outcomes of
3 some of this -- this work. That includes the UXO
4 program, as well.

5 MR. JIMMY PARKS: The FOSTs and
6 FOSLs that you -- FOST and FOSLs, is that what you're
7 speaking of DOJ and National Guard enclaves and the
8 public benefit conveyance and that type stuff that
9 you're doing --

10 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Yeah, right now
11 I'm reviewing a transfer document of FOSTs for a waste
12 water treatment plant, the city wants that, pronto.

13 Next would be the parks and
14 recreation, they're wanting a lot of different areas
15 out here. And that's going to be a lease. And we're
16 looking at that.

17 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Some ball fields
18 and gyms and stuff?

19 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

20 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, Jimmy, what
21 I would like to do is at the next meeting give you an
22 update on what transfer -- not transfers -- not all
23 transfers -- lease/transfers are going on. All of the

1 transfer documents, lease documents that are being
2 written now for use, some of them are associated with
3 public benefit conveyances. Power, phone, gas, waste
4 water treatment, most of the utilities right now are
5 being worked for transfer purposes. And then the City
6 of Anniston wanting the recreational facilities, in
7 fact, to start this summer, so that the -- they have
8 facilities that they didn't have before. But those
9 are --

10 MR. JIMMY PARKS: When you issue
11 the FOST and FOSL, does that mean that area is clean?

12 MR. RON LEVY: No, not -- well on
13 the FOST -- no, not necessarily. It can be --

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: The FOST is --

15 MR. RON LEVY: There may be issues
16 associated with a FOST, asbestos, lead base paint.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It will be
18 clean for the use that it has been leased for --

19 MR. RON LEVY: Right.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- because
21 there will be stipulations in there as to how far that
22 use can go.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Right.

1 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: Right.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, it's been
3 determined satisfactory up to the level we're --

4 MR. RON LEVY: Right. And on a
5 FOSL, we can lease property that doesn't necessarily
6 have completed the cleanup, even though things are
7 going on or the investigations are still going on.

8 So, yeah, in fact, one of the
9 reasons why we're moving on a FOSL is because we
10 didn't believe we could get to a FOSL quick enough
11 because of the ongoing investigations on a lot of our
12 property.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ron, correct me
14 if I'm wrong, but for the next meeting, I would
15 recommend that people go back and look in that study
16 that we've got that EDOT laid out the Fort McClellan
17 reuse plan and specifically look at that phase one --
18 the early phases in the exact areas that Fort
19 McClellan plans to use in phase one. Was it 1-A, 1-B?
20 I think that takes us through the first four years or
21 so, doesn't it?

22 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, sir. The --

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That will help

1 them.

2 MR. RON LEVY: What Fern is talking
3 about is the community's piece to this was to do the
4 reuse plan, and that was the basis of our definition
5 for cleanup and it still, as I understand, even though
6 we've changed from the Fort McClellan Development
7 Commission to the Joint Powers Authority, it's still
8 the defined plan. We haven't got anybody to stand up
9 and say, oh, yes, this has changed or changed
10 significantly, anyway. So, the basis for our cleanup
11 was on that. We've asked specifically of the JPA if
12 there has been any significant changes to their
13 priorities on cleanup, and the word we got back was,
14 no, continue to use that plan. And there are nuances
15 to it, you know, that are coming out that we're trying
16 to react to. But for the most part, that plan is what
17 our basis for our own plan is. So, if you want to
18 understand what the proposals were, what the concept
19 for redevelopment was, you got to go back to that
20 plan.

21 MR. TOM TURECEK: Is there an
22 approved plan or an agreed upon between DoD and JPA?

23 MR. RON LEVY: That plan was

1 submitted to DoD and DoD did, as I understand it,
2 accept that plan.

3 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Yeah, but they
4 flip-flopped since then, the enclave's changed, the
5 reserves was on this side, and now they're on that
6 side.

7 MR. RON LEVY: I understand. And
8 like I said, we're trying to react to some of those
9 changes. The plan was pretty broad, though, in a
10 sense, you know, where they talked about retail
11 development and they talked about commercial
12 development, as opposed to, okay, we're going to put
13 -- you know, we're going to put it -- a facility for
14 fuel rod production in the middle -- I mean --

15 MR. TOM TURECEK: That's why I
16 asked, because I've seen everything from retirement
17 community to plutonium factories to prisons to, you
18 name it.

19 MR. RON LEVY: The one thing I've
20 told the community and I continue to tell the
21 community is that if you make significant changes to
22 your plan and you expect us to react to that
23 overnight, it's not going to happen. Certainly, if

1 it's going to -- if it's going to be an advantage to
2 the community from a redevelopment standpoint in
3 bringing jobs in, then Department of Defense,
4 Department of the Army will do everything possible to
5 put resources towards making that happen. That's been
6 said publicly.

7 MR. TOM TURECEK: Wasn't -- if I
8 understand it right -- you're going to have to catch
9 me up just a little bit -- but wasn't part of the
10 original deal that until they could -- until they
11 created a JPA, that was -- that had some kind of
12 governmental blessing, that they couldn't do business
13 properly with DoD, anyway? So now that that's done,
14 now they can continue or now they can really talk
15 seriously?

16 MR. RON LEVY: Well, it was
17 necessary in order to be recognized that they have the
18 ability to do certain things. And the JPA, as it's
19 configured now does have certain -- that ability, you
20 know, taxation, annexation --

21 MR. JIMMY PARKS: Zoning.

22 MR. RON LEVY: -- zoning. All
23 those authorities had to be within this body. Whereas

1 before, under the FMDC that wasn't there, it is now.
2 And as it stands now, it's recognized as that body and
3 can do these things and that's why things are moving,
4 I want to say quicker now, but that's a relative term,
5 too. So there is a lot happening. And we really are
6 trying hard, the environmental piece, to react to what
7 the JPA wants.

8 MR. JIMMY PARKS: If the -- on the
9 PBCs -- let's just take the golf course -- and I know
10 there is somebody after the golf course -- would all
11 of your resources be tied up in doing FOSTs and FOSLs,
12 if they do it? And Marion (phonetic) Institute wants
13 to come in here, and go, you've got to go do FOSTs and
14 FOSLs for that, looks like to me you would be tying up
15 all of your resources into that area.

16 MR. RON LEVY: For a FOST and FOSL
17 -- doing a FOST and FOSL doesn't mean we're doing an
18 investigation to clean up, it just means we're doing a
19 transfer document and we're capturing the
20 environmental condition of the property at that point,
21 what we know of it. If we don't think that the
22 condition or we know enough about the condition of
23 that property, at that point, that it can be

1 transferable, then we'll step up and say that.

2 Now, in the case of Anniston Parks
3 & Recreation, we've got some concerns about the use of
4 Yahoo Lake and Reilly Lake, because we've not finished
5 our investigations, and we know there are issues out
6 there. And we've asked specifically that those be
7 kept out of this recent FOSL, finding of suitability
8 to lease. And again, it's a lease now, as opposed to
9 a transfer. We're not transferring it. We know we've
10 not completed the investigation on the golf course, so
11 again, we're talking about a lease, so it's going to
12 go for like use, as opposed to a transfer.

13 Whereas the case of the waste water
14 treatment plant, that's category one. We don't know
15 of any issues from our environmental baseline, CERFA
16 category one, there is no color up there to that.
17 Should be an easy transfer.

18 Power lines and gas and electric,
19 those are all easements, as opposed to actually fee
20 transfer where land is actually going. And we'll give
21 them a summary of what we know about those facilities,
22 but they're easements as opposed to actual property
23 being transferred. So, I don't know that we do a

1 transfer specific. It's an easement, not a true
2 transfer.

3 But I don't have -- and there is
4 still a lot of decisions to be made by the JPA. We
5 hear a lot of things, but I don't have -- beyond the
6 parks and recreation stuff, beyond the utilities, I'm
7 not sure that we've got another transfer on the table
8 that's moving forward. Am I correct, Lisa?

9 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Correct.

10 MR. RON LEVY: Transfer or lease
11 that's moving forward. Those are the only ones that I
12 have. And we want to -- I want to be able to show
13 those to you. In fact, we'll put something together
14 at the next meeting that shows you what we're working
15 right now. It's not tapping into any of our resources
16 here.

17 MR. CHRIS JOHNSON: That's other
18 than fed-to-fed? There are fed-to-fed transfers like
19 the DOJ.

20 MR. RON LEVY: That's right, the
21 DOJ, right. But in the Fish & Wildlife, national
22 wildlife refuge, I mean, that's still down the road.

23 MR. TOM TURECEK: Does DOD have

1 like a target date to divest itself of this place,
2 completely? I'm sure they do.

3 MR. RON LEVY: As soon as possible.
4 There will be -- there should be -- Tom, there should
5 be a presence here at McClellan for as long as there
6 is property to be transferred, you know, somebody
7 representing the Army here. And the transition force
8 that's being put in place now, will be, for the
9 purpose of transitioning property and divesting of
10 property, be here. That includes a big environmental
11 piece.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: This document
13 right here, who actually put this together and when
14 was it put together?

15 MR. RON LEVY: My office did. Lisa
16 put it together.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: So, like has
18 Congressman Riley had a chance to see this, yet? Does
19 JPA have a copy of it, yet?

20 MR. RON LEVY: No. It's just an
21 abstract of our work plan, which goes up through
22 channels eventually to Congress. It's all rolled up
23 to Congress for funding purposes. And we are told

1 that we are to share this type of information that
2 comes from Ms. Goodman, herself. And I think I've
3 said that before, that we're to share --

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I need to ask
5 one question on that document that is for '99. There
6 is about a seven, eight million dollar Delta between
7 the program and the actual funded in there. Is that
8 lack of money affecting anything you are doing or
9 would be doing through the rest of '99?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Can you ask that
11 question again? I didn't get the first part.

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: There is a
13 Delta here, I think it's about seven or eight million
14 dollars.

15 MR. ALAN FAUST: Does that
16 represent less work?

17 MR. LISA KINGSBURY: It's about
18 nine million.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Oh, yeah.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I thought it
21 was twenty-six to thirty-four. It's eight.

22 MR. ALAN FAUST: Eight.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So, you don't

1 have eight million dollars that you had programmed.
2 Is the lack of that eight million dollars affecting
3 anything ongoing here at Fort McClellan right now;
4 that is, are there things that you can't do that you
5 would like to be doing right now?

6 MR. RON LEVY: The one thing -- and
7 Lisa's, I think, pointed this out to you really, is
8 that we're pushing back work on the ranges, and that's
9 part of the undeveloped area. The one thing that's
10 significant in that is that we're pushing back a lot
11 of work into '01 for ranges, small arms ranges, and as
12 what we would define as historical ranges, those
13 ranges that sit on top of each other from past
14 experience that we've wanted to investigate. So, you
15 see a movement of a lot of dollars into '01 for range
16 work. Did I say that right?

17 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Yeah.

18 MR. RON LEVY: And that's -- that's
19 something, you know, that's -- it's again, the
20 deferment is out there in '01, Because it's in
21 undeveloped portions of the property, it could or
22 could not have an impact.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But those are

1 studies that are not going to get done --

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Right.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- either SI or
4 RI?

5 MR. RON LEVY: Well, it will get
6 done -- the deferment --

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But it's not
8 going to get done in a timely fashion that you had
9 originally planned it to be done? And now, it would
10 probably be worth our while to know specifically what
11 ranges those are and how that's going to affect areas
12 that are planned for another golf course or a
13 retirement --

14 MR. RON LEVY: And I will tell you
15 this: Other than the ranges that are around the
16 eastern bypass, which we have funded, it's -- it's all
17 the other ranges.

18 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: It's all this
19 property. You got ranges overlapping ranges, that
20 would be all your historical. And then you've got all
21 these small arms ranges up in here. So, it's -- I
22 could give you a --

23 MR. RON LEVY: Truly, they've been

1 deferred into the '01.

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: '01. Was any
3 of that in their phase one? Any in the reuse of phase
4 one area? Because there was a second golf course
5 considered at one time. Was that still in there?
6 I've lost track of that. And there was some ranges in
7 the area.

8 MR. RON LEVY: There was another
9 retirement community that was on top of range sixteen,
10 yeah. That was one of the ranges --

11 MR. PAUL JAMES: Ron, I believe
12 that second golf course and that second retirement
13 community, if mind serves me correctly, was changed to
14 -- they sub-titled it some kind of a reserve, rather
15 than going with the --

16 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Redevelopment
17 reserve.

18 MR. PAUL JAMES: Yes, a
19 redevelopment reserve, rather than a golf course or
20 retirement.

21 MR. RON LEVY: It was undefined as
22 to exactly what they were going to do with it.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah, I was

1 going to say, what's a redevelopment reserve?

2 MR. RON LEVY: We told them that
3 was significant to put it on top of that particular
4 range. And they went back and said, yeah, we need to
5 rethink this one. So, they defined it as a
6 redevelopment reserve, and I can't remember exactly
7 what they stated that was. Frank, do you know?

8 MR. FRANK COBB: Are you talking
9 about the golf course they had roughly in the athletic
10 field on Summerall Road?

11 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

12 MR. FRANK COBB: Those are phase
13 two, as far as I know, as best I remember. In fact
14 the JPA, you know, they have been vocal about what
15 their plans are, as far as I know, with reuse, with
16 the new parties they have in leadership.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Should we talk
19 about what we would like for our next meeting? You
20 had already mentioned a little bit.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I want to give
22 you an update on property that's being transferred or
23 leased, so, let me give you that. And we can put a

1 table together and show you what documents we're
2 working and what property is out there.

3 In fact, it may be better if the
4 transition office might present that. I mean, you can
5 present what's out there that's being considered.

6 MR. FRANK COBB: Sure.

7 MR. RON LEVY: And I'll talk about
8 the environmental piece, as opposed to what they've
9 got in the loop for transfer/lease requirements. That
10 would include fed-to-fed and everything.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Can you put a
12 column or a discussion in there where you can tie it
13 to the reuse plan so we'll know is it part of the
14 phase 1-A, 1-B or out?

15 MR. FRANK COBB: We can talk about
16 that.

17 MR. RON LEVY: We'll try to do
18 that. We'll take a look and see if we can do that,
19 yeah.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Okay.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Anything else for
22 the next meeting?

23 MR. TOM TURECEK: Could you

1 possibly bring a key to this thing, so as you're
2 saying these acronyms all over the place, I can follow
3 them?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Tom, what we need to
5 do is kind of loads you up on some of the stuff we've
6 got out there.

7 DR. MARY HARRINGTON: And remember
8 what you asked for, now. Bring your pickup truck.

9 MR. RON LEVY: If you would, let us
10 know, call us and see what we can't do about giving
11 you some of the background stuff that you've missed.

12 MR. JIMMY PARKS: I'll share mine
13 with you.

14 MR. JAMES MILLER: What we should
15 do is put a big bowl in the middle of the room and any
16 time anybody uses an acronym, they've got to throw a
17 quarter in it.

18 DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Only if I
19 take the bowl.

20 MR. JAMES MILLER: Then we have a
21 party one year from that time, you know.

22 MR. RON LEVY: They defined it,
23 Fern, as the retirement development reserve.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Is that what it
2 was?

3 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. Which is kind
4 of, we're not real sure what we want to do right now.
5 We want to kind of make it a retirement, but we're
6 real concerned about the ordnance issue out there.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Now, the JPA has
8 a new chairman, and that's Roy Hanner (phonetic). And
9 I invited him to be here today and he wasn't able to
10 make it, but he will be here for our next meeting.
11 And I'm going to put a push on JPA to be here for all
12 of our meetings. And I think Roy is very willing to
13 make sure somebody is here for each one of our
14 meetings, because clearly, we need to coordinate --

15 MR. RON LEVY: Maybe we can get you
16 to sign a letter to go to them, Pete.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Great.

18 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Why don't we do
19 a letter?

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Let's do a
21 letter. Anything else?

22 We like to keep these things to an
23 hour, and we're within a five to ten minute window of

1 doing that. Anything from anyone in the audience?

2 Any questions?

3 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Pete, if I may
4 remind the RAB that next month is the normally
5 scheduled month to be in the community. Does anybody
6 have any recommendations where you would like to see
7 us meet? If not, you can just leave it up --

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Where would we
9 rotate, because I think we've been everywhere by now?

10 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Well,
11 Jacksonville community, perhaps.

12 MR. RON LEVY: Go back to
13 Jacksonville?

14 DR. MARY HARRINGTON: That's just
15 so hard for me.

16 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Well, should we
17 go back to Weaver, split the difference and be in the
18 Weaver area again?

19 MR. PETE CONROY: We'd be for that.

20 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Check with the
21 mayor.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Let's check with
23 Weaver.

1 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Okay, thank
2 you.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Adjourned.
4 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned.)
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)
CALHOUN COUNTY)

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

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

1 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
2 set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,
3 on this the 30 day of April, 1999.

4

5

6

7

8

9

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE

10

Notary Public in and for

11

Alabama at Large

12

13

14 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2001.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23