

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at
Norwood Hodges Community Center, Golden Springs,
Alabama, on the 21st day of August, 2000, 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	3-90
CERTIFICATE	91-92

1 DR. BARRY COX: Ladies and
2 gentlemen, may we begin. Appreciate that. Let's
3 start off by the non-members, if you would, introduce
4 yourselves. And if you want to, tell us something
5 about you, where you're from.

6 MR. JACK MCKELRATH: I'm
7 Jack McKelrath, with Foster Wheeler Environmental
8 Corporation.

9 MR. GLEN WRIGHT: I'm Glen Wright,
10 I'm the site manager at the transition force.

11 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: I'm
12 Joan McKinney with the RAB.

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

15 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Scott, go ahead
16 and introduce yourself.

17 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: I'm
18 Scott Beckett. I'm just a visitor.

19 MR. RON MASSEY: Ron Massey,
20 environmental office.

21 MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks,
22 transition force, environmental office.

23 MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James,

1 environmental office, transition force.

2 DR. BARRY COX: Appreciate that.

3 We'll begin with the roll call. Mr. Branchfield?

4 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Here.

5 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Brown?

6 MR. IKE BROWN: Here.

7 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Buford?

8 MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here?

9 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Conroy?

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Here.

11 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Cunningham?

12 Mr. Elser?

13 MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

14 DR. BARRY COX: Mayor Kimbrough?

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.

16 DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Longstreth?

17 Mr. Thomassy?

18 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

19 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Turecek?

20 Mr. Weston?

21 MR. BOBBY WESTON: Here.

22 DR. BARRY COX: Okay. Has

23 everybody had a chance to review the minutes?

1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I make a motion
2 we approve the minutes.

3 DR. BARRY COX: I have a motion.

4 MR. JAMES BUFORD: So moved.

5 DR. BARRY COX: Have a second. All
6 in favor? Minutes carried.

7 Let's move into the old business.
8 Ideas for the TAPP submission, anybody --

9 MR. IKE BROWN: I just wanted to
10 say one thing before we get started. I don't know if
11 this is old business or new business, but it's
12 business. I would like to see if we could make a
13 reflection in the notes that we're meeting at the
14 Norwood Hodges Community Center, not the
15 Golden Springs Community Center.

16 MR. RON LEVY: That's the actual
17 proper name for this?

18 MR. IKE BROWN: Yes, it's Norwood
19 Hodges. It was changed this summer. He was a Mayor
20 of Anniston long time, very active civic community
21 leader, and proud of it, and I want the minutes to
22 reflect that that's the name of this building.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Thanks, Ike.

1 MR. IKE BROWN: Thank you.

2 DR. BARRY COX: So, the minutes
3 have been approved. Going to get into the old
4 business. The TAPP submission, do we have suggestions
5 for what we would like to use TAPP money for?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Does anybody need a
7 refresher, in terms of what was presented about TAPP
8 back in the June meeting? We had Ms. Karen Wilson
9 from the Army Environmental Center come in and talk to
10 us about what TAPP is. It stands for assistance for
11 public participation program, technical assistance for
12 public participation program.

13 Anybody interested in reviewing
14 that? I could quickly go back through the notes. If
15 anybody wants to, I'll do that. Otherwise, we'll just
16 go ahead.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think the
18 main thing is, we're going to have to, every once in a
19 while, bring that up to remind people that that's
20 there, if they want to go in with additional study,
21 get some help in understanding something in detail.
22 But so far, I don't think any of us have anything to
23 throw up on the auction block.

1 DR. BARRY COX: I think one thing
2 was discussed was a review of the EE/CA documents.
3 Wasn't that what we've talked about in the past, have
4 somebody -- independent review of those?

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Is that something
6 we could implement sooner rather than later?

7 MR. RON LEVY: Well, it's certainly
8 something that you could bring forward to the Army and
9 say, you know, this is what we're interested in doing.

10 Let me just remind you, because I
11 think this is important, the TAPP is a mechanism to
12 help the RAB provide a better understanding or maybe a
13 scientific or technical aspects of cleanup
14 requirements. The TAPP requires that there would be
15 at least three RAB members. It requires that a
16 majority want the assistance. There were other
17 conditions that needed to be met. That there must be
18 specific technical assistance for the project.
19 Expertise cannot already exist within what the Army's
20 got. There is an application process. TAPP can't be
21 used for litigation. And it's really not meant for
22 community outreach or trying to obtain a specific
23 contractor that people just, you know, want to help

1 out. And that's kind of a wrap-up of the things that
2 Ms. Wilson had presented.

3 And the other thing I just want to
4 mention, it's really not new money, it comes out of
5 the Army's budget for what's already been proposed for
6 Fort McClellan.

7 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Since y'all are
8 already -- well, I don't --

9 MR. RON LEVY: There was a limit on
10 the dollars, too.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: The testing of --
12 and you know what my concern is -- but the testing of
13 the water source in my community, would that be a
14 viable -- y'all have already done it, but I don't
15 think there is any projected continuation of that.
16 Would that be a possibility?

17 MR. RON LEVY: Well, actually, I'm
18 not sure that there isn't a projected. Certainly,
19 there may be, once we get through what we're doing
20 with the landfills for long-term monitoring
21 requirements on those landfills. And that's the piece
22 that you're concerned about.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

1 MR. RON LEVY: So, I can't say that
2 that's not going to happen. In fact, it may in fact
3 happen. We may be in long-term monitoring
4 requirements for, in this case, it will --
5 particularly landfill three. So, I suspect that we
6 may see some controls associated with -- and that's
7 really what you're concerned about, if I'm not
8 mistaken.

9 DR. BARRY COX: For example, one
10 thing you could do then is have somebody review the
11 existing data and then report to the RAB their opinion
12 on the risk posed to your community. As I understand,
13 that would be one of the options you could have. You
14 can't generate new data, but you can review existing
15 data; is that correct?

16 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: How much money is
18 available?

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Had to be --

20 MR. RON LEVY: It's up to twenty
21 thousand, I think.

22 DR. BARRY COX: Didn't they say
23 last time there really wasn't a cap, but that was just

1 a number that was thrown out? If I remember the
2 statement, it's open-ended, but that was the number
3 that was given out but not actually a cap, right?

4 MR. RON LEVY: I don't have the
5 slides in here.

6 MR. RON MASSEY: The cap is
7 twenty-five thousand per year, a hundred thousand per
8 project. But what you're talking about was the annual
9 RAB budget was an arbitrary cap that it had.

10 DR. BARRY COX: Okay. And, of
11 course, the annual RAB budget could also be used for
12 the same purpose then, couldn't it, as you can do for
13 the TAPP money?

14 MR. RON LEVY: Well, actually the
15 RAB budget was meant for other things, such as the
16 transcripts and other preparation requirements in
17 support of the RAB. So, it was really going to be
18 different dollars. But there is nothing stopping you
19 from making an application, assuming that you can get
20 the entire RAB to agree to that, now.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: It sounds like we
22 have two good ideas on the table right now, one is
23 EE/CA, outside evaluation, another one is an

1 interpretation of the data that has been presented to
2 us regarding water quality.

3 MR. RON LEVY: Well, Pete, now, you
4 need to -- and I will caution you on this, because you
5 need to look at the document first before you decide
6 that you're just going to have it reviewed. Really,
7 nothing has been produced yet for the RAB to see, so
8 it --

9 MR. PETE CONROY: I'm not
10 suggesting anything, I'm just reviewing what we have
11 on the table. Another thought would be, there are
12 reuse -- as you know, Ron, there are reuse projects
13 going on all over the country right now, all over the
14 world, and maybe it would be an opportunity -- I mean,
15 I know there was recently a big conference in Oakland,
16 California, and I would have loved to have had the
17 money to gone out there, but seeing how none of us had
18 that chance --

19 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, that was --

20 MR. PETE CONROY: What we could do
21 is have one of those speakers come here to tell us a
22 little bit about what they have learned from their
23 personal experiences.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Well, that's one of
2 the things I talked about during the last meeting; we
3 have RAB money available to do that, but none has been
4 requested of me. I can do that with the money I've
5 got in-house.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: My thought here
7 was maybe we can request some of that.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. My point is
9 that we don't need to go down the road of TAPP for
10 that. If there is a speaker, if there is somebody
11 you're looking for, that we can bring in, I can use
12 the RAB dollars that I've got available.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: I wish I had a
14 good list of names right now. But how about a couple
15 of us work on that and submit them and get these folks
16 in and listen to them? You might have some ideas,
17 yourselves.

18 DR. BARRY COX: Any other comments
19 on the potential TAPP Project? Craig?

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Do you have
21 to have a specific project identified to use this
22 money, Ron? And again, I apologize, I probably missed
23 the June meeting, so I'm playing catch-up here.

1 It's certainly something that's
2 valuable, but twenty thousand dollars, quite honestly,
3 isn't going to buy you a whole lot of consulting time.
4 You're going to spend probably a minimum of a hundred
5 bucks an hour for a good consultant. And so it's
6 going to buy you two hundred hours or about five weeks
7 full time. So, you really need to focus in and make
8 sure you know who you want and what you want them to
9 do, or else you're going to blow that money in the
10 blink of an eye and get nothing out of it. So, does
11 the project have to be specifically identified or can
12 you --

13 MR. RON LEVY: Yes --

14 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- make an
15 application for it and then, as you --

16 MR. RON LEVY: No. The application
17 has got to be specific to what it is you're trying to
18 review.

19 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I mean,
20 does the RAB feel that we have -- and this is per
21 year, right?

22 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

23 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Roughly. I

1 mean, do we have a good understanding of what's coming
2 up in the next twelve months or whatever the time
3 frame is, to really know what we want to use that
4 money for? It sounds like the mayor has a good idea
5 for one opportunity. But, you know, you certainly
6 want to plan the use of that money very carefully,
7 because it will disappear real quick.

8 DR. BARRY COX: Ron, what do you
9 anticipate coming up, document within the next year?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Very shortly here we
11 should be showing you something in terms of cleanup
12 for ranges along Iron Mountain. We've got an EE/CA
13 coming out for landfills.

14 MR. BART REEDY: Which would be
15 heading towards your concern, Mayor.

16 MR. RON LEVY: We've already come
17 through two different EE/CAs, and one's for the
18 eastern bypass and the M-2 parcel, which is the piece
19 that's being defined for the Consolidated Publishing
20 Company.

21 Other decision documents that are
22 coming up. They'll be two others associated with UXO
23 that will be coming up, so probably a year or so away.

1 It's on areas in and around the cantonment area in the
2 Choccolocco Mountains. I'm sure there will be
3 something on movement -- on some of our other sites,
4 either remedial investigations, feasibilities with
5 T-38, and other sites where we have known ground water
6 contamination.

7 I need to go back and look
8 specifically at time lines and when those are coming
9 up. Immediately, what I know of is the ranges along
10 Iron Mountain Road. That in itself is also going to
11 get an independent technical review from the Army's
12 standpoint. The Army's going to pay some contractors
13 outside of the Army or some folks outside of the Army
14 to look at that document, as well. Certainly, you're
15 welcome to look at that information. We're doing
16 internally, because they're concerned about costs, you
17 know, what we're proposing.

18 DR. BARRY COX: One thought, as far
19 as review, is simply to put this in a one or two page
20 summary that would be in laymen's terms that an
21 individual on the RAB could understand, along with a
22 critical review, we could also have somebody do that.

23 So, you're saying the landfill

1 EE/CA is coming up and we have something regarding
2 some known ground water contamination. Is that --

3 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. If you would,
4 give me a chance to put a list together and show it to
5 you.

6 DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Maybe at the next
8 RAB meeting. And maybe you can look at that and
9 looking down the pipe of what's coming, what you might
10 want some assistance on.

11 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Is there a
12 progress schedule that could accompany that, Ron? I
13 know sometimes those are difficult. We don't have
14 project schedules.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Well, in some cases
16 we do have project schedules. So, in some cases, we
17 don't even have the work plans done at this point.

18 DR. BARRY COX: If I might suggest,
19 perhaps, if we could send that out ahead of time and
20 then so that we would have time to review it before
21 the meeting and then maybe have a chance to be able to
22 vote then when the meeting comes, that, yes, we would
23 like to consider this, this, and this.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Okay.

2 DR. BARRY COX: Would that be fair?

3 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

4 DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

5 MR. BART REEDY: The point you
6 brought up, I think, is really critical; when you send
7 a document to someone, a consultant, to review it, you
8 will go through twenty thousand dollars instantly. So
9 that I would suggest that, you know, if you guys want
10 to do that, then you really need to have a goal in
11 mind, a very specific goal in mind, and an agreement
12 that you're going to get to that goal from the
13 consultant or you will end up with a partial review
14 and not be too happy with the results, I'm afraid.

15 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Well, I
16 think from the RAB's point of view -- and I just speak
17 from my own personal experiences. I mean, you know, I
18 don't think the goal of this -- my opinion is the goal
19 of this would not necessarily be to make sure that the
20 Army and the regulatory agencies' oversight and their
21 conclusions are correct and accurate. I mean, you
22 really need to take a step back and ask, what is it
23 the RAB is really trying to accomplish.

1 There will be a fair amount of
2 technical overview of the documents. The technical
3 accuracy is likely to be pretty good. So, we have to
4 ask ourselves, Barry and other members, you know, what
5 is it that we really want to get out of this, and
6 focus on that, and not be so concerned about, are
7 these guys trying to slide something under the carpet,
8 because that's probably not the case.

9 So, it's like you said, you really
10 have to understand what you want to accomplish before
11 you start spending money. And that goes back to well,
12 what is the RAB's role, and, you know, how do we focus
13 the money in that direction. We don't need to play
14 the role of EPA or ADEM in this particular matter.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: Then, at the same
16 time, all of these, is they require ample
17 consideration, the world is passing us by. We need to
18 be quick --

19 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Sure.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: -- because we are
21 wide open in the Fort reuse right now. And so it's
22 kind of a double-edged sword.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: We do. But I

1 want to reinforce what Ron said and that is, we've got
2 to have a document in our hands, we should have read
3 it, at least reviewed it, and attempted to understand
4 so that we have a specific goal in mind on what we
5 want when we're going to spend that money. And that's
6 going to take some effort. A list that we're going to
7 receive from Ron isn't going to be anything more than
8 a list of what we're going to want to study in order
9 to determine what we really want. You can't do it
10 from titles, I don't believe.

11 MR. RON LEVY: And I would add to
12 that, too, one of the things that you certainly should
13 ask for when you get a document like that is, ask me
14 to bring in the contractor, which we will do, IT
15 Corporation, and have them brief this to you and try
16 to put it in terms that you can understand. And if at
17 that point you're still not sure or don't understand
18 or are looking for some more assistance, that's when
19 you start to say, well, maybe we might want to go to
20 TAPP and ask for another review.

21 MR. BART REEDY: And, Ron, you have
22 offered to have that before, you know, by just as a
23 way of suggestion or a thought maybe, the EE/CA for

1 the landfills, have IT come in and explain the
2 position on the EE/CA and the EE/CAs, that would be a
3 very good presentation and kind of get a feel for
4 what's being proposed.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Absolutely. I think
6 that's going to be a really interesting document. And
7 I would love to see as much public participation in
8 deciding which of the alternatives that come out of
9 that are the best. I mean, we're really looking at a
10 whole bunch of fill areas on Fort McClellan, and the
11 impacts are going to be significant. Some of it could
12 have resulted in some significant controls associated
13 with the property and/or an action taken to address
14 problems. I think that's going to be something where
15 a lot of folks are going to want to see what that
16 does, because this could tie up quite a bit of
17 property.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: When is the best
19 time for that presentation?

20 MR. RON LEVY: Well, first off, the
21 document is really not due out until the winter time
22 frame. Help me out here, Ellis. When is --

23 MR. ELLIS POPE: That's about

1 right. Probably by January.

2 MR. RON LEVY: We're looking at
3 twelve different fill areas on the installation. Four
4 of them are old sanitary landfills. Quite a number of
5 those are fill areas where we're really not sure what
6 went in there, but we know there has been soil
7 disturbance. We have been doing some intrusive work
8 and we've identified some things. Impacts could be
9 significant. Some of it's already impacted upon the
10 reuse and the JPA's -- and what they want to do.

11 So, now I got to tell you, none of
12 us have seen it, yet. We've not really even seen the
13 field work. So, we're at a loss to tell you exactly
14 what's coming out of it. Our contractors are working.
15 They're going by work plans that we approved, but we
16 don't know what data is coming out of that, yet,
17 because we haven't completed it and we don't know what
18 to say at this point. But I think it's going to be
19 some interesting things, because from my standpoint,
20 there is a lot of acreage tied up and it could result
21 in some significant restrictions on property.

22 MR. ELLIS POPE: Ron, that's also
23 one that's going to get the independent technical

1 review by the Army.

2 MR. RON LEVY: That's right.

3 MR. ELLIS POPE: Or their outside
4 contractors.

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Is that going to
6 deal with the movement of the contamination that we
7 have discussed, toward 21, and the aquifers, this
8 geological study, as far as the aquifers and the
9 probability of it contaminating our water system?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

11 MR. ELLIS POPE: Yeah, it will take
12 that into consideration. And it's going to look at
13 all of the twelve fill areas that we discovered on the
14 Fort and what best to do with those fill areas,
15 whether it be -- they'll look at a bunch of different
16 options, but they're also going to look at the ground
17 water issue migrating off post.

18 MR. RON LEVY: By the way, that is
19 Ellis Pope from Mobile District Corps of Engineers who
20 handles the technical aspect in the contract from the
21 cleanup standpoint, technical manager for the Army
22 here.

23 DR. BARRY COX: Any other thoughts

1 on --

2 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I just have
3 one quick question, Ron. If the RAB made a request
4 for TAPP assistance, how long does it take to turn
5 that around or was that covered at a previous meeting?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Ron, help me out
7 here. Do you remember how long that was that she
8 said?

9 MR. RON MASSEY: Well, it varies.
10 She said that the quickest one was five months and I
11 think the longest one was over a year. The money's
12 not the problem there, it's contacting and getting
13 with the directorate of contracting and finding the
14 person or the company to do the review.

15 MR. RON LEVY: That's something you
16 need to understand; this is done through Army
17 contracting means. In other words, it's not passed
18 off to you to go out and find a contractor. The Army
19 will take the money, you know, the scope of work would
20 be developed, you know, and then we'll contract it.
21 That's part of the requirements. I don't write those.
22 So, it will be out of Army contracting. Yeah, Bart?

23 MR. BART REEDY: One of the things

1 that may be a little unpleasant is the delay, you
2 know, the five month delay, and it is an Army
3 contracting issue. But keep in mind that the TAPP was
4 a mirror image of EPA's, their assistance grants, the
5 TAG grants, and when those came about, they're really
6 designed for a scenario that's a little bit different
7 than that, than what we have here. And the scenario
8 is, when the community has a fear that EPA or the
9 state or the Army is playing hide-the-ball and not
10 being up front.

11 Well, that's not the case here, so
12 that's -- but because it was designed that way, that's
13 why the contracting is so protractive. And that might
14 be too long for the things that you guys might be
15 interested in having reviewed. But again, Ron said
16 that he's got some dollars available that he will, you
17 know, throw at requests that you have. And that can
18 happen a lot quicker.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

20 MR. BART REEDY: And the decision
21 and the documents that you were kicking around in our
22 head are still out and they're not here, yet. Those
23 remedial documents are not here, yet, so --

1 DR. BARRY COX: So, in effect,
2 you're going to have to request the money long before
3 the document's available?

4 MR. BART REEDY: Right. If you
5 want a timely -- you know, if you want the contractor
6 to come to you, come back to you all with a conclusion
7 or with an opinion that will be in somewhat of the
8 time frame that everybody else is reaching the same
9 conclusion, yes. But again, you would probably need
10 to have some sort of an idea that the document that's
11 forthcoming you're going to be in disagreement with.
12 And that really -- I don't know that we're there.

13 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I would
14 suggest, Bart, that, from my perspective anyway, it's
15 not so much am I going to be in agreement or
16 disagreement with the documents. Once again, what is
17 -- I trust, in doing my job -- and you probably find
18 that hard to believe -- but I trust the EPA and ADEM
19 are going to look at the data and come up and ensure
20 that these guys are doing the job they've been tasked
21 to do. I mean, that's what your guys' role is.

22 And it kind of boils back in, what
23 is the RAB's role and how do we best fill that. And

1 I'm just sitting here thinking, you know, there are
2 some things that are a little more gray than others.
3 For example, characterizing a landfill is somewhat cut
4 and dry, characterizing soils, but characterizing
5 ground water is extremely gray.

6 MR. BART REEDY: Oh, yeah.

7 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And you can
8 get a lot of gaps in there. And so the RAB may want
9 to consider, you know, that the conclusions you reach
10 for any type of remedial activity that's required are
11 only going to be as good as the data. So, if we see
12 something like these landfills four or five months out
13 in the future, you know -- I don't know enough about
14 them to say this is true, but there will be a sampling
15 program, some sort of sampling to characterize the
16 landfill, itself, potentially, and certainly the
17 ground water to make sure any leachate coming from the
18 landfill is kosher.

19 But the remedial actions you get
20 are only going to be as good as the data you collect.
21 And that may be the best thing for the RAB to spend
22 that TAPP grant on is to ensure that the sampling
23 programs are, in our opinion, adequately

1 characterizing what is going to happen, because any
2 remedy is only going to remedy what you find. It's
3 not going to remedy what you don't find.

4 So, from my experience, you know, I
5 assume you guys are going to make sure an appropriate
6 -- as a matter of fact, your guys' remedy are usually
7 more extreme than people like us would care to see.

8 So, it's more -- from my interest,
9 it would be more from the data that's going to get
10 collected more so than what the final remedies are
11 going to be, because the remedies will address the
12 data that's been collected. And that might be
13 something for everybody to consider, as we're mulling
14 over how to spend this money.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Karen Pinson in the
16 back wanted to make a point.

17 MS. KAREN PINSON: On the issue of
18 the delay in the TAPP, getting the TAPP money from the
19 time the request is put in, I believe in the
20 presentation she said that part of that delay was due
21 to the terms in which the TAPP request was couched.
22 In other words, if the request was couched in too
23 broad of terms like, I believe one of them she

1 mentioned was somebody wanted a consultant to sit in
2 at every RAB meeting and tell the members what went on
3 at the meeting or something like that. In other
4 words, the requests weren't specific enough. And she
5 kind of went into that and said, you have to have a
6 very specific request in order to reduce the time from
7 the time of your request until the time you get the
8 money, the funds. So, that's something to keep in
9 mind, too, that you do have to be specific in your
10 request in order to cut your time down.

11 DR. BARRY COX: Any other comments
12 on the TAPP money?

13 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: We're kind of
14 mulling around here, the UXO characterization is
15 coming up pretty soon, too, and that may be another
16 hot item. I agree with that.

17 DR. BARRY COX: What time frame are
18 we looking at?

19 MR. BART REEDY: That --

20 MR. RON LEVY: That's what I was
21 talking about was those other EE/CAs. Is that what
22 you're talking about?

23 MR. BART REEDY: (Nods head.)

1 MR. RON LEVY: That would be one of
2 the ones that we would put on the list.

3 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Yeah.

4 MR. BART REEDY: And that would be
5 one of the more immediates.

6 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. I think we're
7 still a little bit far out on some of that. I mean,
8 we've got the M-2 and we've got the eastern bypass,
9 but I think we're still a long ways from the EE/CA
10 completions on those other two sites. I mean, I know
11 we're at least a year away, if we're talking the same
12 thing.

13 MR. BART REEDY: What I had in mind
14 was the -- going with what you were talking about, is
15 the data, are we getting what we're looking for here?
16 And the studies, the proposals for the studies on the
17 characterization are coming fairly quick.

18 MR. RON LEVY: And I agree. Can I
19 make another suggestion? Because this RAB is not
20 without resources. I will tell you that there are
21 folks on this RAB, Barry, Craig, and Fern, who have
22 had quite a bit of experience on the restoration side,
23 particularly in a science background, who may be a

1 group of folks, a core group of folks that you might
2 want looking at these documents from a technical
3 standpoint. I don't want to put a whole lot of work
4 on you guys, but truly, you do have expertise that you
5 don't necessarily -- I mean, that you have free here.
6 That's one of the reasons why you're on the RAB. You
7 certainly have an understanding of this stuff that I
8 mean, you could go through and -- because there is a
9 component of some RABs, technical review committees, a
10 separate component, where you can form a technical
11 review committee, because not all members of the RAB
12 have that same background and knowledge, but you do
13 have folks on this particular RAB that could take a
14 look at some of these documents and say, well, you
15 know, and this is what we think. And you might want
16 to use that experience.

17 DR. BARRY COX: I think one of the
18 things we're probably lacking is a geologist on our
19 group. Craig, is your background in that area?

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: No, but I
21 know enough people that are geologists that I could
22 get help if I needed it.

23 MR. RON LEVY: I'm not forcing you

1 not to spend money, I'm just saying, there are
2 resources available here.

3 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I think the
4 challenge there, Ron, though, is the time frame
5 between when we might identify a gap in our knowledge
6 and we could actually get that knowledge is five
7 months, and that throws a little bit of a bump in the
8 road there. And I'm not trying to get out of
9 reviewing documents or anything like that, I'm just
10 saying that I don't know everything, nor does Barry,
11 nor does anyone else in this room. But when we do
12 identify a gap in our skill sets, the time line there
13 is an issue.

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Ron, I know we've
15 talked about that before. I think maybe it was you
16 that proposed setting up a technical review committee
17 and just really never had much enthus- -- I mean, all
18 of us are volunteers and we have a lot of other work
19 and I don't know how practical that would be. But
20 maybe -- I know our knowledge level is climbing, I
21 don't know if the interest level is. Do the three of
22 y'all or anyone else have interest in doing that?
23 Time, I guess, would be the real question.

1 DR. BARRY COX: Sure. It would
2 depend on when the document came up and how much time
3 we had. It depends on how many alligators we have in
4 our midst at the time, I guess.

5 MR. RON LEVY: It would certainly
6 save us from having to reproduce for every member who
7 may not have the ability to go through this document
8 in detail. And they are expensive, they are expensive
9 to reproduce. You know, maybe giving out three or
10 four different copies to various individuals and
11 having them go through with their knowledge and
12 background and comment on it, because we can respond
13 to all comments coming in. And we'd certainly respond
14 to RAB comments coming in. And who knows, it could
15 force us in a direction that we haven't thought about.
16 Certainly, there are things out there that we don't
17 see because we tend to be narrow in our focus.
18 Something you might want to take up and consider.

19 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: How do we
20 capture these action items, Barry? What did you say?

21 DR. BARRY COX: The next thing
22 would be, does somebody want to make a motion to that
23 effect, I guess? That would be the first way to start

1 it, wouldn't it?

2 MR. RON LEVY: Again, ask for a
3 motion for a technical review committee and ask for
4 nominations and go from there.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Sure. On behalf
6 of those of us who don't have time or the expertise,
7 we would like for those of you who do have the time
8 and expertise --

9 DR. BARRY COX: Now, Mr. Conroy, I
10 think we would have to beg to differ that perhaps you
11 do have some expertise for the -- have plenty of time,
12 too.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: I thought I might
14 squeeze out of that, but --

15 MR. RON LEVY: There is a lot that
16 you could add, Pete, if you had the time. Certainly,
17 when you look at alternatives, it's not just the --

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Well, my interest
19 would be informalizing a review process, that's a
20 little bit more than what we've had in the past.
21 Seriously, sure, I'll make the motion that we form a
22 technical review committee. And anyone who cares to
23 serve on it, they should receive the documents. And

1 then that group should probably meet outside of these
2 normal meetings to review the material.

3 MR. RON LEVY: And I will also
4 point out, just so you understand, I can do a lot to
5 support, if you have a technical review committee, I
6 certainly -- if you're willing to come in, I can have
7 our contractors, even before you start to sit down
8 with a document, go through and explain to you what's
9 in there and maybe help you out before you even crack
10 the document open.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And that's what
12 I'm sitting here thinking. If you form such a
13 committee, just out of common sense, that committee's
14 going to have to be directed to look at specific
15 documents that this board wants it to, not every
16 document that comes out. In addition, this board is
17 going to get a tremendous amount of information from
18 the contractors and from Ron's group on those
19 documents. And so somewhere you've got to balance
20 that, instead of just using that technical committee
21 to do the job that these contractors and Ron's group
22 can do much better in most cases.

23 You can have your committee

1 supplement it or compliment it from the board's
2 standpoint, but I think in most cases, we're probably
3 going to get most of the information from the experts
4 who actually did it when they brief us.

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I hate to keep
6 going about one thing, but my main concern is what
7 I've already discussed. I feel like that I don't have
8 the expertise. If they throw that in front of me, I
9 don't have the expertise to determine whether that's
10 everything that needs to be done. And I would look at
11 we do have some folks in there, because I've told
12 y'all, I still have in the back of my mind my
13 experience -- one reason I got involved in this is
14 because of a document that was presented to me of a
15 scenario that there was leakage from the landfill and
16 part of the exercise was how we're going to handle if
17 it contaminates the wells of Weaver. And so I still
18 got in the back of my mind that there is a
19 possibility. Why would they have put that in there
20 and had an exercise to do that, if there wasn't some
21 possibility?

22 But like I say, I don't have any
23 geological background, I don't have any, as far as

1 chemical or other, and I think that this would be a
2 definite asset if we had people on this that could
3 review that document, because I'm not going to know.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And I'm
5 agreeing with you --

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yeah, that's what
7 I'm saying.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- that would
9 be a document that you would bring up, the board would
10 probably agree with you, and that committee would
11 again go into depth using its expertise to go ahead
12 and provide some more feedback besides what we got
13 from the people who actually did it.

14 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Sometimes when
15 you have these things going on, too, and you get this
16 technical review committee, as I did today, sometimes
17 I feel very compelled when I'm reading these
18 documents. And, you know, I'm a geologist and
19 engineer. I'm reading these things. I've done this
20 stuff for such a long time.

21 But today I felt compelled, I need
22 to go see the site in detail. And it takes a day,
23 sometimes two days, to understand when you're trying

1 to understand. And it's very complicated. So, it
2 goes beyond just getting a report and reviewing it
3 sometimes. It takes a lot of understanding, by
4 hands-on, too.

5 MR. RON LEVY: This is tough stuff
6 and you can get overwhelmed with information very
7 quickly.

8 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: It's
9 overwhelming.

10 MR. RON LEVY: There is a lot of
11 information that we've collected, and a lot of money
12 goes into investigations. And I sympathize with you,
13 it really can be overwhelming to somebody trying to
14 figure out what it is we just told them.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I guess what I
16 was doing was seconding the motion. And I understand
17 what Fern is also saying is that, you know, this
18 committee can't review everything, but if we have
19 concern -- and that is my concern -- then I would
20 request that this committee then review that and then
21 any feedback. And then this could be, if we needed to
22 go any further, this could be a resource for the TAPP,
23 if we're not satisfied, you know, with the explanation

1 and with the research that's done, then we could ask
2 for it. So, I would like to see us do that. I second
3 Pete's motion, with that request aspect, you know,
4 understood in there.

5 DR. BARRY COX: We have a motion
6 with a second. Do we have any other discussion? All
7 in favor?

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I'm in
9 favor.

10 DR. BARRY COX: All opposed?
11 Motion's carried. Any other comments on the --

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Do you want to
13 name some members real quick to that group?

14 DR. BARRY COX: Sure. I thought we
15 could get by -- would someone like to suggest members
16 for the technical review committee?

17 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I think three
18 names have already been mentioned, haven't they? If
19 they would accept it. You know, if they don't feel
20 like they have time, I understand.

21 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I'll do it.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I think you
23 mentioned my name. I'll do it. There may be times

1 when I can't and I'll say I can't. You know, we'll
2 just have to see if our time is available and --

3 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I would
4 just like the opportunity to beat up on somebody
5 instead of me getting beat up all the time.

6 DR. BARRY COX: Is there anybody
7 else that would like to be on the --

8 MR. RON LEVY: I'll show up at your
9 meetings.

10 DR. BARRY COX: -- technical
11 committee?

12 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: I think it
13 would be good, too, because you'll get a good
14 appreciation for it, too.

15 MR. RON LEVY: So, I understand
16 three members have volunteered --

17 DR. BARRY COX: Three, plus one.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Craig.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Who were the
20 three?

21 MR. RON LEVY: Craig Branchfield,
22 Dr. Barry Cox, and Mr. Thomassy.

23 DR. BARRY COX: And Pete Conroy.

1 MR. RON LEVY: And Pete, all right.

2 DR. BARRY COX: Forced into it.

3 MR. RON LEVY: There we go. Got
4 four members.

5 DR. BARRY COX: Okay, we've got
6 four members. Let's see, I think we finished
7 dispensing with TAPP. Any other comments on the TAPP
8 issue? Are we through with that? Any other old
9 business?

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Had one thing
11 that I picked up. I didn't make the last meeting,
12 either, Craig and I apologize for that. But I
13 understand that at the last meeting there was some
14 discussion about a helicopter pad near the CDTF. And
15 I would like to know more about that.

16 My understanding is that it will
17 have live agent possibly flown in to the helicopter
18 pad. And I guess my concern is that -- well, I'm
19 concerned about live agent, any time it's in our
20 community. But the transportation of live agent, to
21 me, is far more dangerous than the actual application
22 or use once it gets to where it's going. And I don't
23 think our community is aware that this is happening.

1 And maybe it's not.

2 MR. RON LEVY: Well, let me bring
3 you up to date on it. Our piece, Fort McClellan's
4 piece on that only was to work through any
5 environmental considerations associated with building
6 a landing pad. The Department of Justice, which runs
7 the live agent training facility, what they're calling
8 the COBRA facility now, COBRA training facility now,
9 did do an EA -- I'm sorry.

10 MS. KAREN PINSON: EIS.

11 MR. RON LEVY: It was an EIS where
12 they did address that issue, Pete, and it was open to
13 public comment and forum. Now, again it's not our
14 issue. It's not even an issue here that the RAB has
15 any influence on, but it was a Department of Justice
16 issue. And all we were doing is -- because what their
17 intent was originally was to land it on the parking
18 lot.

19 Instead of landing in the parking
20 lot, now they want something a little safer, they want
21 to build a pad out in the back, which we agreed to,
22 and we looked at the environmental considerations.
23 And, Karen, help me if I say anything wrong.

1 MS. KAREN PINSON: No, that's
2 correct. The parking lot where they proposed to land
3 was in their EIS, was the parking lot in front of the
4 CDTF. And because there might occasionally be a car
5 or two in that parking lot when they chose to land and
6 some various other factors, if they had an emergency
7 that they needed to get that EVAC helicopter in there,
8 they decided a helipad built specifically for the
9 purposes of helicopter landings would be more
10 appropriate.

11 So that, like he said, our issue
12 with it was not whether to let them fly the agent in,
13 because that had already been addressed in their EIS.
14 And they had a public meeting on that at the meeting
15 center. And they did have some public comment on that
16 issue and they addressed it in their EIS. They had
17 their responses to the public comments in the EIS on
18 that issue. But they worked various issues like use
19 -- their flyways are, they are going to be adjusted so
20 that they don't fly over highly populated areas,
21 certainly. But it certainly is a concern and was a
22 concern with the EIS.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Were you at that

1 meeting?

2 MS. KAREN PINSON: Yes.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Was it well
4 attended?

5 MS. KAREN PINSON: You know,
6 probably a little better than some of ours for our
7 public -- for our EE/CA for the bypass and that kind
8 of thing.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: How many people
10 do you guess were in attendance? And, you know, I'm
11 not blaming anyone. I'm blaming, myself. Obviously,
12 I've missed the boat, but --

13 MR. PAUL JAMES: Pete, one of the
14 smaller conference rooms was full. They had chairs
15 all --

16 MR. PETE CONROY: Fifty or a
17 hundred people or something like that?

18 MS. KAREN PINSON: I wouldn't say
19 -- a lot of them were DOJ people, so it's kind of hard
20 to say --

21 MR. PETE CONROY: How many
22 community members, I guess? Was there any article? I
23 mean, if I missed the boat, it's my fault, but --

1 MR. PAUL JAMES: I think you could
2 ask for a public record of that particular meeting and
3 get it and review it. And it should have everything
4 laid out.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: How many RAB
6 members knew that that meeting took place?

7 DR. BARRY COX: I was there.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: A quarter of us.

9 MR. RON LEVY: I understand your
10 concern, Pete, and we have it on record. Certainly
11 it's -- from what I remember, there was some concern
12 about that exact same issue, although I do believe DOJ
13 was able to adequately explain what their methodology
14 was on use of the aircraft. But short of that, it's
15 really not this issue, it's not the Fort's issue, it's
16 not Fort McClellan and the Army's issue, because it
17 belongs to the Department of Justice.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: I understand.
19 But it was only at the last meeting that it was ever
20 discussed in this RAB?

21 MR. RON LEVY: I don't know that
22 we've -- yeah, the heliport, but it was construction
23 of the heliport, as opposed to whether or not they

1 were going to bring agent in, because that was a
2 decision beyond us.

3 We were looking at the property and
4 whether or not when they dug up, you know, whether
5 there was any impacts associated with -- and there
6 might have been archeological sites, maybe that may
7 have run off, and we were strictly looking at
8 construction of a pad, and that was it.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: There have been
11 some -- I attended one in which Mr. Johnson made a
12 public presentation. Was that here?

13 DR. BARRY COX: City Meeting
14 Center?

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And explained the
16 flyover and how they were transported in and
17 everything.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Of course, it's
20 there now. It's what's left over that the military
21 had already had there. So, they actually hadn't
22 started bringing any in, yet.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It was driven

1 by the Chemical Weapons Convention. They used to use
2 binary processes out there to produce the agent they
3 needed for that training.

4 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And because a
6 lot of the limitations that have come out of that
7 treaty and OPC implementation of it, they can't use
8 that laboratory to produce it.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: To make it.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And so now
11 they've got to fly in the agent to operate the
12 facility.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: On a positive
14 note, I would rather them fly it in than drive it in.

15 MR. RON LEVY: I'll point out,
16 that's not a unique thing, that the Army actually does
17 that other places.

18 DR. BARRY COX: Southern Research,
19 for example, I think, is a place --

20 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Is the Army
21 flying it in?

22 MR. RON LEVY: In fact, yes, I
23 think the Army is the one that's flying it in. They

1 have to get the agent from the Army.

2 MS. KAREN PINSON: Escort

3 (inaudible), is it Tech Escort or something --

4 DR. BARRY COX: Tech Escort.

5 MR. RON LEVY: It comes out of labs
6 up there in Maryland, and Tech Escort's the one that's
7 involved in it.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Not to belabor a
9 point, but were there any articles in the newspaper,
10 TV?

11 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I know there
12 was a --

13 MR. PAUL JAMES: Had to have been
14 public notice in the papers.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: The article is
16 not a public notice. Was there an article?

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, there was an
18 article, too. I'm pretty sure I read an article. It
19 was awhile back, but I remember reading an article
20 about it and I believe your point was brought up.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: If you could find
22 the article, just for the record, I would very much
23 like to get a copy of that article.

1 MR. RON LEVY: We'll take a look.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Thanks.

3 DR. BARRY COX: Any other old
4 business? On to new business.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Can I just stop just
6 for a second?

7 DR. BARRY COX: Sure.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Phillip, you wanted
9 to maybe say something about M-2 before we go into new
10 business.

11 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: The M-2, I was
12 here this week and all day Saturday, and apparently,
13 the M-2 was clean in the area that had a span of -- I
14 think they kept it two hundred feet. And we had to
15 shut down the northbound lane on 21.

16 The way I understand it -- and I
17 was there and I saw it -- everything went off without
18 a glitch. And we didn't find anything that resembled
19 an item out there that could be dangerous.

20 The only thing they did find, which
21 was very far away from the road, was a top of a white
22 phosphorous grenade. Other than that, I don't have
23 the exact count and numbers -- that's to come to us --

1 but I understand that there were seventeen grids that
2 were done and fourteen were in the two hundred foot
3 zone. And all they found were horseshoes and pieces
4 of fence and nails, a few bolts, and a couple of other
5 pieces of trash. That's extremely encouraging.

6 In their QAQC, what I saw, was done
7 very well by the DOT and also in a random selection,
8 and also was the same kind of piece of garbage they
9 were picking up. So there, without being said -- two
10 days ago, there were two accidents, and there was one
11 with injuries. But I understand --

12 MR. PAUL JAMES: Traffic accidents.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Automobile.

14 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: It wasn't due
15 to the detour. I understand that some people made
16 some wrong decisions. And they call it the T-bone, I
17 think, crash. And that's the one that caused injury.
18 And the other one was, I think, a fender bender.

19 But besides that, I had an
20 opportunity to meet the police force and I had an
21 opportunity to meet the Anniston road -- I don't know
22 -- traffic division --

23 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Public works.

1 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Yeah, and
2 quite a few other individuals. Everybody was jovial.
3 It was a real good, well run operation, I thought.
4 So, hats off to the guys that were digging the stuff
5 right in front of their face. It was a hot day.

6 They knew their mission that day.
7 We didn't think we were going to get it done that day,
8 but not only did they do it, it gave us more time to
9 even check a little bit more. So, as I say, those
10 guys that are digging really need a good hand, you
11 know, hats off to those guys for a job well done.

12 MR. RON LEVY: We've got
13 Jack McKelrath who is the project manager that
14 represents the company that was doing the work.

15 MR. JACK MCKELRATH: Thank you.
16 I'll take that news back to the troops in the morning.

17 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: It needs to be
18 well said. I went through all their health and safety
19 briefings, too. I used to be a health and safety
20 officer under level B, and pretty intense things -- I
21 know what these guys were going through. And their
22 health and safety briefings and meetings were
23 extremely intense, very well organized, and I think

1 everything, like I said, everything was just like
2 clock work.

3 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. James?

4 MR. PAUL JAMES: I might also add
5 that the three remaining grids were the safety zone
6 around the Berman Museum. So, that established that
7 area. The next one they'll be looking at is around
8 the Natural History Museum. But they're working out
9 that schedule so that there will be no occupants in
10 that area.

11 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: And the way I
12 understand that, that starts at 9:00 o'clock when it
13 opens up, so they'll do everything before 9:00
14 o'clock, it should be done.

15 MR. FERN THOMASSY: On the original
16 schedule then, this is the accomplishment, the removal
17 action?

18 MR. RON LEVY: It's changed since
19 then, Fern.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I haven't seen
21 one since March.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, the new
23 schedule calls for them going through the 15th of

1 September on the completion of the removal --

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I see --

3 MR. RON LEVY: -- action.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: What's the cause
5 for the change?

6 MR. RON LEVY: A little more
7 difficulty, in terms of the terrain and trying to
8 reacquire the objects. I want to say manpower, too,
9 we're limited in manpower, because there is not that
10 many UXO specialists out there that can do the work.
11 So, it's taking them longer than what we originally
12 projected.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: About three
14 months longer.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Well --

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's what
17 this shows. Is that true or is it going to be even
18 longer?

19 MR. RON LEVY: Well, overall, the
20 schedule has changed quite a bit. One of the things
21 that you see in that old schedule -- what's the date
22 you got on yours for the final --

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: 30 June.

1 MR. RON LEVY: 30 June for what?

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Completion of
3 removal action.

4 MR. RON LEVY: That's changed --

5 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That's
6 September 8th.

7 MR. RON LEVY: That's a real old
8 schedule, that's a real old schedule. I've got --

9 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: The original
10 --

11 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: To September
12 8th.

13 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: The original
14 M-2 schedule had the removal action for 8 September.

15 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That's the
16 same schedule.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: No.

18 MR. RON LEVY: No, it's not.

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Final removal
20 report is due September the 8th.

21 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right.

22 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But removal
23 action was to be completed June 30th.

1 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right. That's
2 the last schedule.

3 MR. RON LEVY: That's the last
4 schedule, that's what I meant, that's the last
5 schedule handed out. The new schedule calls for the
6 removal action to be completed on the 15th of
7 September. And then the other things start to fall in
8 line after that. And I can get you a copy of that, as
9 well. In fact, we notified the JPA, much to their
10 angst, not too long ago --

11 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Last week.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Miki, how does
13 this affect your work with the JPA?

14 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: It's affected
15 us because we have a contract to sell this
16 twenty-three acres of land. We are under contract
17 with the understanding that we would transfer the
18 property September 15th. And we're in the middle of
19 some very interesting discussions right now with the
20 parties involved in this.

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Going to cost
22 them a few dollars.

23 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I met with

1 Mr. Ryan today, and we're trying to see what we can do
2 to work with this, but the Army notified us last week
3 that there was a problem and that they had missed the
4 June deadline.

5 MR. RON LEVY: One of the things we
6 also did that they hadn't had originally was the time
7 lines or the time periods needed to get through the
8 real estate action. What you see there really was the
9 completion of the FOST and submission to our NEX
10 (phonetic) headquarters. It really doesn't talk about
11 the time lines needed to get it through all the hoops,
12 once it leaves the installation. So, that was added
13 in there.

14 So, right now, what we're actually
15 looking at and what we've told the JPA on a final
16 transfer of the property from -- actually, the final
17 transfer where JPA actually gets it, somewhere around
18 the 5th of January, then JPA has to turn around and
19 actually turn it over to Consolidated Publishing. So,
20 we're looking somewhere around 9th of January for that
21 to happen. That's what's on the schedule now.

22 And I will provide that -- in fact,
23 we can put it in the mailings out to folks, because we

1 don't have copies of it here. So, if you want to see
2 that new schedule --

3 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Correct me if
4 I'm wrong. Aren't you going to look at those dates
5 and fine tune those before -- I mean, I don't think --
6 that date's not set.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Well, we hadn't
8 gotten to that discussion, yet, Miki.

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Okay.

10 MR. RON LEVY: I know there is a
11 letter going to Mr. Clark and I know that you've got
12 some concerns there. And we haven't sat down and done
13 anything, so right now what I'm telling you is the
14 date that we've defined is on the schedule, based upon
15 what we think we can do as of the 5th of January. But
16 we haven't discussed anymore than that.

17 DR. BARRY COX: Anything else on
18 old business?

19 MR. PETE CONROY: I'm glad to hear
20 about the garbage, that's good news, and the
21 horseshoes, that's good news. Tell us more about the
22 grenade.

23 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: The white

1 phosphorous grenade?

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Yeah. It was
3 just like a cap, right?

4 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: It was a cap
5 and it was actually in an area where they had had
6 training before, up in -- it's further to the west.
7 Excuse me, to the east. And they had actually found a
8 white phosphorous grenade before. And so, it's in
9 that same general area. So, they knew it was going to
10 be -- if they were going to find anything else with
11 the white phosphorous grenades, it was going to be in
12 that same area.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: How many of those
14 have been found?

15 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Just one.

16 MR. RON LEVY: And, Jack, you can
17 tell them how we handled that, how Foster Wheeler
18 handled that grenade.

19 MR. JACK MCKELRATH: Sure. The
20 white phosphorous grenade that we discovered that
21 appeared to have white phosphorous in it, was removed
22 from the site because of the extreme fire hazard and
23 taken to another area where it was bagged and

1 detonated with a sympathetic detonation and other
2 explosive to assure that it was completely destroyed.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Good work.

4 DR. BARRY COX: Anything else
5 ladies and gentlemen? Let's move on to new business.
6 Application, new members, Joan.

7 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes, thank you
8 very much, Barry. You all have a package of the
9 nominations for new members. We have received them.
10 And I listened today, and I heard somebody say we
11 needed a geologist. If anybody knows a geologist,
12 I'll talk to them and see if we can get them to apply.

13 But a couple of things I wanted to
14 ask you. If I've got them in the same order as I've
15 got mine, the first four are Mr. Clendenin, Thrash,
16 Polek, and Gilliland, and those folks, if you
17 recognize, have been in our package for the past
18 couple of events where we've been trying to fill
19 vacancies. And the process is, of course, we call
20 them and we ask them if they would like to still be
21 considered. We explain we have vacancies and they
22 say, yes.

23 But I wonder if the RAB would at

1 some point like to consider a time line on keeping
2 them active, because to the best of my knowledge, and
3 probably the rest of the RAB, these four folks have
4 never visited our RAB. They've never called our
5 office to ask for minutes, to ask for any information
6 about the RAB.

7 And I think when we're considering
8 who we need and we should target now for the next
9 couple of years, who we need to fill these vacancies,
10 I think that some of these folks, yes, we should keep
11 them or if they've been in the pool for two years,
12 Joan, throw them away, I need for you to tell me that
13 at some point.

14 And then you see we have four or
15 five others that are all very good applications, but
16 quite frankly, you know, we've been out looking at
17 folks, asking them, would they consider, or kind of

18 you look folks in the eye, and then, of course, we've
19 asked all of you to give us nominations, which several
20 of you have.

21 You notice that we have an
22 application from Scott Beckett, who came tonight,
23 because he has a varied interest in this and just

1 learned that there was vacancies. And so, he
2 certainly is interested. And I think those are the
3 sorts of folks that we need to consider when you vote
4 next week.

5 So, we prepared each one of you a
6 package to take home, to review, so that next month,
7 in September, when we do vote, we can do this very
8 quickly. You'll already have -- now, hopefully, we'll
9 be able to get a couple of more. I have an attorney
10 who is going to give us a nomination, hopefully. Got
11 my fingers crossed, talked her into it. And she's
12 going to get it to us. But again, you all think of
13 the needs that we're going to have, especially with
14 the technical review committee you just formed.

15 And I would encourage you maybe to
16 let us know if we need to go talk to somebody. Give
17 us the name of the person and we'll go out and sell
18 the program as best we can and get them to fill this
19 out.

20 Can I answer any questions about
21 this, what we're going to do next month?

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Since Scott is
23 here and he's kind of in a category all by himself,

1 would it be inappropriate to ask him just to say a
2 word or two?

3 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Shouldn't be.

4 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: They said I was
5 just going to come observe. I didn't know I was going
6 to speak.

7 I am Scott Beckett. I'm a former
8 high school science and math teacher. Right now I
9 teach developmental math up at JSU. I've worked with
10 Pete before when he was at the museum. We set up a
11 program for adolescent children, a mentoring program
12 there.

13 I have a Masters Degree in Forestry
14 from Auburn University and forest ecology, and and did
15 my fieldwork in research natural forestry in the
16 Talladega National Forest, that was set aside to be an
17 example of long leaf pine eco type, which I understand
18 that the U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service is managing
19 here.

20 I'm a long-time member of Anniston.
21 My wife grew up in Alexandria.

22 I'm really interested in the chance
23 we have in developing the Fort to really bring

1 diversity into this area. I mean, to me it's an
2 incredible opportunity. And the fact that we now have
3 established this recreational corridor that goes from
4 Cheaha up to Fort Payne, and we have resources on the
5 Fort to really make this -- I think it has the
6 possibility to be more a destination place for people
7 who want to hike the Appalachian trail, bike, do all
8 sorts of other outdoor activities. We're a gem of the
9 south and people know us for the golf courses, but we
10 have lots of other opportunities here to develop, as
11 well as all the other development that's being
12 discussed.

13 So, I'm interested in being part of
14 this panel just to contribute whatever I know to the
15 community.

16 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Thank you.

17 DR. BARRY COX: Thank you.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Joan, just one
19 question.

20 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Sure.

21 MR. RON LEVY: It's our intention
22 to actually start voting on membership next month?

23 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Next month, the

1 September meeting.

2 MR. RON LEVY: This next RAB. And
3 these other applicants that you're pursuing, are you
4 going to have them in the mail to the rest of the RAB
5 so that --

6 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes.

7 MR. RON LEVY: -- they can --

8 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: And if we
9 receive them in time, we'll get them to you ahead of
10 time, yes, absolutely, because we don't want to carry
11 the meeting out. We've got a lot of business next
12 month. And if we can, that's exactly right, Ron,
13 thank you.

14 MR. RON LEVY: Good.

15 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: How many
16 slots do we have to fill?

17 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Two. So, let's
18 make it competitive.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Joan has been trying
20 real hard to gather as many applicants as she possibly
21 can. I really appreciate the effort. It's been real
22 tough trying to get people to be interested. And I
23 can see that Solutia got real interested, because they

1 list three in there.

2 DR. BARRY COX: Spead it around
3 some.

4 MR. RON LEVY: But if you've got
5 people that you're interested in, please, get us the
6 application so that we can get it in front of the rest
7 of the RAB for consideration.

8 DR. BARRY COX: Okay. I appreciate
9 that. Last on the agenda. No applause, please.
10 Action summary.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Let me see if I
12 can't go through these. And you can stop me at any
13 time.

14 The finding of suitability to
15 transfer, which is a requirement by law, was signed
16 for property that was defined through an economic
17 development conveyance to the JPA. It was signed on 9
18 August. Now, that's not transferred. That's saying
19 that EPA and the state said, yes, it's suitable for
20 transfer, the Army agreed. And the property, which
21 was defined in that FOST, is now available for
22 transfer.

23 There is other things that are

1 going on right now that are still being worked. An
2 MOA between the local reuse authority, the JPA and the
3 Army, has to be settled, and then all the other hoops
4 that we've got to get through for the real estate
5 action to transfer the property.

6 Now, Miki, maybe you can tell us
7 when you think all that's going to be finalized so we
8 can actually get the property into the JPA's hands.

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: There are two
10 remaining issues with the MOA, both of which are being
11 discussed at higher levels of Washington than those of
12 us sitting around this table. When those two issues
13 are worked out, we should be able to sign the MOA.

14 Our survey for the phase one
15 transfer has been completed. The documentation has
16 been sent to Mobile Army Corps, and Mobile Army Corps
17 is writing the deeds so that that can be -- that's
18 part of the transfer document, we have to have the
19 deeds written. And that's being finalized.

20 MR. RON LEVY: I can't remember,
21 how many total acres was in the FOST that was defined,
22 Lisa?

23 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: There is eight

1 hundred and fifty-three buildings and --

2 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: One thousand,
3 five hundred and seventy-eight.

4 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I've got it
5 right here, one thousand, five hundred and
6 seventy-five acres.

7 MR. RON LEVY: This FOST was
8 briefed at previous RAB meetings. You saw the
9 document. So, this is good news. It really is good
10 news.

11 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: We've just got
12 to get -- hopefully, we'll get the issues with the MOA
13 worked out, I would like to say this week. I will be
14 optimistic and say we hope we can get those worked out
15 this week.

16 And the survey, Buddy has the
17 information where the survey is going.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Go on?

19 DR. BARRY COX: Sure, go ahead.

20 MR. RON LEVY: There was a town
21 hall meeting that was held by the Army. It really
22 wasn't an environmental issue, per se, but it dealt
23 with the cemeteries on the installation. There is a

1 post cemetery and there is a POW cemetery.

2 The intent was to get some public
3 input on what to do about those cemeteries. Knowing
4 that the Army was still responsible for maintaining
5 those cemeteries, there were some alternatives that
6 were put out, and there was a lot of discussion at the
7 meeting. Some of the discussion related to, you know,
8 how the Army was going to maintain them and through
9 what process were they going to do that.

10 The Army proposed that they would
11 contract out maintenance of those cemeteries. And
12 through that contract, they would also provide
13 additional property in and around the post cemetery
14 for the cemetery purveyor to actually operate, to
15 provide for additional burials. And there was a lot
16 of discussion about that.

17 And that, I think, is essentially
18 what occurred. And the Army's moving forward to do
19 that.

20 There was a lot of concern from the
21 families about the relatives that were in there and
22 whether the Army was going to take care of that. One
23 of the things that came out was there is no additional

1 burials associated with the military in there. That
2 was a discussion that was brought forth to the VA.
3 The VA said there really wasn't demographically, not
4 enough people in this area to support having a VA
5 cemetery here. So, they kind of backed off of that.

6 So, what we're looking at is a
7 private cemetery, essentially, that surrounds that
8 cemetery, whereby they are responsible also for
9 maintaining the military piece that's in there. And
10 part of that, also, is to maintain the POW.

11 Now, Glen, did I get that right?

12 MR. GLEN WRIGHT: Generally right,
13 yeah. The Army is going to request someone to bid on
14 that process. Whether we get anyone interested, we
15 don't know. That's where we're going to go.

16 We have agreed to, once we put
17 together a contract, proposal, come back to the
18 community. They asked that they have a representative
19 review it. And I'm not sure who that's going to be.
20 It's someone within the military retiree committee for
21 the community.

22 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Is it going to be
23 maintained with no charge to those military

1 dependents?

2 MR. GLEN WRIGHT: The military
3 portion of the post cemetery, actually, the post
4 cemetery, itself, as identified, it will always be the
5 Army's responsibility to maintain that. How we do it
6 is the question, not if we do it.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Now, there is no
8 charge. There is only, I think, thirty-two interments
9 that can be done, they're for spouses to be buried
10 with their spouse. But short of that, there wasn't
11 going to -- and that the military was going to pay for
12 and be responsible for. But short of that, no, there
13 isn't. And that may be a requirement that's passed
14 off to the new purveyor, in terms of having to do
15 that. But I don't know that that's been settled. But
16 that is our responsibility and we will continue to do
17 that, either through some third party or some other --
18 but I think that what really came out of that was that
19 there would not be a Veteran's cemetery associated
20 with that.

21 They did talk about having a
22 Veteran's piece, where you could bury only Veterans,
23 but that wasn't the VA or the Army doing that, that

1 was whoever we got to handle the cemetery or to be
2 contracted to do the further work.

3 I don't remember, it was a total of
4 twenty some odd additional acres in and around that,
5 they we were talking about -- we were talking about
6 providing in addition to the cemetery for other
7 burials. That's what I understand of that.

8 The last item, which we think is
9 another piece of good news -- is that the memorandum
10 of agreement we had been working with Fish & Wildlife
11 Service was signed, it was signed recently. And I
12 want to say -- I cannot remember the dates. It was
13 signed this month, and it's in place.

14 The memorandum of agreement, what
15 it essentially does is it allows us to have Fish &
16 Wildlife come in and manage the undeveloped properties
17 on Fort McClellan. They don't own the property. The
18 property has not been transferred, but they now have a
19 presence on Fort McClellan.

20 It has mechanisms for funding. It
21 has mechanisms for, you know, doing what's necessary
22 to enhance long leaf pine. But it's not a transfer.
23 And it consists of all the undeveloped portions of

1 Fort McClellan.

2 Now, as pieces go to the JPA,
3 obviously, that will come out. And then it's also
4 mechanisms to help us work towards the establishment
5 of the National Wildlife Refuge. So --

6 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Is this the
7 document that we talked about in Atlanta when we met?

8 MR. BART REEDY: No.

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: No?

10 MR. BART REEDY: No. This is a
11 piece of an agreement with Fish & Wildlife Service the
12 Army's been working for a year and a half.

13 MR. RON LEVY: This is almost like
14 a contract between the Army and Fish & Wildlife
15 Service.

16 MR. BART REEDY: This is more or
17 less Fish & Wildlife starting to establish a presence,
18 running a bush hog, those kinds of things, not
19 management of Fish & Wildlife property, not Pete's
20 property, that's not what --

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Thank you.

22 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Can we --

23 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

1 MR. BART REEDY: Is that accurate,
2 Ron?

3 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: -- get a copy
4 of that?

5 MR. RON LEVY: Would you like a
6 copy of the document? Certainly, we'll give it to
7 you.

8 MR. BART REEDY: Is that right,
9 Ron?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I think so.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: It's an interim
12 management agreement more than anything else.

13 MR. RON LEVY: Absolutely. It's
14 not meant to do anything else but help us manage the
15 property. You know, we're trying to get out of the
16 business and Fish & Wildlife is trying to come in to
17 the property, so I think it's a good tool to help us
18 do that.

19 And Bill Garland is in the back.
20 If you got anything to say about that, Bill, please,
21 do.

22 MR. BILL GARLAND: Well, I think
23 what you said is true. It's more of a, almost a

1 cooperative agreement between the Army and the Fish &
2 Wildlife Service. The Army still has personal
3 presence. Most of what we're doing now is just
4 providing guidance, planning, trying to get into the
5 process, the early process of what we have to do from
6 a planning sense to follow through on it.

7 Now, the bush hogging, all that,
8 the Army is still doing all that. We just may say,
9 you know, this area over here may be where we're going
10 to develop and bush hog this area before you bush hog
11 this. For your EE/CA, please, don't tear this up over
12 here. So, a lot of the first -- this level, at this
13 time, is more or less planning and trying to develop a
14 relationship with the Army on what's done, so, you
15 know, we don't get something that we don't want in the
16 end.

17 As time goes on, we expect this
18 whole process to become more involvement on our part
19 on the ground. But it's a real -- I mean, what it
20 says is the Fish & Wildlife Service is committed to
21 this interest, other than just the newspaper saying,
22 you know, rumors of this are happening. And I think
23 it really documents a real interest on the Fish &

1 Wildlife's part to be involved in this.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Now, the other
3 document that Bill wants to talk about is the EA.

4 MR. BILL GARLAND: Well, the EA has
5 come out on the proposal to develop the National
6 Wildlife Refuge. The comment period started about on
7 the 12th or 10th and goes through to early September
8 some time. Anybody wants it, the documents, if --

9 MR. RON LEVY: Let me mention this,
10 because I guess the list we gave you, Fish & Wildlife
11 used and sent out copies to RAB members, because Mayor
12 Kimbrough got a copy of it.

13 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I got one.

14 MR. RON LEVY: You got one?

15 MR. BILL GARLAND: See, some of you
16 do. I got a copy yesterday.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Pete, did you get a
18 copy?

19 MR. BILL GARLAND: But the
20 document, again, is not that detailed. It's an EA on
21 the concept of developing it, a proposal. Once the
22 land is transferred, there will be a comprehensive
23 management plan prepared. And a more detailed EA on

1 the nuts and bolts will be done at that time.

2 At this time, you would be
3 reviewing the EA on the proposal, a conceptual
4 management plan that gives you kind of an overview of
5 what's going on, and a compatibility study that's
6 attached also to it. So, there is actually three
7 documents.

8 And you can, if you're interested
9 and don't have that, you can call my office and I can
10 send you a copy.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: I think there are
12 some RAB members that didn't get it, because Jerome
13 said he didn't get it and he checked his mail.

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Well, Bill was
15 just saying he got his copy yesterday, so it could be
16 --

17 MR. PETE CONROY: There is still
18 hope.

19 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: If you don't
20 get it in a day or two, give us a call.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, if you're
22 missing the document, we will certainly help you out
23 there and try and get you a copy.

1 MR. BILL GARLAND: Again, this is a
2 proposed EA, so, your comments would be incorporated
3 in the final document. If there is some glaring flaw
4 of something that was missed, the final document could
5 consider that in the final version.

6 DR. BARRY COX: Any other comments
7 on the action list?

8 Time now for audience comments. If
9 you would, anybody in the audience that was not here
10 when we started, if you would, just for the record,
11 identify yourselves, please.

12 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Lisa
13 Kingsbury, Fort McClellan environmental office.

14 MR. JOE DOYLE: Joe Doyle, legal
15 office, Fort McClellan.

16 DR. BARRY COX: Anybody else? Any
17 audience comment?

18 (WHEREUPON, there was discussion off the record.)

19 DR. BARRY COX: Do I hear a motion
20 for adjournment?

21 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Before you do
22 that, who is working with Department of
23 Transportation, as far as the bypass?

1 MR. RON LEVY: Well, we certainly
2 are. I mean, we talk to them. The Corps of
3 Huntsville --

4 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Have they
5 provided a time line for y'all all along?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Paul.

7 MR. PAUL JAMES: It depends,
8 Mayor Kimbrough, on who you talk to.

9 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Well, I want to
10 make -- I'm on the MPO, also, and they have provided
11 us a time line all along, with a projection of the
12 right-of-way and everything. And I just want it to be
13 clarified. I think they've been getting a pretty bad
14 wrap. And there has been that information. If some
15 of these individuals would attend some of the
16 meetings, then they could get that time line. That's
17 basically, I just wanted that in the statement,
18 because I think some people have been getting a bad
19 wrap on that.

20 MR. RON LEVY: We certainly would
21 appreciate anything you could send us from MPO.

22 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yes. It's the
23 metropolitan end. We have to prove all the funds.

1 But we've been having a time line for over a year of
2 projection of right-of-way and everything and
3 construction and all like that, and it bothers me when
4 people are supposed to be involved in things and they
5 don't show up, yet they openly criticize when they
6 don't know what they're talking about. Excuse me.

7 MR. RON LEVY: The one thing,
8 Mayor Kimbrough, if I could ask you if I could get a
9 copy of what you've got, in terms of their time lines,
10 I would like to see it. And that's not a criticism on
11 anybody, I would just like to see what you've got.

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I knew y'all had
13 been working with them on it.

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Would be the
15 first published thing I've seen on it.

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I was saying that
17 for some political -- it being used as a political
18 aspect. And both of the individuals that have made
19 issues of it were on the MPO and haven't attended, but
20 I know that y'all have been giving them time lines, as
21 we have had in here, in our documents, about the
22 cleaning of it and everything like that.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: For this

1 portion of it.

2 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And then the DOT
3 has also been giving us time lines. And I'll be glad
4 to get it to you. But I thought that they had shared
5 that with whoever -- there was a committee at one time
6 that was working or somebody was working --

7 MR. RON LEVY: We worked some -- I
8 mean, it tends to be we're working dates, but I don't
9 have a long time line that --

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I've got
11 instruction from the engineer and instruction --

12 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And I just saw
13 something here in the last couple of days that said
14 that the UXO work was going to be completed pretty
15 soon from our standpoint, however, the need for that
16 and the construction work that would go into that area
17 that had been assessed and cleared wouldn't be until
18 2002. So, we're way ahead --

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: It's three phases
20 --

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- according to
22 what I read.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: It's one going to

1 Choccolocco Road and then there is -- there is two
2 phases going to Choccolocco Road and then that
3 Choccolocco Road is the third phase. And so they're
4 buying right-of-way right now. And it's got the time
5 lines on all of those, as far as right-of-way purchase
6 and construction purchases and --

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But from the
8 RAB's --

9 MR. PETE CONROY: I think they're
10 actually clearing the right-of-way on phase one.

11 MR. FERN THOMASSY: But from the
12 RAB's standpoint, the Army's doing all --

13 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right --

14 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- that it
15 should --

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- in a very,
18 very timely fashion.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right, right.
20 And DOT has, also, as fast as they could go. The big
21 holdup was in Oxford on the off-ramp and how it was
22 going to be constructed. That probably held them up
23 six to eight months or more.

1 MR. FERN THOMASSY: We're sitting
2 in it.

3 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Sir?

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: I said, we're
5 sitting in it.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Just about.

7 DR. BARRY COX: Anything else? Do
8 I hear a motion for adjournment?

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: So moved.

10 MR. BOBBY WESTON: Second.

11 DR. BARRY COX: All in favor?

12 Motion carried.

13 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

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 29th of August, 2000.

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