

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at
Building 215, Fort McClellan, Alabama, on the 4th day
of May, 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	3-83
CERTIFICATE	84-85

1 MR. RON LEVY: If I could get
2 everybody's attention. It's about twenty minutes to
3 6:00. We said we would start about 5:30. Ron Hood,
4 my co-chair, looks like he hasn't made it or is not
5 going to make it, so, Barry do you want to fill in?

6 And as I had predicted, since this
7 is a unique RAB meeting, we didn't get but what, 10
8 percent of the members?

9 MR. BART REEDY: No.

10 MR. RON LEVY: How many we got,
11 one, two, three, four, five, six. We got six voting
12 members, so we've got a little more than 10 percent.

13 DR. BARRY COX: Do you want to call
14 the roll or do you want to just --

15 MR. RON LEVY: And I guess you can
16 go ahead. It's your show now.

17 DR. BARRY COX: We don't have a
18 place to check it, but we'll --

19 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, you do.

20 DR. BARRY COX: The December again.
21 Okay. We'll call this the May. Mr. Hood is not with
22 us. Branchfield?

23 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Here.

1 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Brown?
2 MR. RON LEVY: You need to call
3 them out for --
4 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Brown?
5 Mr. Buford?
6 MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here.
7 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Conroy?
8 MR. PETE CONROY: Here.
9 DR. BARRY COX: I'm here.
10 Mr. Cunningham? Mr. Elser?
11 MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.
12 DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Fathke?
13 Dr. Harrington? Mayor Kimbrough?
14 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.
15 DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Longstreth?
16 Mr. Miller? Mr. Thomassy? Mr. Turecek? Mr. Turner?
17 Mr. Weston? And Mr. Levy's here. Chris Johnson is
18 not here. Bart?
19 MR. BART REEDY: Here.
20 DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Stroud?
21 MR. RON LEVY: Not here.
22 MR. PETE CONROY: Keep an eye open
23 for Donna. She's on the way.

1 MR. RON LEVY: We don't really have
2 an agenda because of what occurred during the last RAB
3 meeting, but just to remind folks, the M-2 parcel
4 EE/CA was presented to RAB members at the last RAB
5 meeting. Anybody that was -- can I see a show of
6 hands who wasn't here during the last RAB meeting.
7 Craig, you got a copy of this in the mail?

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Yeah.

9 MR. RON LEVY: At that time --
10 there was a lot of other things that occurred, but at
11 that time there was some discussion that went on that
12 the RAB asked about issues associated with the EE/CA
13 process. And what was told to the RAB members by
14 myself and other folks was that the comments that both
15 regulatory agencies had submitted were placed in this
16 document and they were in the back of the document,
17 and our response to those comments were put in the
18 back of the documents, but we had not been able to
19 meet to try to resolve those comments or at least to
20 review the comments. So, we generally do that as a
21 BRAC cleanup team. The BRAC cleanup team has comments
22 submitted to -- the Army has comments submitted to
23 them, the Army responds, and then we meet as a cleanup

1 team to try to address the comments and resolve those
2 comments.

3 Well, at that time, we had
4 addressed the comments back to the regulatory
5 agencies, but nobody had a chance to really review
6 them, and we needed another meeting, which was going
7 to occur very shortly. In fact it happened last week.
8 Excuse me, the week --

9 MR. BART REEDY: Week before.

10 MR. RON LEVY: -- week before last
11 week, where we met and we got part of the review. So,
12 let me just tell you what occurred.

13 We got through the review of ADEM's
14 comments, because of the time frames, we were real
15 close to the end and people had to leave, we did not
16 get through EPA's comments, so, what we said was that
17 -- there was a forum going on or a conference going on
18 out in Anaheim or a UXO conference going on out in
19 Anaheim, and we had players from the agencies going to
20 be there, particularly, Norrel Lantzer, representing
21 EPA, and then one of his EPA contractors,
22 Valerie Clinkenbeard, which I understand she is on her
23 way, Bill Shanks from my office, and Phil Stroud from

1 ADEM.

2 MR. BART REEDY: New ADEM guy.

3 MR. RON LEVY: And who else was
4 there?

5 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Larry Bryant
6 who is Phil's boss.

7 MR. RON LEVY: And I understand
8 some folks from TRADOC also sat in on some of the
9 meetings.

10 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yes, a host
11 of folks from The Corps and TRADOC.

12 MR. RON LEVY: Right. At which
13 point they tried to get through and address the EPA
14 comments. I cannot tell you personally, because I
15 have not had a chance to go through those myself, but
16 we'll hear some of that come out, and hopefully EPA
17 will be able to tell us what occurred.

18 And what we will do, initially,
19 though, is -- because you should have copies of ADEM's
20 comments in front of you. Do you not -- is we can
21 start talking about those. And what I was hoping is
22 to have Dave Skridulis -- oh, by the way, before we do
23 anything, let's go around the room and introduce

1 ourselves --

2 MR. BART REEDY: Good idea.

3 MR. RON LEVY: -- so everybody
4 knows who they are and what player -- what agency they
5 represent and what your function is here. Let me
6 start with Bill down there.

7 MR. BILL GARLAND: Bill Garland
8 with U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

9 MR. BOB WERNSMAN: Bob Wernsman,
10 Camerkle (phonetic) employee, representing EPA.

11 MR. DAVE SKRIDULIS: Dave
12 Skridulis, Huntsville Corps, project manager for the
13 UXO work.

14 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Ann McCauley.
15 I'm an environmental engineer working for the
16 Huntsville Corps.

17 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Norrell
18 Lantzer, technical advice and assist to EPA Region 4,
19 8, 9, 10.

20 MR. RON LEVY: I guess everybody
21 knows who you are, sir.

22 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: I'm
23 Colonel Dave Treuting. I'm the Commander of

1 Fort McClellan.

2 MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson,
3 environmental office, transition force.

4 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Without
5 her goggles.

6 MR. DAVID HORN: I'm David Horn.
7 I'm with Noble & Associates.

8 MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James with
9 the environmental office here at Fort McClellan.

10 SERGEANT FOX: Sergeant Fox
11 (phonetic) with the transition force.

12 BEN ?????: My name is Ben, and I'm
13 a -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm the operations officer for
14 the transition force.

15 MR. RON LEVY: And I think the RAB
16 knows everybody else, right, because they're all --

17 MR. BART REEDY: Before we get too
18 far, I want to thank y'all for, again, donating your
19 time and your energy to this. And it is a donation
20 and I appreciate it, we appreciate it. Sorry that
21 Chris cannot be here. Philip, as Ron said, is in
22 Anaheim. But we do appreciate it.

23 I hope you guys had a chance to

1 look at the document, some of the comments, and some
2 of the concerns that we have, all of us have, and some
3 of it made sense, hopefully, to you. Again,
4 appreciate it.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Let me go on record
6 and mention that Chris' wife was very sick and because
7 of that he could not attend. So, we're without a
8 representative from ADEM.

9 Okay. David, what I thought we
10 would do --

11 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Do you want
12 me to move up here?

13 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, why don't you.
14 David is going to try to take us through what you
15 should have in front of you, the comments from ADEM.

16 Now, this is real informal, folks,
17 so, as we go through this, if you've got questions,
18 want to talk about anything, just go ahead and stop
19 and chime in and let us know what it is you're
20 interested in talking about. After we get through
21 with what David is going to talk about in terms of
22 ADEM's comments or the ones that are being resolved,
23 then we can move into EPA and let EPA present their

1 piece.

2 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Ron, I guess
3 the first thing I wanted to say about -- you know,
4 everybody has a copy of their comments, and I won't
5 read them to you, but we'll kind of walk through them.
6 The big issue here -- and, you know, I'm not sure if
7 Bart's going to agree with exactly how I phrase this,
8 but one of the issues here is that the folks on the
9 regulatory side are looking at what's called the
10 CERCLA process. Which I guess you guys have heard
11 that term a lot on the work that's going on out here.

12 And the thing with CERCLA was that
13 whole process and, you know, regulatory guidance and
14 everything that goes along with it, was put in place
15 to address, initially, the problem of HTRW, hazardous
16 and toxic waste. As time went on, there was actually
17 an amendment and then they went and put in to include
18 items like UXO, unexploded ordnance.

19 The issues that the Army's
20 struggling with, and I think the regulators are, also,
21 is being that that was not crafted to exactly address
22 ordnance, there are certain things about UXO that
23 doesn't quite fit into that. And so, a lot of

1 comments that we got back from the State and the EPA
2 was of the nature of, we don't think that you guys are
3 -- the Army is being consistent with what's outlined
4 in CERCLA. And our position has been, well, we think
5 we're being consistent as much as we can, in that it
6 doesn't really address all the issues of UXO.

7 So, I mean, just as a baseline,
8 that's probably the biggest reason that we had a
9 number of comments and, you know, we had the meetings
10 and the reason we're having the meeting today to go
11 over those. I feel like, at least from the Army's
12 side, I feel like that we have reached an agreement on
13 things that we can do, that the Army can do, to make
14 our process look more like the CERCLA process, to be
15 more consistent with it. And I guess the proof of
16 that is going to be when we make the revision to this
17 document and put it in front of the EPA and the State
18 to look at it again.

19 But this paper here, it kind of
20 gives you, you know, just a -- it kind of breaks out
21 some of the areas of -- you know, Chris Johnson had
22 put together, you know, a good set of comments, and
23 they're very specific as to the places that he didn't

1 think were meeting the CERCLA process. And this paper
2 is kind of a summary of that. And some of these
3 things, you know, there is -- the one thing about
4 environmental and UXO work is there is a lot of
5 importance put on the use of certain types of words
6 that you use. And, you know, to myself or even other
7 people farther away from the process, it may not seem
8 that important. But, you know, the initial item here
9 under A has to do with the process of how do you
10 actually get the authority to go ahead and start a
11 project, whether it's environmental project or UXO
12 project. And the State's position was that on this
13 M-2 parcel, we didn't do what the process calls for,
14 which is an approval memorandum.

15 As far as the Army's concerned,
16 once the money gets programmed and becomes available
17 to the Army to work that project, we consider that our
18 approval memorandum to start the project. That's our
19 authority to move forward with it. So, you know,
20 there was a little bit of -- you know, the comment
21 from the State was, well, you haven't done an approval
22 memorandum, and our position was, you're right, we
23 haven't done one.

1 But the process that we have is a
2 little bit different. You know, we look at the
3 funding as the kickoff for the project. So, that's
4 what item A was about. You know, I don't know
5 specifically on that item if that's really considered
6 a big issue now, based on what we discussed.

7 The second item on there was about,
8 they stated that the goals and the scope of what we
9 had put in the EE/CA were not clearly defined. This
10 is one of the issues of what I like to call semantics,
11 because it has to deal with what we're calling or what
12 the EPA or the State would like to call as a "final
13 remedy".

14 Ron, I'm trying to remember. I
15 think this one had to do, also --

16 MR. BART REEDY: Where are you
17 David?

18 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: I'm on item
19 number B.

20 COLONEL TREUTING: B.

21 MR. BART REEDY: Baker?

22 COLONEL TREUTING: Baker.

23 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Uh-huh.

1 MR. BART REEDY: There was some --
2 maybe, Dave, if we kind of go --

3 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Sure.

4 MR. BART REEDY: -- through these
5 together we could --

6 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Okay.

7 MR. BART REEDY: -- maybe get these
8 folks out to eat dinner tonight.

9 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: That's a good
10 idea.

11 MR. BART REEDY: There was a big
12 issue, concern over whether or not we're going to call
13 -- the Army is going to call what happens up at M-2
14 the "final remedy". And ADEM's read and my read of
15 the original document, it seemed to say one thing one
16 place and another thing another place. And again,
17 that's our read on it.

18 And we wanted some clarification.
19 Is this going to be the final remedy? Do you expect
20 to come back? We think that's kind of important
21 actually in keeping -- having a -- how do I want to
22 say this? Having a good address and phone number for
23 the Army should we have a really big frost heave in

1 the winter and things fly up -- you know, and UXO come
2 up out of the ground, should something unexpected or
3 something that we did not find the first time, should
4 that come up, what's going to happen? Who do we call?
5 And all of those things are tied together with the
6 concept of final remedy. That's why that was an issue
7 for us.

8 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Right. And
9 from our side, we were looking at the final remedy.
10 When we saw the words "final remedy," we thought that
11 was portraying to the people that got that property
12 that we were done with it, we would never be back.
13 And that's not our intent. You know, our intent is to
14 have five-year reviews and to also -- because, as
15 we've told everybody on the UXO side of the work, you
16 know, we can never guarantee that we've got a hundred
17 percent of everything off of any piece of property.
18 We can do the best that we can with the technologies
19 we have, but we can never make that guarantee. And
20 for us to call it a "final remedy," our argument was:
21 You know, if we say it's a "final remedy," that kind
22 of means to everybody that the Army is going away and
23 we won't be back.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Ann, did you have
2 something that you wanted to expound on that?

3 MS. ANN McCAULEY: No, he hit the
4 nail on the head. Historically, the Corps has been
5 reluctant to use that term, "final remedy," for that
6 very reason that in a publicly available document like
7 the EE/CA, the public, at times, and in fact
8 regulators, at times, interprets that to mean that we
9 will go away and never come back when in fact that is
10 not the case. So, it's a semantics issue here. And
11 we've overcome that by agreeing to use that term here
12 with the understanding that we will indeed come back
13 if some other --

14 MR. BART REEDY: So, you intend to
15 go ahead and use the word "final remedy"?

16 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Yes, we are
17 using the words "final remedy," but we're also going
18 to include a few other words that indicate that we
19 will come back if that is necessary.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: May we ask a
21 question?

22 MR. BART REEDY: Go right ahead.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Come back in

1 accordance with -- my understanding, the cleanup is
2 going to be in accordance with the economic
3 development plan that's been submitted. Okay, so,
4 this is one thing that we have asked is that my
5 understanding that if it's -- if it's designated say
6 as a park area, then there is certain standards that
7 you have to meet for that. But if the owner comes
8 back and wants to use it for something other than park
9 area and comes in and finds some ordnance or something
10 in that area, say twenty, ten, fifteen, twenty years
11 later they want to build some type of facility there
12 and have to dig a footing and all, okay, my
13 understanding has been that if it was cleaned up in
14 accordance with the plan, then that would be the
15 responsibility of the owner of that property.

16 Now, is that -- I'm hearing here
17 y'all saying y'all will come back. Is that you will
18 come back in accordance with the cleanup plan that was
19 designated, originally, or does that mean if they want
20 to use that land differently from what the plan was
21 that y'all assisted cleanup?

22 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Uh, Ron?

23 MR. RON LEVY: Well, there is an

1 Army policy that says that, you know, we clean up to a
2 certain standard. And I guess it's actually DoD
3 policy, we clean up to a certain standard. And we
4 convey the land to that standard. And if you decide
5 to change your land use, then, no, the Army won't come
6 back.

7 Now, that's different from finding
8 undiscovered contamination, contamination that we
9 didn't know about. So, if we said that we were going
10 to clean up to a certain parts per million, then
11 that's different from coming in and finding out that
12 there was UXO in the ground twenty feet deep that we
13 did not know about, in which case we would have to
14 come back. It's unknown versus what we knew we left
15 in terms of contamination. Under CERCLA 120-H, we do
16 have to come back.

17 MR. BART REEDY: Basically, Mayor,
18 it's pretty well agreed across the nation that DoD has
19 this property and they will clean it up to a certain
20 level, that level being the original reuse. If -- I
21 think the agreement -- I don't think -- let me back up
22 from that. The agreement is that in order to get the
23 property, you're going to have to have a reuse that

1 matches -- an actual reuse that matches the plan. And
2 should the property then be -- owner decide that they
3 want to install something else that is inconsistent
4 with the plan, DoD is not really on the hook to come
5 back and make that pristine property. They are -- DoD
6 is not on the hook to do that. That's -- that's why
7 it was so critical to get a reuse plan in that was
8 accurate and acceptable.

9 Otherwise, what would happen and --
10 otherwise, what would happen would be DoD would turn
11 over a piece of property. Your forest, all right,
12 it's clean enough for these things, these activities.
13 Okay, should, however you and Pete get together and
14 want to build houses on it, you really don't have a
15 legislative leg to stand on to come back and make Ron
16 go out and start digging stuff up to a depth below
17 where you're going to put footings. DoD is not going
18 to bounce for that.

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I say, and I've
20 said it before, that's where I disagree. The
21 government put it there. We can't predict what's
22 going to happen in twenty, twenty-five years. And if
23 the government put it there, then there should have

1 been responsibility. We've discussed this before, but
2 that's why I asked, I wanted a clarification so that I
3 knew that I understood it. You know, this was clean
4 land at one time.

5 MR. BART REEDY: Absolutely.

6 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay. And things
7 can change, as we see in many municipal areas that
8 have grown and everything. And this is designated as
9 a high-growth area --

10 MR. BART REEDY: Right.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: -- in the future.
12 And, you know, so, the use can change. They can do
13 the best job they can right now to develop their plan
14 and submit it, but what's going to happen in the
15 future? But, you know, I can't argue that, you know,
16 the policy, that's something that we can't -- but I
17 just -- I totally disagree with that. So, that's
18 enough said on that. I wanted to make sure that I
19 understood it correctly.

20 MR. BART REEDY: Is that -- Ron,
21 did I accurately state it?

22 MR. RON LEVY: I think so. But
23 there is a --

1 MR. BART REEDY: Yeah.

2 MR. RON LEVY: For the majority of
3 Fort McClellan's property -- just so we can put this
4 in perspective --that's not going to be the case,
5 okay, because -- particularly, the property that's
6 within the cantonment area, the property that's really
7 ready to be developed right now, that won't be the
8 case.

9 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I understand
10 that, Ron, but what I'm saying, the future. I'm not
11 talking about today or tomorrow, I'm talking about ten
12 to fifteen years down the road.

13 MR. RON LEVY: UXO is definitely of
14 concern --

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Reilly Field, for
16 instance, if it's exchanged -- if it's transferred and
17 then the lake all -- if that's transferred as park
18 property, then you're going to clean it up in
19 accordance to the guidance for park area, which there
20 won't be nothing developed.

21 Come back later, that borders 21,
22 say commercially they want to develop that, they come
23 in there and they find something in there. Of course,

1 I know we've got the landfills that surround it and
2 everything.

3 MR. RON LEVY: Well, in the case of
4 park property I can tell you this much, when we do do
5 a PVC, it locks it in for thirty years, so they can't
6 do anything with the property, either, for thirty
7 years. I think it's thirty years, sir.

8 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: I thought
9 parks was in perpetuity.

10 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: What I was told,
11 but we were in the -- we were never in the running for
12 it. I was told that if it was transferred for park
13 property, then you could -- you would have to use it
14 for park property.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Right.

16 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: It couldn't be
17 used for other --

18 MR. BART REEDY: Philosophically,
19 your point is very visible, but --

20 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: But,
21 Mayor, technically, when you're -- the property given
22 over to a park is being sponsored by DOI, another
23 federal agency.

1 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

2 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Very
3 similar to what you're dealing with on the golf
4 course. So, they couldn't come up and decide, hey,
5 I'm going to put Disney Land in there, because then
6 that stops the reason why DOI sponsored it in the
7 first place. If that makes sense to you.

8 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yeah, it does.

9 MR. BART REEDY: Is this going
10 quick enough to get through all of these comments?
11 I'm not so sure that it --

12 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I won't ask
13 anymore questions.

14 MR. BART REEDY: No, I want you to
15 ask questions.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Don't feel --
17 please, don't feel like you're --

18 MR. BART REEDY: We'll stay all
19 night.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: No, I've got
21 another meeting at 7:00 o'clock.

22 MR. BART REEDY: As a suggestion,
23 have y'all read this? Maybe we can speak to some of

1 those questions, possibly, if y'all have questions.

2 Did anything jump out at you, either in --

3 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: I just say, if we
4 cover this with ADEM, that, I think, was what y'all --
5 you got to be, we would like, what, see, a few more.
6 If we could get through that document, then that might
7 satisfy some of it.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Let me kind of lay a
9 flavor here to what we believe was coming out of
10 ADEM's comments and our desire to resolve them. We
11 believe that we will be able to resolve all these
12 comments. And I think that ADEM believes we can do
13 that, too, after the last meeting. There is still
14 some issues that will be a part on national issues
15 that we've talked about before, but for the most part,
16 we believe we're going to be able to resolve all of
17 ADEM's comments. Now, David, correct me if I'm wrong.
18 Was that not what we said?

19 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Yes.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Ann?

21 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Yes.

22 MR. RON LEVY: So, if anybody wants
23 to zero in again on ADEM's comments now, we'll do

1 that. Otherwise, we can move on and listen to what
2 EPA wants to present to us. Does anything just jump
3 out at you, as Bart said?

4 MR. BART REEDY: Last call for
5 right now.

6 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Can you
7 explain to me about the risk assessment, comment F
8 down there, about how you can do neither a
9 quantitative or a qualitative risk assessment. I
10 mean, I find it hard to believe you can't do a
11 qualitative risk assessment for ordnance and
12 explosive. I mean, you can do a qualitative risk
13 assessment for just about anything.

14 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Well, I think
15 the real issue is, can we do one that's acceptable.
16 You know, in the past we've done quantitative ones and
17 people have come up with, you know, tried to portray
18 to the public and say, well, your risk is X times ten
19 to minus six. Well, that doesn't mean anything to
20 anybody.

21 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: No.

22 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: So, you know,
23 we moved away from those things. And, actually, Ron,

1 I don't know if it's still your plan, we had a
2 gentleman from Huntsville come out to the last BCT and
3 give a good briefing on qualitative risk. And that
4 was Rob Wilcox.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

6 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: And I don't
7 know, you had mentioned to me the possibility of
8 bringing Ron back maybe to talk to the RAB --

9 MR. RON LEVY: This is --

10 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I mean, a
11 qualitative risk assessment, all you have to do is
12 identify is there quote unquote "contaminate," is
13 there a --

14 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Right.

15 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: --
16 receptor, is there a pathway between --

17 MR. BART REEDY: Exactly.

18 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- the two.

19 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Right.

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And I don't
21 see how that's something to say --

22 MR. BART REEDY: It is being -- let
23 me take a shot at this. And if you --

1 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Okay.

2 MR. BART REEDY: The issue of risk
3 assessment is one of the very -- one of the most
4 contentious aspects of UXO cleanup between the states
5 and DoD that there is. One of the arguments about UXO
6 is that it doesn't fit the way my risk assessment mind
7 works is, all you have to do is contact it once and
8 the -- then the receptor and the pathway is there, you
9 contact it once and you have a catastrophic event,
10 you're pretty well dead.

11 So that the end, the end point in
12 EPA's point of view, the end point is death. Well,
13 the Army doesn't feel -- or not the Army, excuse me.
14 DoD doesn't see it that way and never has seen it that
15 way. And that -- this risk assessment issue is still
16 being battled and we are not going to get this
17 resolved at Fort McClellan. It's not going to happen.
18 We talked about this a pretty good bit when we were in
19 Guntersville and maybe Lantz --

20 MR. RON LEVY: Craig, this is going
21 to come up when we go through EPA stuff, too, because
22 this is an EPA comment, as well. You might want to
23 hold off and let's see what Lantz says.

1 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: We can answer
2 it now.

3 MR. BART REEDY: Let me give him
4 just a piece of a background here.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Okay.

6 MR. BART REEDY: As Ron indicated
7 earlier, there was a UXO conference in Anaheim,
8 started when, Monday?

9 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Monday.

10 MR. BART REEDY: Lantz hasn't been
11 home, yet. Lantz is a contractor at EPA, as is Bob.
12 Has not been home, yet.

13 While in Anaheim, Lantz and Valerie
14 -- I believe most of you have met Valerie, a lady from
15 the Corps in Huntsville -- sat down and went through
16 these comments one by one by one and EPA's comments.
17 During that time -- while we were in Guntersville, we
18 kicked around this risk assessment and the problems
19 that we -- the way we look at it, the way DoD looks at
20 it. And, you know, we could hear one another talking,
21 which is a good thing, but we were not, I don't
22 believe, at a point of agreement, yet. But if you
23 could take a minute maybe and --

1 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Let me give
2 you some background. I've been doing quality
3 assurance on UXO for somewhere around fifteen years
4 now. Over the last three years, been predominately
5 providing advice and assistance to EPA, been working
6 very diligently with the risk exposure lab in Las
7 Vegas for EPA, trying -- because there is a problem
8 with what DoD wants for a risk methodology and what's
9 acceptable. And we're all trying to come into an
10 agreement. Well, part of that agreement should have
11 been the range rule risk methodology, but that's down
12 the road.

13 Unfortunately, there is a lot of
14 sites out there like Fort McClellan that are in the
15 pin right now, so what I suggested is we work on
16 Fort McClellan, what's acceptable for Fort McClellan
17 versus the rest of the DoD or Camp Bonneville
18 (phonetic) or ADAC (phonetic) or Coll Lavey (phonetic)
19 Island or any of the other ones. What's acceptable
20 for Fort McClellan. And we had some very good
21 meetings in Anaheim with Valerie and Philip and Larry
22 Bryant and TRADOC guys, Dave Dothitt (phonetic),
23 engineer -- or head safety for Corps of Engineers.

1 I think we'll get there. We aren't
2 there, yet. But I think for Fort McClellan, you're
3 going to end up with -- the way the range rule risk
4 methodology is set up currently is, the end result is
5 a qualitative risk assessment. You may have
6 quantitative inputs into it somewhere along the way.

7 And that's -- talking with the risk
8 exposure lab, that's what they're looking at, too.
9 So, I think it's starting to become much more
10 compatible on a national level. But this isn't
11 national, this is local to you guys. What we want
12 here is what's acceptable for you, which will end up
13 as a qualitative with potentially a lot of
14 quantitative inputs.

15 And one last note is: I found
16 Valerie to be very refreshing, and all the folks she
17 brought in on all the meetings, very knowledgeable,
18 and they're willing to work with us. And that's a big
19 plus.

20 MR. RON LEVY: I wanted to ask,
21 Ann, do you have anything to add to this issue?

22 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Well, I have
23 just a comment maybe, and maybe you can respond to it.

1 I know in the hazardous waste side of the business,
2 risk assessments are used to determine when
3 unacceptable exposures are occurring, thereby
4 triggering some type of cleanup or response action.
5 And then risk assessments are further used to
6 determine cleanup standards; that is, the level to
7 which you clean up a hazardous waste site.

8 Now, in our particular case, if
9 there is a piece of -- if we know there is UXO present
10 and there is a possibility that the public can be
11 exposed to it; that is, they're going to use the site
12 for some commercial use or some such thing, we clean
13 it up. And if I understand properly, we clean it up
14 to the extent that technology allows it, at this
15 point.

16 So, I'm not exactly sure what the
17 risk assessment -- what are those numbers going to
18 tell us on Fort McClellan and how will it impact what
19 we do here at M-2?

20 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Do you want
21 me to respond, Bart?

22 MR. BART REEDY: The -- Ann, I
23 agree with you that the numbers and formal risk

1 assessments on regular chemical hazardous waste sites
2 will give you a number. We generate cleanup numbers
3 from that, based on the reuse. And everybody's in
4 agreement that that process really does not totally
5 fit UXO.

6 Now, one of the things that we do
7 have in lieu of a risk assessment is DoD's policy,
8 which is DDE --

9 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: DoD 60 -- or
10 DDESB 6055.9, specifically chapter twelve.

11 MR. BART REEDY: And those are
12 guidelines that DoD, themselves, come out with and
13 said, when we turn over property, if we clean up
14 stuff, this is where we'll go, okay, in lieu of a risk
15 assessment. So, we have to have -- everybody would, I
16 think, agree that we have to have a number or a place
17 to end that everybody agrees to, otherwise we don't
18 know what we got there. And that's the DDESB cleanup
19 guidelines are what we are, I believe, going to use.
20 Right?

21 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Well, my
22 understanding of those guidelines, Bart, is those are
23 numbers that you use to clean up a site if you don't

1 have any information on it. And what we're striving
2 to do, in cases like the M-2 parcel is, you know,
3 ideally what we want to do is find out if there is
4 ordnance that was used in an area, what type is it,
5 how deep does it penetrate, where can we expect to
6 find it based on the soil and everything else, and go
7 through that process to determine the cleanup depth
8 that would be appropriate for that.

9 We wouldn't just go to that table
10 from DDESB and say, because you're going to use it for
11 this, we clean it up to four feet or one foot or ten
12 foot.

13 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Excuse me,
14 Ron. This is -- unless there is anybody else in the
15 room that's interested, this is getting way more
16 detailed than what I was getting to.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Have we overwhelmed
18 you?

19 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: No. Based
20 on my profession I have some knowledge of risk
21 assessment. And my only point was that I read this
22 thing sitting out in the parking lot real quick before
23 I came in, and I saw that it says a qualitative risk

1 assessment doesn't exist which is acceptable to
2 everybody. And I think the point that I would care to
3 make to you is if you take this to the public -- I
4 mean, if I, being a member of the public, I read this
5 and I would say, this is not rocket science. You guys
6 are going to go out there -- you've already said
7 you're going to find all the OE and you're going to --
8 whatever you find you're going to dig it up. I mean,
9 there is -- you know, so the result of the risk
10 assessment, in my opinion, is almost moot, because
11 whatever you find you're going to take it out, anyway,
12 which is what the end result of -- I would just be
13 very careful about saying that you can't do a
14 qualitative risk assessment because you guys can't get
15 together and agree on the method.

16 MR. RON LEVY: In the case of M-2,
17 that would be true. But that's --

18 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: In other
19 areas, that may not be the case, in which case maybe
20 we want a more detailed answer. But in this
21 particular case, I'm not trying to lose too much sleep
22 over it.

23 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But my

1 understanding from our last discussion is, this is
2 going to set the precedent for the rest of the
3 cleanup. Is this correct?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Process-wise --

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

6 MR. RON LEVY: -- we were talking
7 about. But in this case, we're talking about a piece
8 of property where we do have a history, we know what's
9 out there, essentially, what's out there. So, we're
10 not working off of just blind information. But there
11 are pieces out there where we just don't know. I
12 mean, we don't have a lot of history, and that's going
13 to change the risk piece to it.

14 If anybody wants to discuss this
15 more, we can talk about it, but what I heard was you
16 want to move on?

17 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Yeah, I'm
18 satisfied. I threw out my two cents. Mine was more
19 of a statement to you guys of what the public might
20 perceive from reading a comment like that, more than a
21 fifteen minute lesson on risk assessment OEs. But I
22 appreciate it, anyway.

23 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: You ought to

1 sit through the R3M meetings eight hours.

2 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I can't
3 wait.

4 MR. RON LEVY: Let me ask you,
5 Bart, since we really don't have anything to -- well,
6 we've got these slides that Lantz put together. And
7 we looked through them briefly. I didn't see anything
8 in there that was too controversial to us. Am I
9 right, David?

10 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: (Nods head.)

11 MR. RON LEVY: Ann?

12 MS. ANN McCAULEY: (Nods head.)

13 MR. RON LEVY: So, if you wanted to
14 start with this and talk through this. Is that what
15 you want to do?

16 MR. BART REEDY: I think so, and
17 then hit some of the more key high points and comments
18 --

19 MR. RON LEVY: Because I think you
20 list those in the back here, right, some of the
21 issues?

22 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Well, the
23 last slide is the conclusions and some --

1 MR. RON LEVY: You got standard
2 issues in here?

3 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah. Well
4 --

5 MR. RON LEVY: Not necessarily
6 McClellan, but they're --

7 MR. NORRELL LANTZER:
8 Unfortunately, she's got them out of order, too. This
9 was on the run. I was in LA this morning.

10 If you go to the fourth slide, UXOs
11 by state. We'll reorder them. That just gives you an
12 idea that Fort McClellan ain't alone out there, there
13 is a lot of them out there, and you're in the
14 pipeline. And we don't care about the other ones,
15 what we care about is Fort McClellan. If you go to
16 the next slide, the clearance process, that gives you
17 a quick overview, very simplistically from the start,
18 we start making the decision all the way down to a
19 recurring review, and some of the little pieces that
20 go into each one of those, some of the decision
21 points. On the M-2 parcel, you're down at the EE/CA
22 decision point.

23 MR. RON LEVY: I would tell you, in

1 our BRAC process, we're not calling them necessarily
2 by the same names as you have here.

3 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah, I
4 understand. This is out of a DoD document.

5 Now, we go back to the first --
6 second slide. The first document that's critical in
7 any of the clearance process is the archival research.
8 That gives you a flavor for what's out there. And
9 particularly on the unexploded ordnance side, you're
10 looking for the OE types. And you see just where it
11 was located at and any unique hazards that you have
12 associated with those. That's where you start getting
13 into the qualitative risk assessments right up front.
14 If you've only got training items out there, that's a
15 lower risk to an individual than a hand grenade or a
16 law (phonetic) rocket or other things.

17 From that, you go from there into
18 site investigation, site assessment, site
19 characterizations. And at that point all you're
20 trying to do is get more information, one, to find out
21 if it's really out there. If so, where is it exactly
22 at, because you -- it doesn't make sense to clean
23 clean land. I mean, why waste the money? Let's clean

1 the dirty parts.

2 So, that's all you're trying to do
3 is delineate where all the ordnance is, find out what
4 your densities are, and the depth of those densities,
5 because you'll have stuff on the surface, one foot,
6 two foot, three foot, ten feet, twenty feet.

7 The lower you go, the harder it is
8 to see. And dependent upon which instrument you use
9 to detect that, some of the instruments don't see very
10 deep. That's where the land use becomes very, very
11 key into what you're going to do a clearance for. If
12 you only have a requirement for surface, plus one
13 foot, there is no requirement to clean below the one
14 foot.

15 Now, in some instances -- and this
16 is a discussion that the Corps and DoD is having -- if
17 they see it, they're going to go get it. Okay. But
18 if you only have a requirement for one foot, that's
19 the key.

20 My personal opinion is if you have
21 a recreational area that says surface, plus one foot,
22 I want you also to see below that one foot to see what
23 residual risk is going to be out there. You know, is

1 there a requirement to clear it? No. The Corps says
2 in a lot of their instances, they'll go get it.

3 From there, let's go over to the
4 EE/CA stage which is where we're at on the M-2 parcel.
5 That's where you take all that information you've
6 gathered up to this point and you sit down and analyze
7 it and you say, what do we got, how does this all fit
8 in together, what does it fit the land use, what risk
9 do we have, do we have accessibility of the area, and
10 let's start looking at different alternatives. And if
11 you really look at it, you've got no further action,
12 you've got clean it. There is not much else. You got
13 either, it's not there so don't worry about it, or it
14 is there, now let's do something about it. And the
15 goal is to keep the risk down to the public.

16 The next slide is the one that Bart
17 was alluding to from 6055.9. These are the guidance
18 that comes out of that document that says, default, if
19 you don't know anything about that site, these are
20 your standards. That's where you start at up front.

21 But as you gain site specific
22 knowledge, you can start adjusting those depths. If
23 you only have ordnance that is found in the first

1 foot, once you clear that first foot and you're
2 reasonably sure that you've cleared that first foot,
3 the end document should be for unrestricted use of
4 that area, period. And I think that's what they were
5 alluding to over here is, it depends upon how you look
6 at the ordnance usage.

7 Now, are you going to know
8 everything about an area? No. There is always
9 unknowns out there. People did strange and wondrous
10 things fifteen, twenty years ago, and it wasn't
11 documented. Can we go out and find all those areas?
12 If you want to spend the money. That gets very
13 expensive. The key is you try to locate what you know
14 is out there and sample the other areas to see if
15 there is anything else out there.

16 MR. BART REEDY: As I understand
17 right now, the plans is for two foot?

18 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: The plan is
19 for clearance to two foot.

20 MR. BART REEDY: To clear without a
21 doubt the first two foot?

22 MR. RON LEVY: Well, that was based
23 on the instrumentation, in terms of what you could

1 look down --

2 MR. BART REEDY: Right.

3 MR. RON LEVY: And the history of
4 the site. And two foot was what we were talking.

5 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: I think the
6 two foot was, right now, based on what items we found
7 in and around that area. But as we go on and get into
8 the geophysics and mapping it, depends on what that
9 gives us as to whether two foot is still a good call.

10 MR. BART REEDY: Okay.

11 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Let me ask you --
12 and skipping back to the cost analysis and engineering
13 evaluation -- you said there are two options, it's not
14 there or the second option is to clean up. Is there a
15 third option, not clean up?

16 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: That's the no
17 further action, really. And if you'll look at it, you
18 either do something or you don't. If it's out there
19 and you don't do anything about it, you do a lot of
20 institutional controls or land-use restrictions or
21 lots of other things.

22 MR. RON LEVY: There is actually
23 other alternatives. You can clean up to --

1 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Subsets of
2 those, yes.

3 MR. RON LEVY: -- a certain level
4 and restrict the property.

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: In the deeds, I
6 understand that.

7 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah.

8 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Is there fencing
9 in and not doing anything about it? That's my
10 question.

11 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah. There
12 is subsets of those two basic actions. And really,
13 you normally look at four different actions. But two
14 of them are really subsets of the other ones.

15 MR. RON LEVY: And if you look at
16 our other EE/CA, one of the alternatives was clean up
17 and then put land-use controls or restrictions also in
18 place, as well. So, which is --

19 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: The next
20 slide, what I tried to do is, since I work a lot of
21 different sites, Army, Navy, Air Force now, and Marine
22 Corps, these are standard issues that come up at each
23 and every site, the adequacy of the archival research,

1 the initial delineation of those areas of concerns
2 from that archival research, and then a conceptual
3 site model based upon what you know at that point.
4 And I think that's where Craig was starting to allude
5 to of, you know, here is my primary release mechanism,
6 here is my exposure pathway, how do I break that. We
7 don't see that done a lot. You see it in bits and
8 pieces. DoD's getting a lot better at it.

9 Sampling approaches, that is a key
10 issue in dispute at 98 percent of the sites within
11 DoD. There is not enough sampling or the sampling is
12 done in such a way to where you are missing those high
13 risk areas. But they're working on them.

14 Land use to clearance levels, site
15 specificity. If you start analyzing the data from
16 here is my default depth, here is my site specific
17 depth, and then here is my frost heave, here's what
18 our clearance standards are, rather than just go from
19 one to we're just going to clear it to depth, I would
20 like to see that analysis so we know what has been put
21 into there.

22 Detection capabilities, there's a
23 lot of detectors out of there, there is a lot of

1 contractors out of there -- out there that say they
2 can detect everything. I will tell you up front, my
3 company owns no detectors. I fight my company
4 consistently. I own no detectors. I will never own a
5 detector. I don't care if you put a gerbil out there.
6 You tell me what you want to detect, your detection
7 requirements, and I don't care what you put out there,
8 as long as it meets that requirement.

9 Detection goes anywhere from 50
10 percent all the way up to, in some cases we've seen
11 96, 97 percent probability of detections. It all
12 depends upon the detector, the process and procedures
13 that are in place, etcetera.

14 Now, for Fort McClellan, what I've
15 seen from what Valerie has as part of a prove-out, on
16 first glance and as I get the data, it looks very
17 good. It appears you got a very good process and
18 procedure set in place. It's now we're going to see
19 it actually in work.

20 MR. BART REEDY: One of the -- one
21 of the items you might speak to here, Lantz, is the
22 going back to the property and verifying the
23 assumptions that were made from the data that was

1 massaged.

2 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah. You're
3 looking at a complete process. All the way -- every
4 time you go out to that piece of property, you add
5 more data into the data base and you always analyze
6 that data. And I'll -- can I do bump in the road
7 story?

8 Bump in the road story. I spent
9 seven years going in and out of a bombing range on a
10 little island and we used Jeeps. Nine miles long,
11 getting from one end to the other, and it was just
12 horrendous. But we all knew that about halfway down
13 the island there is a little bump in the road that if
14 you hit it just right with your Jeep wheels, you could
15 get a minimum of three wheels off the ground, and if
16 you did it really good, you could get all four wheels
17 off the ground.

18 Several years ago, we started doing
19 a clearance. And the first thing we wanted to do was
20 go ahead, let's clear the roads. We've been driving
21 on these things, let's clear the roads.

22 They got all the roads done. And
23 then I started doing QA on their clearance. And one

1 of the requirements was you had to find all the 20
2 millimeter bullets, which are about this long --
3 (demonstrating) -- and about this big around at twelve
4 inches. My third QA grid I found a 105 round, which
5 is this long -- (demonstrating) -- and this big around
6 at twelve inches. And I said, guys, wait, we have a
7 problem, you missed this round.

8 So, we went back on the geophysical
9 site and found out that the analyst had changed the
10 filter and upped the filter to get rid of some of the
11 background. So we made him reprocess four hundred
12 grids. And what we found was another four hundred and
13 eight anomalies in the road. And one of them was that
14 bump in the road. And that bump in the road was a two
15 hundred and fifty pound fused bomb at eighteen inches.

16 COLONEL TREUTING: Which could have
17 really made you leave the road.

18 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Oh, yes.

19 MR. PETE CONROY: Talking about
20 four wheels off the ground.

21 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: And not
22 come back.

23 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: As we dug it

1 up, that was one we could not move. It was too
2 hazardous to move. And it was like, you know, guys,
3 we've been lucky all these years because we didn't hit
4 the fusing right to blow it up. That would have
5 caused a twelve foot by eighteen foot crater in the
6 road and not much left of the Jeep or us.

7 But that's the key, to go back with
8 -- and I think that's what Bart wanted me to talk
9 about is: Contractor goes out and says he's cleared
10 it. Contractor has a quality control system that goes
11 out and verifies and checks. Additionally, the
12 government comes in and does their own. And it's real
13 key that that happens, because even as well as your
14 process is, you have to have some oversight of that
15 process to make sure somebody's not getting lazy or
16 you just missed something.

17 For example, DDESB just certified
18 twenty-five hundred acres of land for unrestricted use
19 to one foot and said, public, here it is, go play with
20 it. They certified it three months ago. One of the
21 agencies said, time out. We want to go back in and
22 re-look at a couple of areas. And what they found was
23 thirty-eight rounds within the first foot that were

1 all HE filled, all fused. So, that twenty-five
2 hundred acres is now up in the air.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Where is that?

4 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Bad lands.
5 Fort Ord, California, on Fitzey (phonetic) Air Field,
6 they're doing the fourth clearance of an area that,
7 yes, it's clean, yes, it's clean, no, it's not.

8 And that's why it's so key to get
9 the process in place to do verifications. And it's
10 not that hard to do. You have good detectors picked
11 out for Fort McClellan. I'm fairly confident that
12 they can see what's going to be out there. And it's
13 just watching the process.

14 And that really covers the removal
15 action. Based upon all that data, you start doing the
16 monitoring. I think somebody alluded it to a five
17 year requirement. It's really site specific, but it's
18 a minimum of five years.

19 If you have a heavy erosional area,
20 you may want to come back sooner, in particular areas,
21 just to look and see if anything else is coming up.
22 But the minimum is a five year recurring review to see
23 everything is still working.

1 Now, onto the M-2 parcel, the last
2 slide I did real early this morning, because we were
3 in meetings most of yesterday. As Ron and Bart have
4 said, I set down with Valerie, Phil was there from
5 ADEM, and we walked through all the comments and
6 worked through all those issues. I got a very good
7 feeling of what Valerie is rewriting in the new EE/CA.
8 So, I feel confident that on the next one I won't have
9 to write as much.

10 Now, one of the things that we hit
11 on yesterday, other than the cost estimates, was the
12 one particular issue on ARARs. And that involves the
13 State side. And what -- Valerie said that she had
14 talked to Margaret, the Corp's lawyer, and she wants
15 to sit down with the State people to start working on
16 the site -- or State specific ARARs that would apply.

17 MR. BART REEDY: Do y'all remember
18 what ARARs are?

19 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: They're
20 applicable and relevant requirement.

21 MR. RON MASSEY: Applicable or
22 relevant and appropriate.

23 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Appropriate

1 requirements, yes.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Thank you.

3 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: And in fact,
4 what I was showing Ron earlier -- and now my computer
5 has gone dead and I can't do it. Sorry. The Corps'
6 new document has some very good sections on ARARs.
7 And that's what I pointed to Valerie, I said, just do
8 it like here and you're okay. So, that's still kind
9 of an open issue, but I think it's a workable one.

10 And then we have the explosive site
11 safety submission and the work plan that was delivered
12 a week ago for review. Back to you, Bart.

13 MR. BART REEDY: Back to me? One
14 last little word on the ARARs. Again, everybody's
15 been in Anaheim except I guess me and Pete. But an
16 ARAR is a law that may be -- it may be a state law, it
17 could be a federal law -- that a reasonable person
18 would say that applies here, even though it may not be
19 written for UXO. It may be -- maybe it's a law by way
20 of example for surface water. If we go out and start
21 digging around out here, we'll have to put up some
22 silt fences and things along those lines to keep the
23 sediment out of the creeks. That is just a very rough

1 example of an ARAR.

2 What I believe I am hearing is that
3 Huntsville is going to do -- is going to get together
4 with ADEM and identify the applicable ARARs. That's
5 --

6 MR. RON LEVY: That's what came out
7 of --

8 MR. BART REEDY: That's what I'm
9 hearing.

10 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, that's what
11 came out of the meeting in Guntersville.

12 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: And that's
13 what came out yesterday from Valerie.

14 MR. RON LEVY: We were going to get
15 -- but we were asking for some help from the State in
16 identifying all of those. And I think that Chris
17 somewhat signed up for that, although he wasn't --

18 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Yes, I think the
19 issue last week or two weeks ago at the meeting was
20 that the State had identified very broad laws. I
21 don't even recall which ones --

22 MR. RON LEVY: The Clean Water Act.

23 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Yeah, the Clean

1 Water Act was an ARAR. Well, there is lots and lots
2 and lots of requirements and elements of the Clean
3 Water Act. Exactly what do these experts from the
4 State who oversee this law and implement this law,
5 what do they see as relevant to this project? That's
6 the kind of help that we need. I mean, we need those
7 experts who deal with these state laws to help us
8 identify some -- more specifically some of those
9 elements of those very broad laws that they have
10 previously identified. And it's that work that the
11 Corps and the State will be doing together.

12 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Ron, when will
13 that be done?

14 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Got a
15 schedule.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, but the one
17 for the ARARs is not specifically listed. It's
18 ongoing now.

19 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Well, you've
20 got two parts of the ARARs. You've got one part that
21 fits the M-2 parcel and then you've got the second
22 part, which is the rest of Fort McClellan.

23 MR. RON LEVY: But that work's

1 ongoing now. And although it's not specified in the
2 schedule there, we're trying to fit it in to meet all
3 the other time lines, so it's not a set --

4 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That's where
5 I'm going.

6 MR. RON LEVY: There's no set time
7 line on that.

8 MR. RON MASSEY: It's not a
9 show-stopper?

10 MR. RON LEVY: We don't believe
11 that it is. We believe we're going to be able to do
12 it.

13 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Specifically
14 speaking to M-2, when will the ARs be --

15 MR. RON LEVY: ARARs?

16 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: When will we
17 know what they are?

18 MR. RON LEVY: When will you know
19 what they are?

20 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: When the
21 document comes out.

22 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: For M-2?

23 MR. RON LEVY: When we redraft the

1 -- when the final EE/CA comes out, that should have
2 all of the ARARs in it.

3 MR. BART REEDY: That has to happen
4 by May 10th, right?

5 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: 12th. Our
6 schedule is the 12th of May.

7 MR. RON LEVY: And we're working on
8 it right now.

9 MS. ANN McCAULEY: The ARARs are
10 already listed in the EE/CA, if I remember correctly.
11 It's just --

12 MR. RON LEVY: We were going to be
13 --

14 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Right --

15 MR. RON LEVY: It's the specificity
16 of them we're working on.

17 MS. ANN McCAULEY: Right.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: They said May
19 12th.

20 MR. RON LEVY: And I know Valerie
21 is working on those. Anything else, Bart? Do you
22 want to open it up for more questions?

23 MR. BART REEDY: Do any of the

1 comments in the back, do any of those do anything for
2 you? Did it trip a switch? Do you have any questions
3 you would like to ask me, Ron, Lantz?

4 A lot of the answers, the
5 resolution of those answers, is going to take place in
6 the rewrite of this document and the subsequent
7 document to that which will be a very -- which will be
8 the site specific work plan, where we ask very
9 specific questions, how are you going to -- what
10 frequency and how are you going to go back and dig to

11 ensure that what you claim is -- that you see that you
12 got it all? How are you going to do that? Those very
13 specific answers are to be in the work plan.

14 Most of the questions that we have
15 asked right here are work plan kinds of questions. It
16 was EPA's assumption and understanding that it would
17 be actually in this document. We sat down last week
18 or week before last and got to talking about it a
19 little bit, and in fact a lot of the questions will be
20 resolved in the work plan, the specifics.

21 MR. RON LEVY: We all agreed to
22 that.

23 MR. BART REEDY: Yeah.

1 MR. RON LEVY: We'd see it in the
2 work plan.

3 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: In some
4 cases, I think you'll see it started in the EE/CA and
5 then the fine detail in the work plan.

6 MR. RON LEVY: And the thing I want
7 to point out to you: This is -- I don't want to say
8 it's A new relationship, but it's somewhat of a new
9 relationship between what we're doing here with EPA.
10 This is new for Fort McClellan, and you have a new
11 team, in terms of Bob and Lantz looking at it. So,
12 some of it's just a matter of understanding how we're
13 operating, and not so much that there's a real issue
14 there, but, you know, what is it you're -- you're
15 doing it differently than what my last guy was like,
16 and how do I understand that.

17 MR. BART REEDY: There is that, and
18 it's also, you know, quite truthfully, this was a very
19 hurry-up project and everyone has been jumping to make
20 the project happen, and we understand that. Really,
21 there are lots of things that ought be addressed that
22 just flat didn't get addressed, yet. So, there is
23 really two things going on here; familiarity of the

1 concepts and the way Huntsville's doing business here
2 and the other, as well.

3 MR. RON LEVY: I give it to you,
4 Bart, because we are on an accelerated schedule.
5 Everybody knows that. We're trying very hard to get
6 this property back in the hands of the community.

7 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: What's
8 driving that, Ron, is it this bypass road that's going
9 through or --

10 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: No, the
11 guy that wants the parcel, to be very blunt with you.
12 You know, the promise that I made as a commander and
13 hold to all these experts, who I don't even want to
14 get down to that level, because my head hurts, I'm
15 starting to understand it after three years, but it's
16 still -- I'm not transferring shit if it's dirty. And
17 make sure you put that in there.

18 DR. BARRY COX: Well, by definition
19 it would be, wouldn't it?

20 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Let me
21 explain to you the issue. And we're on the same sheet
22 of music. You step on an 81 millimeter mortar, you're
23 going to have a significant emotional event. And my

1 whole game plan is to make sure that doesn't happen.

2 Now, that's a tough thing to do, because they were
3 firing rounds out here from 1917 to 1948. 1948 they
4 moved all the firing over to Pelham Range, except for
5 direct fire weapons and rockets and things like that.

6 There is some ranges that we're not
7 going to be able to clean up. There is too much shit
8 there. You're not going to build your house on it,
9 you're not going to put, you know, a Disney Land.
10 We're either going to retain control or it's going to
11 go over into the national wildlife refuge with
12 restrictions on it, because no one wants to see loss
13 of life, regardless of how much money is involved.

14 We get to a parcel -- I can go out
15 right now and show you a parcel that's about twenty
16 acres square that has more UXO than anyplace on the
17 planet Earth. And that is one of the later removals.
18 It's going to take us about six hundred and ten days
19 to clean it. So, if you're planning on building a box
20 Wal-Mart on it, you better plan for six hundred and
21 ten days after it.

22 Now, the good news is, it's not in
23 the development area. But there are places like that.

1 He's been here before. You can go out and find it.

2 We've got some other things that
3 mitigate. I'm not a physicist, I'm not a nuclear
4 scientist, and I'm not a geologist, but most of the
5 area around here has got bedrock on it. What does
6 that do? That mitigates the depth that that shell is
7 going to be at. But we also have erosion, we have
8 also a buildup of silt. And that's where we're going
9 to go look. It's kind of stupid to go look on a, you
10 know, bedrock, granite mountain, because a shell
11 couldn't pierce it. And if it did, it made a big
12 hole. And that's kind of the game plan.

13 Now we've got to go find it. So,
14 we've taken all these historical records from 1917 on
15 and we say, yeah, we think we shot an 81 millimeter
16 mortar over here and it went in this direction. We've
17 got to go find them. And it's going to take time.

18 The good news is what Ron was
19 saying, is most of the development areas and the
20 cantonment area. And that, originally, you know, in
21 1917 over at Buckner Circle, they were shooting
22 artillery. They were shooting it back here against
23 the mountains, but, you know, it's basically clear.

1 Well, we couldn't transfer it, we couldn't sign a
2 master lease with JPA, we wouldn't be in the transfer
3 that we're doing in June.

4 What makes M-2 different is that
5 they got an offer for that parcel. Now, I could tell
6 you, I would be willing to bet a paycheck, there is
7 not spit out there. But now I have to go and prove
8 it. And I should be forced to go and prove it. And
9 that's what we're going to go do, we're going to go
10 prove it.

11 And if it ain't ready, I ain't
12 going to give it to them. Okay? And then answer all
13 the Congressionals and the stuff that's going to come
14 out of it, because you know who is buying it. I mean,
15 that's no secret. So, that's what's driving it and
16 why it's so quick.

17 We're willing to tackle it
18 collectively as a team, because we all kind of feel,
19 it ain't spit out there, probably training stuff. It
20 wasn't fired at -- I met a lot of stupid mortarmen,
21 but very few of them that shoot mortars right on the
22 road. These were back when we were on 21. Okay, I
23 met a couple that might have. But that's the area.

1 You know, you got Legarde -- what's it called the
2 Berman Museum, it's sitting -- no fooling, when we
3 gave it over in 1968, it's sitting on a range. You
4 know, now, that's prior to the EPA and that's prior to
5 ADEM. Did they dig it up? Stay tuned. No one's
6 blown up, yet.

7 I've got UXO and ASR under the
8 starship. Well, Jesus, we built the starship and
9 nobody got blown up, but I'm still going to go out and
10 check it. So, that's kind of what they're trying to
11 tell you in scientific, I just told you in cavalry
12 terms.

13 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: And they're
14 still digging up the back yard of the Korean
15 Ambassador's --

16 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Yeah.

17 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: -- yard again
18 in Washington D.C., because it's got unexploded
19 ordnance in it.

20 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Exactly.
21 And to answer your question, Mayor Kimbrough, what
22 happens is, you come back fifteen years from now, and
23 what Bart is talking about, frost heave, is those

1 things move up. There is no way a civilian company
2 put an eight inch round out there. First of all, we
3 don't sell them to them. We're the ones that shoot
4 them. We don't shoot them anymore. We don't have
5 them.

6 MR. BART REEDY: What the Colonel
7 means, I believe, is, if you find an eight inch round
8 --

9 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Don't
10 touch it, call us. We'll come blow it in place.

11 MR. BART REEDY: -- we've got a
12 good phone number for the Colonel.

13 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Now, all
14 you guys have been hearing these explosions go off.
15 Right now it's at less than three percent have been
16 HE. It's all been TPT. And we keep detailed records
17 on a weekly status, we send to him, and he sends to
18 the regulators. And we're not blowing them up, we're
19 splitting them, so we can define -- learning from ward
20 (phonetic), exactly what the round was, because you
21 wrap C-4 around anything, you can make it disappear.
22 So, we're using the splitting charge, so we say, yeah,
23 that was HE, sometimes we get a concussion explosion.

1 You wrap twenty-three of anything together and blow it
2 with a splitting charge, guess what happens?

3 MR. RON LEVY: Makes a lot of
4 noise.

5 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: It blows
6 up. So, we've learned from the last group that did it
7 -- and the range that Lantz is talking about is one of
8 the ones we zeroed in on. We ain't doing this four
9 times. We're going to do it one time and we're going
10 to do it right. So, we went and looked at everybody
11 else that's touched it and said, boy that was stupid.
12 We ain't doing that.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: David, I always
14 appreciate your clarity. I also appreciate this
15 meeting tonight. I have to run.

16 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Is Roxanne
17 giving you the hand?

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Uh-huh.

19 DR. BARRY COX: I guess one
20 question I would have, you know, just going through
21 it, it seems like a lot of editorial things that
22 probably need to be edited. Have they been cleaned up
23 or have you talked about some of those or --

1 MR. RON LEVY: Well, editorial
2 things are easy. We change them right away.

3 DR. BARRY COX: Okay. On page
4 seven --

5 MR. RON LEVY: Of the EE/CA?

6 DR. BARRY COX: Yeah. We talk
7 about risk analysis. And on the third from the last
8 line it says, land use controls result in the property
9 being safe.

10 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: What page are
11 you on, sir?

12 DR. BARRY COX: Page seven. It's
13 my understanding that you would not use the term safe
14 in the context of risk analysis; is that correct?

15 MR. BART REEDY: Yeah. Where are
16 you?

17 DR. BARRY COX: It's the third line
18 --

19 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: From the bottom?

20 DR. BARRY COX: It says --

21 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: David, what
22 did we agree on? We agreed to change that whole --

23 MR. DAVID SKRIDULIS: Well, they've

1 been -- yeah, this whole section is going to be
2 rewritten.

3 MR. RON LEVY: It's going to be
4 changed.

5 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: There is a
6 major rewrite on that one.

7 DR. BARRY COX: And probably the
8 same thing as we go through this. Page nine, when we
9 start into removal action, and it says the intent of
10 this project is to locate, recover, and dispose of all
11 surface subsurface OE within the M-2 parcel. Then
12 when you go down to the next paragraph below that it
13 says, in the event the actual removal of OE is
14 required.

15 In this one you're saying you're
16 going to do it and that one you're saying in the event
17 it's -- you see my point? In other words, in the top
18 one you're saying you're going to do it and the second
19 one you're saying in the event it's required.

20 MR. RON LEVY: This was also an
21 issue in --

22 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: There were a
23 lot of inconsistencies in terms of --

1 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, and I think we
2 also were going to change this one, too.

3 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah.

4 MR. RON LEVY: Because that was a
5 point made by the State.

6 MR. BART REEDY: I believe, also on
7 that page up here, this is going to be addressed,
8 there is not a doubt in my mind about it: Dispose of
9 all surface and sub-surface within the M-2 parcel.
10 And that's a pretty big statement. Well, you know, we
11 need that -- we're going to get everyone together on
12 just exactly how deep we're going and how hard we're
13 looking. And that will, I'm sure, be fleshed out in
14 the next rewrite of that.

15 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Yes, sir.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

17 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: What Valerie
18 is doing is she's doing the land use to depth matrix,
19 just like I talked about, here is the 6055, here is
20 the site specific, here is the frost heave, this is
21 the required clearance depth. And then, oh by the
22 way, this is what we're going to do out there.

23 DR. BARRY COX: And on eleven, as

1 the Colonel just got through saying, it says, the M-2
2 parcel will be transferred. It means it will be
3 transferred if it's clean, right?

4 MR. BART REEDY: Colonel?

5 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING:

6 Absolutely.

7 DR. BARRY COX: Okay, so I mean
8 that --

9 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: If y'all
10 come back and find a nuclear reactor, I can tell you
11 you ain't going to be transferring a thing.

12 DR. BARRY COX: Just as I read it
13 through -- and as I said, I assume you're going to --
14 a lot of those will be cleaned up. It just seemed
15 like there was a lot of --

16 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: The
17 problem is, Barry, is we know most of it's clear.

18 DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

19 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: We're
20 going to find the same thing we find out in training
21 area 10, 11, and 16, we're going to find training
22 rounds, former smoke grenades that have been burnt out
23 that some dufus left there, that's the kind of stuff

1 we're going to go pick it up.

2 MR. BART REEDY: The Colonel, I
3 believe, has said it a couple of times, on the M-2
4 parcel we really don't expect to find much of
5 anything. I believe I'll get a dinner out of the
6 Colonel for this here.

7 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And me.

8 MR. BART REEDY: But the reason
9 that Chris and I asked you all to look at this to get
10 your perspective on it was that this is the first time
11 Huntsville has started working at Fort McClellan and
12 Pete's forest up here is, you know, a prime candidate
13 for an application of OE removal, as well. What are
14 we going to do there? And this is kind of a -- could
15 be viewed as a precedent setting approach for
16 Fort McClellan. But what I'm hearing is that -- what
17 I'm hearing is that we're going to use this for the
18 M-2 and the M-2 only, which nobody expects to find
19 anything, and then when we start going into the more
20 densely populated is where some of these other still
21 remaining things will be cleaned up; is that correct?

22 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Exactly.

23 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: Much more

1 detail.

2 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Much more
3 detailed on the other parcels, especially for phase
4 two, which is where most of it's at, and phase three.
5 And the reason why I say phase two is most of it is
6 because those are the close-in areas. You get out in
7 phase three up on that map there, you're talking rock,
8 I mean, thick rock. So, I don't count this. I will
9 disagree with that. It ain't a precedent setter.
10 This is for M-2 and M-2 only. There is a process that
11 we want to follow. I'm using this, quote unquote, as
12 a "rock drill," because there is nothing out there.
13 Show me what part can be improved, where can we go
14 better, and then that's what will influence it, you
15 know.

16 A rock drill in the Army is a
17 rehearsal. You go through and plan what you're going
18 to do before the bullets start flying. Because I
19 know, I've been out there, I've spent many years
20 there. There ain't spit out there. And if I find
21 something out there, I'll be shocked. Maybe I'll put
22 a bar-b-que on for the RAB.

23 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Make sure you

1 get that.

2 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: She got
3 it. She's got it.

4 MR. BART REEDY: Mayor?

5 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: The first two
6 parcels are the bypass and the M-2 right now. And are
7 there any adjoining areas that have been identified to
8 have a possibility to be dirty, you might say, and
9 what precautions are going to be taken to --

10 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Yes, let
11 me talk to that. Bart won't know that.

12 This is what we've been working on
13 since '98. Excuse me, Bill. This here. We've broken
14 it down into what we call operable units, Mayor. Most
15 of the stuff we're finding up -- is up in here. And
16 it kind of makes sense if you look where the range
17 fans went. They haven't found much, at all, down
18 here.

19 We're going to do a fee transfer to
20 Department of Transportation so that they own this
21 land. They're going to come in probably about the
22 summer -- I want to get written down on the record
23 claiming Alabama DOT, but I was supposed to be ready

1 in July '01 right here. Okay.

2 And then as they go through, we're
3 going to have our contractors, when they find
4 something, if we haven't cleared it, we're going to
5 stop construction and we're going to go blow it in
6 place. Or if it's capable of being removed, remove
7 it. I'm not expecting much here because not much was
8 shot here. Most of your indirect fire, your high
9 plunging arc fire and your rounds is over in here,
10 it's not over here. This was direct fire, bazooka,
11 tank, cannon, machine guns, stuff like that. We found
12 mostly up in here 2.36 and some mortars. And most of
13 them have been what we call target practice rounds,
14 very little HE.

15 This is a lot cleaner. This is not
16 clean, just isn't. That's where the artillery fell.
17 They basically used this as a backdrop, they tried to
18 drop it here. Now, because we've been in the Army, me
19 and Lantz, we know every once in a while you get one
20 of them things hanging out there, and that's what we
21 got to go figure out because this was an 81 millimeter
22 mortar and that's a dangerous round. Up here was 75,
23 105, 155, and 8 inch. So, that's where we expect most

1 of the work, up in Pete's grand forest, or whatever
2 we're going to call it, in this area up here.

3 Now, these green areas, you see why
4 you got green in there. That's HTRW, that's lead,
5 that's small arms. Okay? And we got some interesting
6 technology that we're going to use out here. Some of
7 it's like fido (phonetic) remediation. How you get
8 plants to suck bullets, whatever. We'll get in there
9 and we'll work that.

10 But this piece, the reason why
11 we're relatively moving this quick is what we found
12 from the records and what we found so far working on
13 this for about a year and a half, I don't think there
14 is anything there.

15 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Okay.

16 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Just
17 don't. It's too damn close to the road. You would
18 have to be a complete bozo to set up an indirect fire
19 range here.

20 MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Well, you know
21 what my concern is, if folks wander off into an
22 adjoining area and then --

23 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: What I've

1 been doing, since I anticipate the transfer in June,
2 July time frame, is from this area on back, I have
3 been blocking it off. I've put gates up, barricades.
4 Now I'm installing mounds with wire on them and signs.
5 I've had my contractors out there doing that. I check
6 it every week. I'm trying to stop the dufus from
7 wondering in and getting blown into Cleburne County.
8 And I've got to tell you guys, we've been hunting this
9 for almost thirty-five years. And the hunters have
10 helped us pick out a lot of rounds and we've blown a
11 lot of rounds. So, I might have cleaned up some of it
12 before we even got the really official Dave and the
13 band of merry men getting out there.

14 But there is frost heave here. Me
15 and Chris disagree on it. I believe there is frost
16 heave here, so I believe we're going to find some
17 stuff that wasn't there fifteen years ago.

18 So, I blocked this off. And in
19 fact, if you cross a barricade, I'm going to ticket
20 you and you can go talk to the county judge. I've
21 done that now. We're up to number three. I didn't
22 see that. Well, you didn't see. Are you blind, Helen
23 Keller? You can't see that? My god, it looks like an

1 aircraft carrier.

2 So, if you get a chance, you can't
3 get to there. Now, I'm going into all the little
4 rabbit trails and spider trails and I'm putting big
5 mounds of dirt and I'm putting fences on the top and
6 I'm marking it with signs, because I really don't want
7 to get anybody hurt.

8 The intent here is by June, when I
9 do transfer to the JPA -- it's not up on this slide --
10 parcels that they've asked for, that I have it
11 basically barricaded off. I've got an obstacle plan.
12 So, you have to really want bad to go in there.

13 Now, does that mean I'm going to
14 stop hunting? No. I'll open the barricade. You're
15 assigned your area. You go in there, you do your
16 hunting and you get back out. And that's the game
17 plan. So, that's the way I'm trying to stop guys from
18 stepping on mortars. Which if you've been in an
19 artillery barrage, it's not a lot of fun.

20 DR. BARRY CO: What type of land
21 use controls do you anticipate will be on that?

22 MR. RON LEVY: At this point, we
23 don't know, I mean, until we get through finding out

1 what we find out, we don't know.

2 DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

3 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Barry, we
4 got about twelve areas we know we'll have land use
5 controls on.

6 DR. BARRY COX: But not necessarily
7 on 2?

8 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: No,
9 they're not on M-2.

10 DR. BARRY COX: I just --

11 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: Everybody
12 knows, the Mayor is very familiar, we've got
13 landfills, there is going to be institutional controls
14 on there. We got a thing called T-38, which the
15 troops called chemical hill. There is going to be
16 land use controls on it. You were out there, just out
17 there this afternoon.

18 MR. RON LEVY: One of the controls,
19 one of the land use controls would be an education
20 process, just telling people --

21 MR. BART REEDY: I could envision
22 an education program, deed restrictions, and the
23 process set up to monitor the deed restrictions being

1 enforced.

2 DR. BARRY COX: I just noticed,
3 option four did have -- you know, it indicated would
4 have land use controls in it, that's the reason I had
5 asked.

6 MR. RON LEVY: And that's the one
7 we're thinking -- when we think about M-2, it's the
8 education piece.

9 DR. BARRY COX: Yeah. But option
10 four is the option you're going to use on that or is
11 that --

12 MR. RON LEVY: That's the one we
13 recommended in there.

14 MR. NORRELL LANTZER: You will
15 probably always have a part of the deed that says,
16 this area was probably used as. You may not have
17 found anything, but I just bought a house up in
18 Aberdeen, Maryland, and I'm three miles outside the
19 gate, and my deed said, this area could have chemical
20 munitions in it, please, sign. And I was like, okay.
21 I know there is nothing there, because we're so far
22 out, but you will more than likely see something like
23 that in the deed.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Not necessarily for
2 CW.

3 COLONEL DAVID TREUTING: I think
4 the other thing I would share with you is the RAB has
5 a tremendous perception that because the word chemical
6 school -- because the word Fort McClellan has been
7 associated so long with the chemical Corps, that god,
8 you got to have three eyed monsters out there, and you
9 got to have -- and I'm telling you that there is a
10 possibility of it --

11 DR. BARRY COX: But only in
12 uniform, right?

13 COLONEL TREUTING: Yeah, I hope so.
14 That's four eyed, Barry. We've done a really good
15 full Corps press to try to find -- you know, we found
16 a 1946 van out there, I mean out in the hinter
17 (phonetic) land where you would break your neck to go
18 out and get -- some supply sergeant parked it there.
19 Now, what was in it is parts of vehicles all in the
20 Smithsonian Institute. Well, we remove it. And we'll
21 keep doing that until we get it, because, you know, no
22 one wants to go to the national wildlife refuge and
23 run into a tent. And so that's kind of what we've

1 been going after is, get the stuff that you visibly
2 can see and remove it. And we've spent a lot of time
3 and effort on doing that. And the intent is to try to
4 leave it as good a state as we can.

5 If you go back out on ranges right
6 now, if you get through my ops section, you're not
7 going to see any of the buildings, you're not going to
8 see any telephone poles, you're not going to see
9 creosote posts. All you're going to see is where a
10 road was, and that's about it. So, we've stripped it.
11 Pretty much the plan was when we're finished, you
12 can't tell that it was -- other than unless you were
13 here in training, that it was a range. And that's the
14 intent.

15 MR. BART REEDY: Going once.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Well, unless there
17 is anymore questions, since we don't have a quorum, I
18 recommend we adjourn.

19 DR. BARRY COX: Anybody opposed?

20 All in favor? We're adjourned.

21 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

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 14th of May, 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

