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 12th day of February, 2001, commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.

R E P O R T E R ' S I N D E X

DR. BARRY COX: If everybody wants to take their seats, we'll go ahead and get started. I wanted to welcome all of our visitors here tonight. And what I would like to do is start this side of the room and, if you would, please, introduce yourself and, if you would, tell us where you're from.

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

MR. ELLIS POPE: I'm Ellis Pope with the Corps of Engineers from Mobile.

MR. JOE DOYLE: Joe Doyle, legal office here, transition force.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Josh Jenkins, IT Corporation.

MR. COPEN (phonetic): Dan Copen, Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

MR. STEVE MORAN: Steve Moran, IT Corporation.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Joan McKinney, the RAB coordinator.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James, environmental office here at the transition force.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: My name is

Major Jim Morrison, I'm the executive officer of the transition force.

MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks, Fort McClellan environmental office.

MR. DAVID HORN: I'm David Horn. I'm the videographer with Noble & Associates.

MS. ELIZABETH (inaudible): Elizabeth, Anniston Star.

MR. A. C. YOUNG: A. C. Young.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Wanda Champion.

MR. BOB ROBINSON: Bob Robinson, subbing for Miki Schneider from the JPA.

DR. BARRY COX: We appreciate all the visitors coming. If I may, let me explain the way that we conduct our meetings. We have set aside at the end of the meeting a time when any visitors can make comments relative to the activities of the RAB and can ask any questions. Up until that time, we'll hold the questions to those members of the RAB.

Roll call. Mr. Hood?

MR. RON HOOD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Beckett?

Mr. Branchfield?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Buford?

MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Conroy?

MR. PETE CONROY: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Cunningham?

MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Elser?

MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Fathke?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Dr. Harrington?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'm here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Hopper?

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mayor Kimbrough?

Mr. Thomassy?

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Welcome back.

Mr. Turecek? Mr. Levy is absent. Mr. Brittain?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Golden?

MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Has everybody had a chance to review the minutes from the last meeting?

MR. RON MASSEY: Let me say that everybody has a new set of minutes at their -- we made a couple of changes to the minutes that you received in the mail. The changes were, you know, a spelling error or something like that, but the content's the same, there was just a couple of editorial corrections.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: We changed the format on the top of the page, if you'll notice, and there was a couple of spell errors that still spell check thought was right. But in any event, no content was changed, no other information was changed. It was merely editorial, administrative.

DR. BARRY COX: Do I hear a motion that we approve the minutes?

MR. PETE CONROY: So moved.

DR. BARRY COX: A second?

MR. JAMES BUFORD: A second.

DR. BARRY COX: All in favor?

(Motion carried.)

DR. BARRY COX: Under old business, the next meeting we'll have at Jacksonville State University on the 11th floor of the library. Anybody need directions to get to the library? Tallest building in town.

Next we'll go to the briefing on the ground water contamination related to landfill three, Major.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Let me get things set up.

DR. BARRY COX: And while he's doing that, any of you audience members that have an interest in the RAB and would consider being a member, we do have at least one opening on the Restoration Advisory Board. Isn't that correct, Joan, we have one and probably one more coming up before too long?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: That's correct, we have one vacancy coming up. We have two new members coming on at the next meeting, but that still leaves us with one vacancy. And so if you have anyone or if you hear are interested in joining, we would

like to bring you on board if we could. We'll get an application to you.

DR. BARRY COX: So, anybody, if you're interested, if you would, please, see Joan after the meeting, we'd love to have you. Major.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Ron, if you would, go ahead -- can they all stand on the easel and just have the -- have I got them in order?

MR. RON MASSEY: You've made them in order.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Yeah. I would like to introduce myself. I'm relatively new, standing up in front of the RAB, as a matter of fact, very new. My name is Major Jim Morrison and I'm the executive officer of the garrison. I wear many hats. And one of the things I do is public affairs, very little, but I do some.

I'm standing up here tonight. Ron is sick. He got the flu pretty bad, couldn't make it tonight, so we put together a little update briefing on the landfill three and the potential for ground water contamination.

I'm going to talk to some bullet

slides in the back. I've got some map charts that show a little bit of detail. They're kind of hard to see. But we've played this and tried to figure out which end of the room was best. When we get down to it, if you have any specific questions, I'll have Ron point out anything that you might have a question on.

In the course of my talk, if you have a question, I'll stop and, please, stop me and we'll try to answer the question as we go through.

Good Armyese, we always have to have a purpose slide. Two things, we'll just update the RAB and the people here and we'll touch on some of the history, also, to bring you up to speed on where we've gone since the last RAB in discussing what we're calling an off-site-well-installation work plan.

And in that process, in discussing with the BCT, we've taken on looking at domestic water sampling, domestic well sampling, municipal well sampling, and lastly, the installation of additional wells in the Weaver area outside of landfill number three. And later on we'll get to that. And they're plotted on the map board back there in the back of the room.

A little history. The landfill was closed in 1967, operated from 1946. In 1986, the Army had five wells installed on post to determine what contamination was there.

A little time after that, the Army contracted to have IT do remedial investigation, which went on for, culminating in it the installation of an additional number of wells. And some of those wells were put off post, two of the ones that we're concerned about; one is in the median of Highway 21, just adjacent to landfill three, it's well number twelve, which I'll pretty much focus the rest of my talk to; and well number seven, which was basically on the installation, but just outside the fence line.

The first of those tests did determine that there was off-post contamination. And I'll show you more on that.

After that, we developed the need to have a long-term monitoring plan for all three of the post landfills. I said all three, but landfills number one, two, and three.

And then the recommendation of that long-term monitoring plan, well, landfills number one

and two needed no further action, but landfill three, contractor made three recommendations to the government. Well, excuse me, one recommendation and three alternate courses of action.

And their recommendation was that the Army would proceed with further geologic studies because of some anomalies in the geology, which was discussed last time in the RAB, that gave us some fits with predicting and showing where ground water was going and where it wasn't going.

So, at this point in time, we have on the back again, I'll show on the maps, proposed locations for additional wells off the installation. And we may need -- as we go down the road discussing a schedule, we'll probably need some help in trying to get the folks who own the property that those proposed wells are on to see if they'll let us dig or put those wells in for off-site ground water monitoring.

That brings us up to date. Kind of approached this when I put it together as what we know, what we need to know, and where we're going with this. So, on what we need to do now: We know there is contamination, we know specifically that number

twelve, well number twelve, in the middle of Highway 21, that the levels of chlorinated volatile organic compounds exceed the site-specific screening levels.

And we also know from presentations made that Weaver's wells, as tested by them, by Weaver last summer, were not contaminated. So, the best information we have now, there is no contamination at that well.

Because of the lack -- there aren't anybody -- none of the public drinking water from the wells, that all the water is from the city systems, there's no direct path, so we consider the threat or the risk to the public to be very, very -- there to be no risk and no eminent threat to life safety or the environment.

Just as a bottom note there, the soil type in the area is clay. And if you were going on the soil type alone, the transmission rate is .05 feet per day. You can see, that boils down to moving from -- potentially, moving from a landfill about six hundred and twenty feet over a thirty-four year period since the landfill was closed. Now, that's if all conditions were perfect and it moved through the

ground at a very consistent rate, which it doesn't do.

The other thing that may impact this is again, the geology, which is why we're here, and we're trying to figure out -- have looked at what the geology is and where we need to go.

The RAB hasn't, I don't believe, seen this before. This is the results for the two tests that were conducted, one in April 1995 and the other one in March of 199- -- February 1998.

This is adjusting well number twelve. What it tells us is that the levels did increase. But again, there is no exposure pathway, meaning that there's nobody going to be drinking from those wells.

MR. RON HOOD: How do you explain the factor of about fourteen increase in under three years, when you're talking about a flow rate that is -- it shouldn't have happened. What's your explanation for that tremendous increase in the --

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I'm going to take a shot at it. And I've got some technical expertise back there that might help me through that.

MR. RON HOOD: It would seem your

flow rate is considerably higher than what you're projecting.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The problem -- yeah. But the problem is that that's part -- four hundred parts per billion.

MR. RON HOOD: True, but it still increased fourteen in less than three years.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The problem is that over a period of time, we don't have the day-to-day monitoring that would tell us exactly what that flow is. And that may represent a blip or it may be a continuous rise.

The important thing is, is that we know that there is contamination. And what we're saying is, is that regardless -- okay, I understand that the rates that that level went up, but is there a threat to the safety, is there a threat to the public, is there a threat to the environment?

We know that there are heightened levels and we know we need to do something. We know we need to watch it real closely and come up with a plan, which is where we are now.

So, I guess to try to answer the

question directly is that even though they have -- they increased over that level, the amount of data doesn't necessarily say enough to make a determination. And the other piece is, what we believe is, we need to watch it more closely and suffice that that's where we need to go.

Any help. Doyle? Talked around it. Probably didn't hit it.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: My name is Doyle Brittain. I'm with U. S. Environmental Protection Agency.

We talked about this this afternoon. You only have two data points, and that does not give us enough information to determine what the trend is, as far as the ground water movement in that area. And that's one of the reasons that the Major is going to show you in a few minutes where we're going to be putting in some additional wells and going back out and doing some additional monitoring, even of the existing wells.

The things that we are looking for, those chlorinated compounds up there, are what we call DNAPLS, dents, non-aqueous phase liquids. Translated,

what that means is: They're more dense than water, so they'll sink. And we compare those with other things that we call LNAPLS. And that is ladder non-aqueous phase liquids. Or those are the floaters. That would be -- the floaters would be things like gasoline, if you had a leaking gas tank from a gas station. The chlorinated solvents would be the things that would go down to the bottom of the water. And they would form pools down there at the bottom of the water, wherever there is a place that they could collect.

One of the things that we're trying to determine now is: Is this a constant movement of these chlorinated compounds or these DNAPLS from the landfill over to these wells. And that is one possibility.

The other possibility is that these have been there for a long time, about thirty years or more. Chances are, that if they move, they would have moved probably some time earlier. So, one good probability is that they are trapped in little pockets there. And if you have an increase in water flow, that it would be like flushing a toilet; you would get a slug of this chlorinated solvents moving through the

area. And that is just one possibility, but that might be what explained why you got the higher reading the second time than the first time.

We can't give you a concrete answer tonight saying, what is the reason that you did get the higher reading one time than the other. Those are just two of the possibilities. But by doing the additional monitoring that the Major is fixing to talk about in just a few minutes, it will help us to get a handle on that and to answer the very question that you're asking.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I won't go into that slide. I think Doyle, Mr. Brittain, covered that fairly well.

That took us to where we needed to go, what we needed to find out. And we're close to having a plan that's approved by the BRAC cleanup team. And that would take us to figuring out what the extent of the contamination is, how deep, what levels are the contamination in, and what direction they're going in.

So, by putting in these additional monitoring wells, I believe we should pretty well have

all the bases covered as to surface and subsurface and down to the bedrock levels of what the ground water movement is in that area.

So, at this moment in time, with that information, we go out and put these additional wells in, that will help us to be able to characterize and answer that last question; is there a plume and how do we characterize it. And I put "plume" in quotation marks because of the geology in the area; it may be a piping action in a fissure or a crack in the geologic formation, in which case it would move very rapidly through an area. And that's what these wells would help determine.

Real quickly, we talked through some of the well locations with the BCT last week and the beginning of this week, today. Through discussions with the BCT, we'll also pick up monitoring -- excuse me, not monitoring, but monitoring, installation of new wells, and monitoring those wells, and also, taking some samples in both domestic, private wells, and municipal wells that we are going to go out and pull samples, once we get permission from individuals who own the private wells

in the City of Weaver to take water samples and conduct a thrust test on those water samples. That will help us get -- again, to define the nature and the extent of the contamination.

And what I also want to talk about is the timelines of when we're proposing to begin this. Essentially, we plan on beginning this as soon as possible. Once -- go ahead, Ron, pull that up, would you, please.

I don't think we've actually had a start date, yet. Once the BCT gives final approval, which we've all pretty well discussed it, so within the next week, I would think, would give me -- initiate the plans to begin this execution.

You see the whole timeline is about twenty weeks. Steve, Ellis, I'm not sure who made the timeline up. Fingering somebody. But if there is any questions, they would be better than me to answer the questions on the timelines.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: You had mentioned earlier that there was no threat to the health because there were no private wells, but you just mentioned that you will be taking samples from

some private wells.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Uh-huh.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Can you repeat the question, Major?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Pardon?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Can you repeat the question?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Her question is: I have said there is nobody on the local wells -- and may need to clarify that -- but the wells, I've said that there is no threat to the public, because there's nobody drinking water from the wells. But, yet, I've said we're going to go out and take samples from Weaver's wells and also the private wells. It's our belief that, number one, that of those private wells around there, they're not using for drinking, they're used only for watering.

Now, Weaver's wells are 1.7 and 2.1 miles away. At this point in time, based on the results of the tests that we had before, we don't believe that there is any contamination, based on the last summer's test results. What we'd like to do is to confirm that now. Is that --

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Uh-huh.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: So we can say today, with a fresh look, you know, validating what I've said here.

On the timelines, our biggest headache, our biggest concern is, we've experienced in this last year, with trying to put in boring wells to take boring and core samples to determine the geology, had a lot of resistance from private land owners about putting these boring wells on their property. So, we're not sure how long that process is going to take to get permission from local owners to try to put wells in their -- on their properties.

So, if that went very smoothly, within twenty weeks, as according to that schedule, we should be able to complete, having two things done; one, the test done on the local wells, and the second thing is to get the wells in place, new water testing wells, water monitoring wells, and have the results back from those wells.

So, twenty weeks is about five months. I'd say outside the end of August and September, we should be fairly well along with --

complete with that process and be able to come back and say with clarity where we are with that. Not that we wouldn't discuss it in between time, but we would pretty well have a final, knowing what's there, that would lead us into an action of what to do about potential ground water or ground water contamination.

Aside, alongside is a -- at the same time, the engineering evaluation and cost analysis on the landfill, itself, is drawing to a completion. It's a separate action. But by the end of the month, we should have a draft document in our hands that the BCT can look at and make a determination on the remedy selection for what we're going to do with the landfill, itself, landfill number three.

The ground water, itself, is being handled -- it's kind of a, as a supplemental remedial investigation, which will answer the questions that we need to get answered so we can get a good fix and determine if there is something else we need to do, just besides whatever the remedy is in place for the landfill.

That may or may not answer all the

questions for ground water. So, once we have the data in for the ground water, we'll be able to close the loop and I think have a complete plan, which will answer all the questions and then clean up or do what's necessary to ensure that there's no danger.

MR. PETE CONROY: When was the last time the Weaver water was tested? We have here '95 and February '98.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: That is only the well number twelve in the median.

MR. PETE CONROY: Right.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: It is my understanding from the last RAB meeting that I think the Weaver Water Board folks were here that said that they tested it July or August last summer.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Yeah, we've been testing it once a year, at least.

MR. PETE CONROY: When did the Army test it last?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The Army has not tested that well, to my knowledge. We've tested a well owned by Mr. Medders, directly off the installation. In 1995, Mr. Medders -- about the time

that we put the first monitoring wells in, Mr. Medders requested that we test his water. And we did do that and there were no significant levels, at that time. That was about the August, I think, '95 time frame that that test came in. And Ron is pointing to the Medders' well --

MR. RON MASSEY: Here is landfill three. And then the Medders' well, according to this, is only about five, six -- well, it's just across the road from landfill three, in a north-westerly direction.

DR. BARRY COX: How deep is it?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think -- I'd have to go back and look. Would you call it a hundred, plus?

MR. ELLIS POPE: I think it's somewhere between a hundred and two hundred feet, but it's -- I believe it's also -- it's caved in. It's not something that's being used for drinking water. I think the well is caved. I believe the Weaver wells were sampled at the same time back in '95.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I don't know when, but I know y'all have --

MR. POPE: And I think SAIC had it done.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: -- because we requested it and y'all did.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: In the stuff, in the information I went through, I couldn't find any reference to it, but I'll go back and look and see. If there is something there, we'll put it in the report.

At the risk of not trying to confuse, at both ends, instead of everybody trying to look at one end of the room to the other -- I think I got them out of order. Sorry, Ron. This first slide just located landfill three, where it is along Highway 21 in the northwest corner of the installation. If you'll look -- and we're out of sync now.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: That first one in the front.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: You got it right there in your hand.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Good rehearsal always solves the problem. Sorry, we haven't rehearsed it well enough.

This shows the locations of all the on-post monitoring wells. I think some of this data or these slides were shown with slight modification from the last RAB meeting.

These are the two wells that came up, indicating that the ground water contamination was moving off post. This is number twelve in the highway in the median. And number seven is just off -- on the installation, outside the fence, I believe. And those are the constituents of what was determined in that test.

Put this together so you would get an idea of again the position, where the different wells are, the Medders' well is here, Weaver is 1.2 -- excuse me -- 1.7 and 2.1 miles, showing Cane -- Cave Creek and Cane Creek flowing in their direction.

We believe that when you're looking at ground water flows, as I've learned today, that ground water basically flows in the -- the ground water will flow in the same basic direction in most cases as surface water. So, you follow the drainage areas. Which looking at that, gave us a location of one of the wells.

As you see here, this slide projects the locations of the proposed wells off the post. This one, along Cave Creek, to determine, if there is any carrying effect from the surface water and the ground water, going in the basic, same direction. And these other wells are here. And I don't have the property owners' names of those in front of me now.

If you're looking, you can also look back there. You don't have to strain your neck to see up front.

We may not get to all of the wells, dependent on if the property owners do not allow us to do that, and we can't make some sort of arrangement with them, we've got a couple of well locations in here that could be used as alternates. We may elect to put all of them in, including the alternates.

You'll see on the slide that's in the packet that there is an A and a B. And A was our first choice. In other words, if we could put A in, we may not put B in, but we've discussed that and we may end up deciding in the final decision the BCT would put them all in.

And that will help us -- what was the term, Doyle, that we used for like --

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Be what we call sentinel wells, be like a guard; it basically would tell us if there is any contamination that is moving in the direction of the Weaver City wells long before it arrives there and give us the opportunity to do something, as far as cleaning it up, to keep it from getting into the wells.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Will these wells be a one-time thing?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: They'll be put in -- they'll be a permanent well and we'll leave them there, as long as we feel like there is a need for it, and then we'll abandon them. But they'll be sampled as often and as many times as we need to, until we feel comfortable with what the ground water flow direction is.

There is a couple of theories on that, and I don't want to get too much into that, but there is a theory that because of the structure of the rock on that side, that the ground water isn't really flowing much past that highway, it's flowing back

underneath the landfill.

So, really putting these other wells in over here is just kind of like the spare tire in your automobile, it's just a precaution. If it is in fact getting past this -- the geologists have a name for it, that large rock that forms a wall there to the left of the landfill, then it would be going to those wells. And there is a good theory that it's impossible for that ground water to get over that way. But we just wanted to put those wells in just as a safeguard just to check.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: But theories are theories, right?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: You got to check them out.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: There is always a probability.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Yeah, sure.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Whether it's 1 percent or 100 percent.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: And that's the reason we're putting them in and that's the reason we're checking them out.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Thanks, Doyle.

MR. RON HOOD: Could I ask one more?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Sure, sir.

MR. HOOD: You were speaking of the two wells that you think you found contaminants in and you gave us the data for G-12, the two data points. What were the two data points for the -- let me see, what is it -- OLFG-7?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I probably have them here, somewhere.

MR. RON HOOD: Did it also show an increase?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Uh-huh.

MR. RON HOOD: That's not on one of these slides.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I did not include that on a slide. I don't have that in front of me. I've got a chart, but I didn't capture that particular --

MR. RON HOOD: Are you planning to take more samples? It's been about three years since you took the last. That would give you a darn good

line.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I don't have an answer.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Yes.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Yeah, we'll do G-7 and 12 at the same time we do all the others.

MR. ELLIS POPE: We'll do a complete round.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The answer is, yes.

MR. RON HOOD: How much did seven go up? Did it go up by about the same factors or --

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: You're asking me and I don't have the data in front of me right now. And believe me, if I had it, I would tell you. I neglected to pull that piece out of the report.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It went up from 17 to 92, 17 PPB to 92.

MR. RON HOOD: We've got a good size increase. I mean, we're talking small numbers, but there is a big increase.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Yes.

MR. RON HOOD: That would concern

me because of the complex geology of this. You might drill wells and might not see anything, but then you've got one that all this is showing an increase. And you see what it's done in the last three years.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think the general consensus for it is that continued monitoring of those wells served -- the only purpose it served was to continue compilation of a data base, as we knew it was there. And again, we focused in on the most important thing was, we know it's there. And that is, as Mr. Brittain has said, that the number themselves, only the two data points, and in some cases, three data points, some were tested three times, did not give us enough data to actually make an extrapolation on whether that was a continuous increase or whether it was a blip. What was important was, was that there was contamination and we knew that we needed to watch that and watch it carefully. I'm not satisfying your --

MR. RON HOOD: No.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: -- your need for an answer?

MR. RON HOOD: You're not.

MAJOR MORRISON: Sir?

MR. FERN THOMASSY: That one chart, this one that showed the two wells, seven and twelve, as having identified contamination, also shows some of your other wells that were in the median and some that were east of the highway. Am I to infer from this chart that the other wells showed no contamination above some level --

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Except for number seven, yes, sir, on the ones off post. The ones on post, which I didn't show, had different kinds of contaminants, not in all -- in all cases were they the same contaminants, in the same levels.

I had a piece of it. See, my -- the piece of the chart that I had only went back to about one of the -- well number ten. Without going through each one -- the only ones that came up above the site screening levels were number twelve and number seven in the off-post area, period.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Let me ask --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: One of the important things, though, Jim, is part of these are actually in the landfill. So, I mean, we expected to

find it there. It was more of a, this is what we're looking for, not that it went outside of the landfill, itself. As you notice, some of the wells there --

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- they were actually drilled into the landfill.

MR. FERN THOMASSY: I was referring primarily to those that are on the border or actually off-post and in the median.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Last meeting, we had the geological study. Now, if I understood -- Mr. Brittain has said something different about two different theories. But if I understood correctly, the information that I took away from here was that the fault line is going in our direction; is that correct?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think the best picture that I saw showed the, if you will -- if I could -- if my hands showed the relative angle of the thrust fault, itself, the thrust fault runs at an angle down back underneath the installation. And the theory is that anything migrating in that direction, any ground water migrating, hits that trust fault and

runs right back down underneath the installation. And that's the theory that we're working on.

To prove the negative is the reason for putting the wells in down here, because -- I'm not sure what kind of test data is going to conclusively indicate that. Josh, I don't know if I've said that --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, basically, you're correct. It's like perpendicular, the fault trace with the line of the fault, is pretty much perpendicular to the road, Highway 21, is what we're seeing now. So, the actual plane of the fault is going underneath that landfill. So, if you draw a line up there, just like along the road, Highway 21 --

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The line of the fault is along here and the plane of the fault goes back under.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Did we not say at the last meeting that it was going toward our wells?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: No.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Well,

thank you.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Mayor Kimbrough, what may be confusing is we have said that based on these hydro -- hydrologic table, that the ground water generally is moving to the west, northwest in these different locations, moving in that direction here and moving in the westerly direction here. But again, it -- if in fact all that's being intercepted by the thrust fault, the plane of that thrust fault, it won't go very much further than somewhere in this area before it comes back underneath the installation. And a lot of that also depends on what depth. And what Mr. Brittain was saying about the DNAPLS is that they're heavy, so this stuff has a tendency to want to go deep as soon as it can.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I'll be quiet in just a second, but this concerns me. You know, my concern was that if that water, if there is a probability that that contaminant would get into our wells, then I have a plan, you know, to provide water for the citizens of my community.

And so, you know, that was my -- I thought -- I thought I asked the question last time.

And I came away with a feeling that there might be a small probability, but there is a probability, you know, whether it's 1 percent or 100 percent, it's moved thirty. And somebody talked about some formations and which -- whatever, if it got into -- I don't know if it was a --

MR. RON HOOD: Karst formation.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Anyway, that it could move faster than it's moving at this time. So, I've been operating the last four weeks under the concept that I need to have something, just in case -- and it might not ever happen, but just in case that this did happen. Now, did I make the wrong assumptions?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: I've only been here for about three months, working with this base, but this particular environmental situation -- I mean, this base is new to me, but the kind of work is not new to me. I've done it for a number of years in other places.

This is one of the first things that was pointed out to me when I came here, was the concern from the off-site migration of chlorinated

solvents from landfill three. I've dealt with this kind of situation in other places and I've been concerned with it. So, I asked a lot of hard questions then.

And we have, the Army and the State and EPA and everybody's contractors, we've kicked this around a whole lot. And they, the Army and their contractors, has done a lot of testing and they have a good picture of what the soil structure looks like to the west of that Highway 21 right there, showing that rock wall so that, yes, the ground water is moving toward that direction, and as best they can figure, hitting that fault or that rock wall or whatever you want to call it, and then flowing back underneath the landfill.

I'm a skeptic. While I can accept that, I'm always looking for the fact that there might be, you know, the possibility something else is going on. So, we've talked about that. And that's the reason they're putting in these additional wells.

There are additional wells going on -- Major has got them up there. Three additional wells to the left of Highway 21 there. Can you point to those, Major?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Twenty-five, twenty-nine, thirty.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: One there, one there, and one right there. Because if you look at the way the ground water is flowing, if it does get past that fault, that -- am I saying it right? Is that the right word, Steve?

MR. STEVE MORAN: Correct.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: If it does get past that rock wall there, it will be headed towards those wells. And if it's in those wells or if it misses those wells, it's going to show up down there in Cave Creek, because water underneath the ground is going to follow basically the same path as water on top of the ground. And it's going to be headed straight for that creek down there.

So, we sunk a ground water -- a bedrock -- we will be sinking a bedrock well at Cave Creek down there. So, that's two different levels of checks that we'll be putting in over there.

They're also putting in an additional well up there toward Weaver so that if it does move in that direction, we would -- before it

gets to your well, if it's going to show up in your well, it would have to show up at this well, first. But that's just as a check.

And I accept the fact that with some 99. Whatever percent probability, these other guys are right. But I'm playing devil's advocate and I'm saying, let's just check this other possibility.

And I share your concern about the concentrations going up. There's a number of different possibilities that could cause that. But with two data points, we can't give you a concrete answer and I don't want to sit here tonight --

MR. RON HOOD: True.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: -- and try to snow you on that.

MR. RON HOOD: Well, it begs for a third.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: That's exactly right and it's probably going to beg for a fourth or a fifth. And before it's over with, we're going to come back to this group right here and we're going to tell you that we know exactly where the ground water is coming from and where it's going to and the pathway

that it takes to get there and how deep it is; we're going to be doing that.

MR. RON HOOD: Well, I understand that. Another question, talking about this thrust fault, with -- you're assuming impervious rock to the ground water there. What's the depth out there around the highway? How far below the overlay of soil?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Steve?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: They hit ground, they hit in bedrock, in some areas at thirty feet and other areas they haven't hit it at a hundred feet.

MR. STEVE MORAN: At GL7, I think it was around twenty to twenty-five feet.

MR. RON HOOD: So, it's highly variable.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: That's right.

MR. STEVE MORAN: And then G-12 it was about ninety feet.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: And I think up here where the Medders' well was -- I don't think they hit it, at all. I think it was residuum. I thought the Medders' well they never got to bedrock, did they?

MR. STEVE MORAN: I don't know if we've ever received the geological for Medders.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I may be wrong.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I think Mr. Medders would be -- the casing was, I believe, close to ninety feet below ground surface. And then it was open hole from ninety feet below that. So, going under that inference, the bedrock is probably around eighty-five to ninety feet or so.

MR. RON HOOD: And what was the water table in that vicinity?

MR. STEVE MORAN: We don't have any information on that.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: What does that mean, though, for the water flow? Are you saying that if there is bedrock there, the water is not going to go through, at that point?

MR. RON HOOD: I'm concerned that it might go across the top of it.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Well, yeah, that's the clarification I'm asking for. I mean, doesn't the fault go through the bedrock?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, the water could get through either over the bedrock, through the soil, or through the bedrock, if there is a fault there?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We think water will travel in both the clay, the residuum, and in the bedrock, but it may be traveling at different rates. And that is -- that's just unclear, at this point, how quickly and what different pathways it will take.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, the depth of the bedrock really don't say yes or no the water can or can't get through here?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The water -- the point about the fault is, the water -- this water's going to take the path of least resistance. So, clay soil will be very -- water moves very slowly through clay soil and that's at .05 feet per day.

So, if it hits the -- if it's down to bedrock level and hits that plane, that thrust fault, then that's the path of least resistance. And we anticipate that it would and will take that path, if the geology -- if we understand the geology

correctly, it will be coming back underneath the installation.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Rather than going through the clay?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Right. But what Steve was trying to say and Josh was trying to say is that, with kind of all the information we've put out tonight, the type of chlorinated -- these VOCs are heavier than water, so they're going to go below, dive down underneath the water table and keep going until they hit the lowest depth they can.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Bedrock.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Bedrock. But on their journey down through that point, you don't know and we don't know and a lot of tests would indicate at what point away from the post, what's the depth here and what's the depth there. All we know is that that's going to take a dive. It's going to go to bedrock.

And the best we -- not the best. We want to be able to do, though, by testing these wells, there is two indications, there are two different types of wells here. You'll see that in

these locations there is two dots. I failed to point out, and I apologize, that there is two wells in each of the locations; one is a residuum well and one is a bedrock well.

So that you get two tests in the same location at different heights, different depths in the ground, if you will; one all the way down to bedrock to determine what's there and the testing the residuum of the soil to see if there is any of this contamination moving through the clay layer.

So, the tests will be able to determine both ways, which way --

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Something else is that if anybody's gone up and down that road where a lot of these wells are going to be put, there is a big topographic rise there. It's almost a mountainous system and it's almost a valley. That if you look at that, the road is going through. And hydraulically, that's in a big favor toward the Weaver wells. I looked at it hard today. We went out and looked at it today again, so I can get a grasp on that.

Usually, again, what they're saying is: Water basically falls topographic relief. And

that's a huge mountain system there. Chances are pretty good -- now, don't mark my word, but you may see a rise in water level going that way, which means the hydraulic barrier -- hydraulic gradient is back to Fort McClellan.

And I was impressed how big that hill was. So, chances are you're going to see a valley and, you know, the water will be coming down this way. And it makes sense that it would go down to Cave Creek.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: If it gets past the thrust fault.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah, if it gets it. And I'm not saying that's the case, but this will also open up a lot of the -- I mean, it will raise more questions, but also it will solve a lot of that. And that's what I'm kind of looking forward to see, if it will -- you have not only a thrust fault, but another hydraulic barrier there, just from water coming back this way.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I would also toss out, Mayor, if it makes you feel any more comfortable, it's been my experience, the only time

you see ground water plumes a mile or two big is when you -- not a situation like this, where you have what was really, my understanding, was not even an industrial landfill, but just a general waste landfill. The only time you see ground water plumes that are, you know, miles large, are when you have lagoons that people have dumped drums in and things of that nature.

So, while it's certainly prudent, in everything that I've seen and heard, what they're proposing to do is the right steps to be taken, based on my experience. The odds of it being out at those wells are extremely small. I mean, we're not talking, in my opinion, you know, on the order of a percent, extremely small.

And the other thing on top of all that is these are also low levels of volatile organic compounds. And by the time they could get that far, there is two things that would take place; one, you would get delusion from all the other water that is going into the system between here and the Weaver wells; and two, you also have a (inaudible) -- don't know now if these particular contaminants are

(inaudible). But you also have a process called natural attenuation, where these things just naturally break down over time. And over a thirty year period, that was (inaudible) sinking further away from the site, they would be naturally breaking down to compounds that we don't even bother to look for in this type of work.

So, there is a lot -- certainly, everything that's being done is prudent and needs to be done, but there is a lot of reasons to believe that those Weaver wells, the odds are very, very small to get that far, given that it's been thirty some odd years and we're not seeing anything out there.

That should help add to your comfort level, because it's obviously a major concern to you as it should be.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Well, you know, I didn't go away thinking there was a threat, but I just went away thinking, what do I need to do if, you know. Like you say, there are no guarantees in life, I learned that a long time ago. And if something were to happen, that's my concern.

And still, there is a probability

there. You know, it might be a half a percent, but I have to be prepared, you know, to whatever, for some type of alternative source. See, we've got an alternative source, which we're hooked in with Anniston water, so we can cut our wells off. But just three hundred people would be without water.

And that's what I need to -- that's what I'm working toward. That was my question. That's what I'm working toward right now is trying to get provisions where those people would have water. And my question was, you know, to you: Do I need to still work toward that or do I just quit and say, there's no danger?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: I'm not going to tell you don't do it, but I am going to tell you that by the end of this summer, early fall, we should have all of this characterized and we'll know exactly the nature and extent of this contamination.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: By the end of the summer?

MR. PETE CONROY: So, the next data set would be available?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Well, he's got

the timeline here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Based on their availability to get access.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Right.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: And that's where you can help us, Mr. Mayor, if you can maybe call some of these people and say, hey, look, you know, he wants to put a well over here in the cow pasture, it's to the City of Weaver's advantage, can you be so kind as to let them stick this well out there. And, you know, the Army will restore the property so that there be no damage to the property, there would be no expense to the people, it would just be a matter of letting them put a well on their property.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I've already committed to that. Of course, that's in Anniston, so I don't know if those Anniston folks, how they feel. And they're on Anniston water. You know, it's not Weaver water, so I don't know how much influence I would have with them. But I committed a long time ago to do that, to work with them and do that.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Well, you know, not only you, but even the other people of the RAB. And that's one of the main purposes for the Restoration Advisory Board is to serve as liaison between the State, EPA, and the base, with the efforts that we have, trying to do the environmental investigation and clean up and the community. And, you know, if you know some people that live in those areas over there, where those wells are proposed and you can call them and maybe get them to give us permission, we can speed this process up.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think when all is said and done with the plan that we've got proposed here with the public cooperation, we know we'll get ALDOT's cooperation, there is a couple of wells that are in their right-of-way, already gone in preliminary discussions with ALDOT. Don't know how soon those will go in. I think they would like to do this as a package, work with the contractor on that.

But our interest is getting this project underway, getting these wells in and getting the data back. And I would imagine, you know, we'll commit that through the RAB process, RAB meetings in

the future, we will be able to give the RAB updates as we get through that and let you know how well we're doing. Is there any other questions?

MR. JERRY HOPPER: What drilling technology is being utilized, especially when you bedrock well installations, because these DNAPLS do have a habit of pooling or developing pockets, to prevent actually carrying the contaminant down with you as you go deeper with the well, if you happen to hit a pocket, are we oversized drilling, encasing that?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MR. STEVE MORANN: Actually, we've been casing off the residuum in the bedrock wells. We've been casing off the residuum and then going inside the outer casing and drilling with PQ coring or with coring techniques, whatever, depending on the well, and installing it.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Has there been any discussion or thought on actually in the highway median there, the number twelve we're talking about where we see the contamination, does that actually represent a natural scenario or is it a possibility

that the installation of the highway developed some migration patterns or routes there that's really not a natural situation that we're looking at?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: We have not specifically asked ourselves that question, to take a look at that. I mean, I realize the highway has been there in that area long before probably even the landfill was there, but not in its four lane form now. Certainly, we can look at that.

I do appreciate -- unless somebody's got a question, I appreciate your patience with me. I had to get real smart on this in the last three weeks to be able to do this.

If you have any other questions, shoot now or write them down and give them to us and we'll try to get back with y'all on anything you might have. I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

DR. BARRY COX: Thank you. Next we'll go to the new business. Under that, agency reports. And, Phil, start with you with the ADEM report.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I guess I'll pass these on around. I'd didn't have much to add for

the big poster I had. The reason that is is because we had an on-board review meeting and these will be put on the next plate for next month.

But I do have these. These are some of the reports we do have and some that are still pending and some that we've finished up. We've only really finished up two finals and one draft that I've done, personally. But with EPA, and (inaudible), we had an extraordinarily successful meeting last week.

EPA is being extraordinarily proactive. This is exciting for the State, also, and the Army. And I'd say last week was one of our most progressive weeks we've ever had.

I'm going to give y'all some numbers here. And, Lisa, I don't know how many of these you made, but this is our minutes we had. We reviewed and accepted six work plans for a total of six parcels. And this is, of course, environmental work, sampling, drilling, the same kind of things we're doing out here. And also, we had gone over in two days -- but we were prepared for this long before we got here last week -- and that was twenty-two SI reports, which covered fifty parcels.

But these were areas we knew that were not going to be really contaminated. And we didn't have a lot of real hard decisions like we did at landfill three.

But anyway, I don't need to go through all of these, but just to let you know the sheer numbers, next month I'll present those on a plate and you'll get to see those. So, if anybody has any specific questions, I have this here and you can read it. Any questions about that?

But I would say hats off to EPA. I'm excited about what I'm seeing, seeing the Army. Feel real confident, it's a team spirit I've never seen before. We're working smart. And so I'm really encouraged by this. I don't know if EPA -- well, EPA has to talk next, anyway, so I'm just going to hand this over to him now. And if anybody has any further questions, I'll be glad to answer them. I'm just really excited, I really am.

DR. BARRY COX: Doyle?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: I don't have anything to add to what he said there. You know, I think -- I've been here three months. I think we're

working well together. I've still got a lot to learn about this specific base. I'm trying to come up to speed, as far as what the specific problems are here. I've done this kind of work for a number of years, but learning the particular base is still a challenge for me. So, I think we're making progress and having fun.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: From the Army, again, I want to thank Doyle and Phil for all the hard work they did and all the other folks that worked on this. This was a very successful meeting, to have this on-board review. It helped us clean up a lot of documents that we had outstanding. There was a timing issue of getting everyone in there. It wasn't that we held them all, it was just that things were coming through.

We're at a process that moves along slowly and then everything starts coming out as you go through this process. But, you know, these guys worked hard and long to put that together. And we really appreciate it.

I have one other thing that I want to make the RAB members aware of. And I didn't make a lot of large maps. I've got one I'll kind of use as a

display, just to make sure that -- out here in the training areas -- they're training areas 15-B, C, D, I, and J. For some of you that are hunters, that may be in and out of here -- due to our need to do prescribed burns periodically, we're going to do a prescribed burn in these areas, some time between now and the 15th of March. This is a part of our U. S. Fish & Wildlife habitat management and overall management plans.

So, as smoke comes off the installation, which we know will, and you hear that, I wanted to make sure the RAB members knew that this was an ongoing process much like the Pelham Range burns that have been done. And we've talked with the folks out here to make sure that they're aware of it. We'll make sure that it's publicized and everything. We just don't want to, you know, all of a sudden for you to get a call, what's going on out there. Has the landfill caught on fire?

That's all I have.

DR. BARRY COX: Did you have any comments from the --

MR. BOB ROBINSON: Miki didn't send

me any (inaudible), so I don't have anything to say.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay, appreciate it. I guess now we'll go to the action summary sheet. Glynn, who is going to --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I think we've pretty well -- Lisa, do you have anything on the action summary sheet you wanted to go through?

MS. LISA KINGSBURY: I have nothing to add.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I think we pretty well covered it with our on-board review. That's really all we've got on that.

And also for the Fish & Wildlife burn. Now, Bill Garland may want to add something on that.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I would like to hear it.

MR. BILL GARLAND: Well, we really appreciate the work that the Army is doing in this. One of the main reasons we're here is because of the mountain long leaf, which requires a lot of prescribed burning. It requires a program that will kick off eventually with Fish & Wildlife. We've completed our

plan and are now working with the U. S. Forest Service to incorporate some of their work here.

We've got a team from the Okafinokee (phonetic) that is taking over our burn responsibilities here. And eventually, we plan on having an area-wide helicopter burning program on Fort McClellan. And the Army's favor (inaudible) in this work, it really is a big help for us. So, really, hats off to the Army, go ahead.

MR. PETE CONROY: Hope this isn't a subliminal message, but on item 4-B, that should be wildlife refuge.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Refuse.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: You need to talk to Ron.

DR. BARRY COX: Do you care to comment on that, Ron?

MR. RON MASSEY: Can you not take a joke?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: See, spell check didn't catch that.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: It's a word.

DR. BARRY COX: Anything else

before we go to the audience comments?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: May I, please, just a minute. We have bad news and good news. The bad news is, this is likely to be Ron Massey's last meeting. Yes, you know, the contract expired and so, Ron may move on, but he has promised me that if there are meetings like today, that he will come back and run it for us.

So, I've really appreciated everything Ron has done for us and know that he's going to be sorely missed.

We do have Teresa Norton, who has come in this evening, to kind of shadow everything. Teresa worked here at Fort McClellan for many years. She's familiar with the process, she's familiar with the details that are required to put together a meeting such as this. And so, we'll do the best we can to keep the RAB going in the same manner that Ron kept it, although I'm going to miss him sorely. You know, I never had to show up except an hour before the meeting, you know. I may have to work, now. Ron, thank you so much.

MR. RON MASSEY: You're quite

welcome. It was good to get to know all of you. If any of you have jobs available, please, after the meeting, let me know.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: And he'll get a good recommendation.

MR. RON MASSEY: Thank you.

DR. BARRY COX: Thank you. Now, we'll go to the audience comments. Any comments?

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: I've got some questions.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: The one part that he was talking about, what would make enough percentage to make a difference in these chemicals that are being found in the water? What would make the percentage?

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think your comment's directed towards the level.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Uh-huh.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: I think it's important enough to say that in those two wells, the levels are above the site-specific screening levels. And that in itself causes us to take an action.

If the levels -- and if I misstate myself -- if there was a different circumstance that caused us to take an immediate action, such as some evidence that there was a direct link or a threat to life, safety, the health of the public, then some other action by the Army would be appropriate. But it's kind of hard to answer your question as to what percentage, because essentially, we're at an action level of doing something right now.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Okay. One of the other questions, because I went to the library and I've checked up on the Trichloroethylene article that Ms. Elizabeth Blumintz (phonetic) had in the Anniston Star, if any of y'all read it last week. And I've talked to one of the water board workers down at the Oxford Water Board. And so this would be another question is: What kind of filters do you have in place to remove these chemicals if they do go to well water or to any kind of drinking water in this system here?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Okay. You want to take that, Phil --

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Well --

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: -- or do you want me to?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Well, either or, it doesn't matter. I can answer it this way: In my experience in the past, we have had Trichloroethylene in wells. As a matter of fact, I think it's even been noted to be in the Clear Water -- what's that, the --

MR. PETE CONROY: Coldwater.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: -- Coldwater Springs at certain levels. And it's below what I think the state action levels are, whatever those numbers are. I don't know what those numbers are.

But I have seen cases where it has gone above the drinking water standards. And in that case, the city has an option either to shut down the whole operation or continue by putting in some kind of carbon absorption beds that would get it probably non-detect. And that is an option he could go to. But it could be expensive.

And that's a measure you can take. And sometimes that's passed off as a higher water bill and things like that. But as it gets higher, yes,

there may be a shut down, absolutely.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Well, if you're talking about one private well for a person, carbon absorption can be put on just that one private well, if we had any indication that it was going towards the City of Weaver, before it got there, there are other techniques that we could use to intercept that plume and to treat that and cause it to decompose so that it would be eliminated before it ever got to the city.

And that's the reason for us doing this additional monitoring over there. And there is several different techniques for doing that. But the main thing that you need to keep in mind is that right now, we are not aware that anyone is drinking private water from a private well in this area over there west of Highway 21.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Right.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: And if there is, you know, we need y'all to call that to our attention, because we want to be out there sampling it.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: And another

question I have is: Does Cave Creek and Cane Creek flow into the direction of the Choccolocco Creek, and if so, where at and at what point?

MR. BILL GARLAND: No.

MR. DAVID HORN: They don't flow into Choccolocco Creek, they flow into -- straight down through, toward the Ohatchee area and into the Coosa River, below the Neely Henry Dam.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Okay.

MR. DAVID HORN: I believe they flow through Pelham Range, if I'm not mistaken.

MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Cane Creek does.

DR. BARRY COX: Anybody else have any questions? Appreciate everybody coming. Do I hear a motion?

MR. PETE CONROY: So moved.

MR. RON HOOD: Second.

DR. BARRY COX: All in favor?

(Motion carried.)

DR. BARRY COX: Thank you. Look forward to seeing everybody at Jacksonville next month.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned.)

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.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 17th of February, 2001.

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE
Notary Public in and for
Alabama at Large

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2001.