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 22nd day of January, 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: Ladies and gentlemen, we would like to get started. Since we have a lot of guests tonight, let me explain the way the board meeting is operated. During the first part of the meeting, the comments and questions are restricted to the board members. At the end of the meeting, we will then have a time that we can have audience comments. We'll start with the roll call, with the members, Mr. Hood?

MR. RONALD HOOD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Beckett?

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Branchfield?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Brown? 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. JERRY ELSER: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Fathke?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Dr. Harrington? Mr. Hopper?

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mayor Kimbrough?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Longstreth? Mr. Thomassy? Mr. Turecek? Mr. Weston? Mr. Levy?

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Let's see. And we still have Bart on the roll, but he's not with us anymore. Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Here.

DR. BARRY COX: Mr. Golden?

MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Here.

MR. RON LEVY: We need to add Glynn as a board member.

DR. BARRY COX: Right, we need to add Glynn as a board member and change the EPA.

MR. RON LEVY: We'll do that.

DR. BARRY COX: Now, what we would like to do is we'll go around the room and ask could

each of you here just to give us your name, please.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Joan McKinney.

MR. STEVE MORAN: Steven Moran.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Josh Jenkins.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Ellis Pope.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Rickey Steele.

MR. JOE DOYLE: Joe Doyle.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: Jeanette Champion.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James.

MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks.

MR. BOB DAFFRON: Bob Daffron.

MS. SHANNON HOOD: Shannon Hood.

MS. AMANDA HOOD: Amanda Hood.

ROY MACKY: Roy Macky.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Wanda Champion.

DR. BARRY COX: We're happy to have this great turnout. We certainly appreciate you coming out and visiting the meeting tonight.

Next we have the minutes. Has everybody had a chance to look over the minutes from

last -- well, actually two months ago? Any comments or corrections to the minutes?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: It's good.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Make a motion. Do we need a motion?

DR. BARRY COX: We need a motion.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Make a motion we approve as presented.

MR. JAMES BUFORD: Second.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: I'll second.

DR. BARRY COX: All in favor? Opposed?

On to old business. We have a report on the off-site borings by IT Corporation. Ron, you want to --

MR. RON LEVY: Josh Jenkins is going to do this briefing. He's from IT Corporation. He's a geologist. He's intimately involved in the cleanup of Fort McClellan. But this particular issue has to deal with some of the geology that's up underneath landfill three. So, he's going to talk to you about what they discovered from their borings that was done there, some real interesting geology

associated with that. And it has an impact on ground water and where the contaminants associated with landfill three might go. All yours, Josh.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Thanks. As Ron mentioned, I'm talking about the structural geology investigation of landfill number three. Landfill number three is located in the northwestern corner of the main post at Fort McClellan. The map of Fort McClellan is there in the lower left hand corner. And this is the site we're going to discuss.

The reasons for the investigation of landfill three, as Ron mentioned, the location of the site is on the edge of the main post, there is ground water contamination that's been noted in some of the existing monitoring wells. The geology at landfill three and in the area is significant and in the ground water flow direction, which is actually flowing off-site.

Next slide. In this presentation, what I'm going to do is give you some background information. That's going to be some of the background geology, some of the historical ground water contamination we've seen and some of the known

ground water flow directions. And then I'm also going to talk about -- actually, our structural geology investigation, which looked into these elements a little bit deeper.

Landfill number three is approximately twenty-one acres in size. As I mentioned previously, it's located in the northwest corner of the main post. It bounded at the west by Anniston Jacksonville Highway and to the east by landfill number four and the industrial landfill. And those are here on the main post.

Landfill three, there is -- we've counted forty-nine linear depressions, trending northwest, southeast, on the ground surface. But the area now is currently forested, mostly in pine.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: What is a linear depression?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It's just a long -- if you look on the ground, it looks like just a straight trench that's been filled in. And it's just a low area that extends very long one way and very narrow in the other direction. Does everyone understand that?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Is that an indication of anything in particular?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We believe it is.

MR. STEVE MORAN: It's an indication of a trench.

MR. RON LEVY: Donna, let me try to answer that. Most landfills, during the years that this landfill was used -- and this landfill was Fort McClellan's sanitary landfill, just like the county had their own landfill in the '50s and '60s, I believe --

MR. ELLIS POPE: '60s.

MR. RON LEVY: -- '60s, did a trench and fill method. Essentially, they cut a trench in. There is separate trenches as they filled up a trench or cell, they would move into the next trench. So, all the fill, all the garbage, as you would, that came from, you know, activities on the installation went into this landfill.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Thank you.

MR. ELLIS POPE: And the reason it's depressed now is because of settlement, you know,

settlement over time, it's left a depressed area there.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Okay.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Which that explains --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: So, as everyone said, it pretty much outlines this slide.

What we found in historical records reviews was it was the sanitary landfill for the main post from '46 to '67. It was constructed by digging trenches, placing fill in the trenches, covering with top soil. And those go back to the linear depressions that you inquired about and any reported fill material, sanitary waste, pesticide containers, various other items that were commonly used here on the main post.

These linear depressions are approximately six to eight feet wide and they may be two to three feet deep. During rainy periods, we have noted that they are filled with water.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Can I ask one question?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Sure.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Would this right here be kind of tied in with the stuff I pulled up, things that was underground injection control, UIC program, in other words, through the EPA years ago?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I don't believe it is.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: That picture that they're showing --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This was strictly a sanitary landfill where they went in and -- believe that they actually went in with bulldozers and bulldozed out a trench and it was big enough for a bulldozer to enter. And then they backfilled this with fill material and then covered it with some of the top soil that they bulldozed out.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: That's what this here picture talks about, in other words.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I'm not familiar with that, that site.

MR. RON LEVY: As far as I understand it, that's a completely different issue. You said underground injection?

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Yeah.

MR. RON LEVY: This is typical sanitary landfills that were done across the country. And not having read what you're talking about there, I'm not sure. But just by the title of what you described, I think it's called different laws.

There are laws that the EPA has and the State have under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, RCRA, which talk about solid waste and landfill operations. And those are the laws that essentially apply, although there were different activities that went on prior to some of these laws that are in place now. So, what we are trying to get at here is talking about how we are looking geologically at our sanitary landfill and what's gone on to address the issues with that landfill.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This slide shows the landfill boundaries. It talks about landfill boundaries and it also depicts the linear depressions that we've seen. Kind of maps them out, where these linear depressions are and how they are situated on the landfill surface.

Now, I want to talk about some of the previous investigations that have gone on at

landfill number three. Investigations have been ongoing since the 1980s. There have been a total of nineteen monitoring wells installed in the vicinity of landfill number three.

The results of the ground water sampling indicate that there is off-site, actually off-post ground water contamination present in at least one ground water monitoring well. And we've also noticed that there has been some contamination noted in another well on post on the western side, near the Anniston Jacksonville Highway.

DR. BARRY COX: Are you going to later on tell us what the contamination is or should we ask that now?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes. There's a couple of solvents that we're seeing in these two wells.

DR. BARRY COX: Particularly, which ones?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: 1, 1, 2, 2-trichloroethane and 1, 1, 2-trichloroethene.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Were those basically used as degreaser agents in the ammunitions?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We know that 1, 1, 2, 2-TCA was used as a -- it was used in a decontamination agent. And I'm not sure where the other compound -- if it's a breakdown product or if it's something that was used completely separate.

The wells were last sampled in 1998. IT did that. And the results verified that there was off-post contamination.

MR. RON LEVY: Jerry, let me add to your question, because McClellan did have a dry clean operation on the installation, although we don't have records because there wasn't very good records kept back -- in terms of what went in to that fill area back then. It's a good possibility that the dry cleaning solvent ended up in that landfill, as well as other cleaning compounds associated with weapons cleaning as you pointed out.

The problem is that we don't have specific records that says that went in there, in the fill area, because back then there wasn't any requirement to keep those kind of records. So, we can speculate as to where the contaminants came from, but we can't actually nail it down.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This slide shows a depiction of where the relative sample locations are at landfill three. There are, as I mentioned before, there is nineteen monitoring wells installed in the vicinity of the landfill. There is also some monitoring wells installed to the west of landfill -- excuse me, to the east of landfill three, associated with landfill four.

This area, just to the east of landfill three, where it says, borrow area, this is associated with the industrial landfill and landfill number four. So, you've got a landfill over here that is currently active. And then we have landfill number three, which was used historically.

MR. RON LEVY: Not all the RAB members are aware -- have been with the RAB for a long time. But that area up there, it was a lot of wetlands, low areas, and that's what people did historically was fill those in. So, that's what the Army did. You see a lot of fill activity going on up in that area, landfill three, landfill four, other fills that are just north of that. Just -- we just went crazy up there, filling areas in.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: So, the data that we collected in 1998, what IT did, number one, was develop site specific screening levels specifically for Fort McClellan. And these are levels that we have compared our analyticals of against their -- if anyone is familiar with MCLs, they're like and similar to MCLs. And in a lot of cases, our SSSLs are more conservative, meaning that they are actually lower than MCLs. But they're a comparison for what is potentially dangerous to human health or environment. We've actually set up the SSSLs for both the ecology and human health.

MR. RON LEVY: Explain to them what an MCL is.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: MCL was developed by the U.S. EPA as a maximum contaminant level. They developed these for specific compounds, mostly organic related compounds, but there are some metals, some inorganic compounds. They're only developed for a handful of compounds.

And what we have done is we have taken that list, that MCL list, and actually expanded upon it. So, when I say organic versus inorganic, I

mean something that has carbon, carbon based compound. But it's generally a man-made solvent or petroleum-based compound is, I guess, would be a catch-all description of what an organic compound might be.

So, next slide. In our screening process, we found that there were several well locations that had compounds exceeding SSSLs, and most of the compounds were metals. And in these wells over here to the south and to the east and to the north, the wells show compounds, inorganic compounds exceeding SSSLs.

We attribute that to water quality, water sample quality when we collected samples. We have done a study out here, Philip Stroud is aware of, where we have actually taken water samples that are -- have high turbidity. We ran them against -- run them for metals analysis. We've shown that the high turbidity actually attributes to the so-called high metal content in these wells. So, we feel like that the high metal content is most likely attributed to the high turbidity or the high dissolved solvents -- excuse me -- suspended solvents in the sample when it

was collected.

Up here, OLF-G12, this well was put in the median of the Anniston Jacksonville Highway. This one actually had some of the organic compounds I mentioned earlier. 1, 1, 2, 2-TCA and 1, 1, 2-Trichloroethylene. There was a couple of other organic compounds.

This is the off-site well that has contamination, we've noted. This is the well on post, OLF-G7, that has contamination, organic contaminants in it exceeding SSLs, also.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Can you tell me real quick what the predominant direction of the ground water flow is?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, ground water flow --

MR. RON LEVY: Northwest.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: -- predominantly northwest.

As part of a off-site or a well user inventory, there were several wells identified where folks are still using well water to obtain their potable water supply. And we have plotted these

locations, generally within the vicinity of landfill number three up there.

The Weaver -- there is two Weaver supply wells. I believe the closest one is about -- is a little bit less than two miles from our site. There is one a little bit further away. I think the last time I looked at a map, I calculated distances were about 1.7 and 2. Something miles away. And these are in a due-west location.

We've got a well down here, S-14, that may not be plotted precisely, but it's near -- folks from around here are familiar with Weaver Cave. It's in the vicinity of Weaver Cave.

And then we have some wells up here that are up to the north of landfill number three, which are associated with some trailer park, folks living up in that area.

MR. RON LEVY: It's up the Anniston Beach Road.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes, Anniston Beach Road.

MR. PETE CONROY: What kind of wells are these last three you just mentioned, private

residence wells?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Excuse me, up here, up on the north?

MR. PETE CONROY: The last three you mentioned, which would be, I guess -- even from here, it's hard to read, but --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: S-5, S-4, S-3 and S-2, those are residential wells.

MR. PETE CONROY: How about 14, near Weaver Cave?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: 14, also. They're all --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: They furnish trailer parks. I think they all furnish trailer parks. I think that the -- EPA, there is a limit on how many that they can do without meeting commercial standards, I believe, but --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I believe this well, during the well inventory, that supplied five individuals. Five, yeah, five individuals, what we identified it at. S-2, up here to the northeast, that supplied an estimated seven people. And based upon our information, I can't say if that's seven families

or if that's seven individuals living within a household.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I was going to ask: Do you know the depth of those wells, relative to those monitoring wells you installed?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The depth of these wells, S-2, S-3, and S-4, are relatively shallow. S-2 and S-3 were tagged at sixty-eight feet below ground surface. S-4 was forty-four feet below ground surface, total depth. S-5 was rather deep, two hundred and seventy-eight. And S-14 is two hundred and four feet below ground surface.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: What were your monitoring wells?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: What monitoring wells, number what?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I'm sorry?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Weaver's two wells, what numbers are they?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Weaver's wells are up here, number 2 and number 3.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: And you had them at what depth?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The Weaver's supply wells, supply well number 3 is a hundred and twenty-five feet deep, according to some stuff I got from Rickey, well number 2 is four hundred and eight feet deep.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: How does that compare to the monitoring wells you have in that northwesterly direction?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The water supply wells -- the Weaver water supply well are --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: The wells around the landfills? I mean, are the monitoring wells you put around the landfills --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Most of the wells around the landfill are a hundred feet or less deep.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And that's all overburdened wells, or is that going to --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No, they do -- some of them go into bedrock.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Will this information you have be in that federal repository down at the library for people to see?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I believe it will, eventually. It's not gotten there, yet because, we have not -- we have worked on this investigation and we are working that data into a work plan for some more work.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: About how long --

DR. BARRY COX: Excuse me. Could we hold the audience questions until the end, please.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: So, again, these wells were identified. These -- I think there were seven wells up here, were identified during the well user's survey in '95 as ground water supply wells in the area of landfill number three.

I want to touch briefly on the geology of landfill three, because it does have impact on investigations. We've got a couple of different units. They're early Paleozoic sedimentary rock. And what that means, Paleozoic is just an aged, very old. Sedimentary, you've got three different types of rocks, igneous, metamorphic, and sedimentary. And the rocks around Fort McClellan, at least in this part, are sedimentary rocks.

Now, we have the Conasauga formation. It's a dark gray, finely course grain, dolomite and limestone. And it's on the east side of landfill number three.

And we have the Rome formation, which is, if you drive up Anniston Jacksonville Highway, some of this red looking rock or reddish brown brick colored rock, that is some of the Rome formation. And that's on the west side of landfill number three.

Both of these formations represent rocks that were formed as sediments, deposited in shallow seas. That just gives you kind of an idea of the depositional history.

Now, the structure also plays an important role in our investigation. Fort McClellan is located in the valley ridge physiographic province, it's in the -- considered within the Southern Appalachians or in the foothills of the Southern Appalachians. It's extensively deformed, folded, tilted, and faulted. And the folding, tilting, and faulting are the actual causes of the structure, or at least some of the structure that we looked at in our

structural investigation.

There is a series of northeast, southwest trending low angle thrust faults, and they're prevalent in the bedrock, all in this area. And just for some of you folks that may not be aware of what a thrust fault is or what a thrust fault may look like, if you -- I put together this little block here, just as a diagram. This surface represents -- the top represents a land surface. And this face right here, this front face, represents a cross-sectional view of the subsurface.

So, a thrust fault, when a thrust fault occurs, you get some compression on each side of this block. And it forces one block up, as opposed to another. So, you have relative movement, in this case, from your right to left, I think that's how it is.

But bedrock is moved this way. (Demonstrating.) This break, you see right here, this is actually the fault plane or the fault surface.

And what happens over time then is you get erosion of weathering that just wears down the land surface is what we see today. So, you may have

-- you may have older rock actually lying on top of younger rock, because these rocks were laid down sequentially, meaning that there is -- the old rock was laid down at the bottom, younger rock, successively laid down on top of it. So, when you get the rock -- the sediments hardening into rock, then you get the faulting, you get the movement, you get older rock that may be adjacent or actually lying on top of younger rock.

Now, the reason why the faulting is so significant is that fault planes -- this fault plane surface right here, in geology, in this area, this fault plane may actually be a conduit or serve as a preferable pathway for ground water to move.

So, if you've got ground water in an area that may have contamination in it, then you may want to be looking for faults or looking in a fault to see where the preferential path of the contamination ground water is moving.

There are a couple of major faults in the area, Pell City fault and the Jacksonville fault. And I described them a little bit. Pell City is a major thrust fault in the region. It's

approximately two miles west of the main post of Fort McClellan. The Jacksonville fault, it's approximately one mile to the east of landfill number three.

So, as I mentioned here at the major splay of the Pell City fault, the Jacksonville fault is the major splay of the Pell City fault. And just simply what that means is it's just -- it is broken off of the Pell City fault, so you see some breakage away from the Pell City fault.

As I mentioned before, it's important -- the Jacksonville fault is actually important because Coldwater Spring, where 90 percent of -- 90, 95 percent of Anniston gets it water, potable water source, is actually located in this fault.

Next slide. What I've done here is presented a cross-section. That would be this face. And this is looking northeast, across the main post of Fort McClellan. And this shows how the rock strata -- here I have it shown horizontally in this model. What we're seeing here at Fort McClellan is actually the rock layers are actually tilted. And then the

faulting has actually occurred in a couple of locations. Here is the Pell City fault, over here on the left. And then over here on the right, we show the Jacksonville fault.

Next slide. This is a -- this map is a surface expression of the geology. This shows landfill number three. This is the Conasauga formation to the east and the Rome formation is mapped to the west. And the actual cross-section that I just showed you, if you were standing say down here two hundred feet below ground surface looking to the northeast, you would be looking at that cross-section, looking at the actual strata.

Some of the hydrology at landfill number three, generally, the hydrology or the ground water flow along the main post flows to the northwest. And we're finding that ground water flows from higher elevations to lower elevations.

The direction is determined by plotting the ground water elevations from the wells or map. And based upon this, from the higher to lower elevations we're showing at landfill three, that we do have -- next slide -- we do have a general northwest

to west trending ground water flow direction. The blue lines indicate ground water elevations of equal elevations. And the elevations actually go down as you go to the west or to the northwest. The arrows point to the relative ground water flow pathways that we're seeing.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Did you also do, at the time you were doing a directional study, a flow velocity study, vertical and horizontal flow velocity?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No, we have not done that. We've only based our flow directions on ground water elevations. These elevations were taken in March of this year. Since then, with the drought, we've noticed that several of the wells have actually come up dry. We have some wells out there that are installed only thirty to forty feet, and some of those wells are actually coming up dry right now with the drought.

Next slide. So, that gives you some background of landfill three. So, based upon that information, what we wanted to do was to perform an investigation where we could look at the rock types and the geologic structure in the vicinity of landfill

three to determine if the structure and the bedrock would actually be major players in influencing ground water flow and contaminant transport.

And what we intended -- what we are using this data for is we are in the process, now, of developing a work plan or -- to come up with some additional site investigations or we can plot our wells or put wells out there to actually monitor potential ground water contamination to the west of the landfill.

Next slide. A structural geology investigation consisted of installing 3-D borings. We performed continuous sampling in the residual in the soil. And soil, the residual was collected with a sonic drill bit, which is just a bit that vibrates in a high frequency and slowly spins. This gave us some real good return on our soil cuttings. We were able to actually look at different dips and some structure within the residual.

Once we got down so far, we would hit harder rock, bedrock, and we collected that with a core barrel. Core barrel spins rapidly and picks up a continuous core of the actual rock.

We did some bore hole geophysical logging. And that was used just to augment some of our boring data. And we used four different methods, acoustic teleview logging, gamma logging, caliper logging, and resistivity logging.

Boring one. And boring one was installed on the east side of the fill area. It was installed in the Conasauga formation. And what we found in that one, mostly carbonates or limestone and dolomite.

And this photo shows some of the rock that we encountered in boring one, seventy-five to seventy-eight feet below ground surface. We had some argillaceous limestone or some very silty. And at eighty-eight, eighty-nine feet, we had what we call brecciated limestone, or evidence that the rock had actually broken and have smaller fragments within this matrix of material here.

So, that right there actually indicates a movement. There had been some faulting at one time or some breakage of the rock.

Next side. This is also a piece of core from boring one. This was down near the bottom

of the bore hole. We described this as calcareous mudstone. It's the Conasauga formation. It's very similar to what we're seeing around here in some of the other units.

Next slide. Boring two and boring three were put in on the north and on the west side of the fill in the Rome formation. And most of this rock was a reddish brown mudstone and silt stone.

We also noticed that there was some limestone, I call it a distinct carbonate bed. That was primarily a limestone unit within that mudstone. And this is a piece of core from boring two, a hundred and thirty-five to a hundred and thirty-six feet below ground surface. This showed the reddish brown character of the rock. This is a mudstone.

And the lighter color material is a calcite. It's a secondary deposit. What happened here was there was some breakage and then you had some other mineral deposit within the fractures of the rock.

These are two more pieces of core, boring two, a hundred and eighty-four to a hundred and eighty-six feet below ground surface. This is some of

the mudstone. And there is some limestone in here.

And then in boring three, two hundred and fifty-one to two hundred and fifty-two feet, we have some mudstone with contorted bedding. And what those swirls that you see in here, what that shows is there has actually been a lot of compressional forces on the rock. Instead of the rock just breaking, the rock has almost flowed in a real -- I guess in a sense, but the rock has actually been squeezed. And therefore it's deformed in that way, instead of actually breaking. So, this shows a lot of compressional forces at work.

This is just a close-up of a previous slide. This shows the locations of the borings. We've got boring one over here in the Conasauga. It was on the southeast corner of landfill three. And then boring two and boring three were on the west side and the northwest side.

So, based upon the data that we collected, the lithologic of the bedrock data and the structural information, we were able to construct composite boring logs. And I'm standing right in front of this actual composite log. I don't know if

there is a good way for me to show that.

But this is what we came up with. This is the top of the boring one, bottom of boring one, boring two, and boring three. These are -- basically -- the same elevation runs across equally, so you've got like elevation of seven hundred feet above ground surface. So, that's how we equated them, as far as, you know, where the rock was and the elevation in the landfill.

We took this data from the composite log and we constructed a site-specific cross-section. Again, this is a view of looking at the landfill. This is this face right here. (Demonstrating.) If the landfill's up here on top of this block, this would be looking at the side here of this block. So, this is just a two-dimensional representation, looking straight ahead into the landfill. And you have depths here of two hundred feet, plus below ground surface.

MR. RON LEVY: Just point out which boring is which, which boring one and two --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, boring three is over here on the left and boring two is here,

in the middle, and boring one is over here on the right. And, Steve, can you go back to slide nine?

Boring three is up here. Boring two, we actually projected the data on the cross-section in boring one. So, our cross-section location is from here to here, with some other wells, which we actually projected three dimensionally. So, this would be boring three location, boring one location on this corner of our block, landfill three sitting up here.

Based on the data we have, we have -- this is just a model of what we think is going on at this site. The geology that we saw is very complex. We drilled through two different units. We did notice that there was some changes in bedrock type from mudstones and silt stones. The brecciated zones that we saw were indicative of faulting, so we feel like we've seen some movement. And also, with some of the contorted bedding, we also believe that that is indications of some movement, maybe not on as large a scale.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: So, the water is going to travel in the fault, where the

faults are?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We believe that is a major conduit and we believe that it is influencing ground water flow. Next slide. Go back to -- go to slide thirty-two.

Getting to that investigation, what we found based on our studies is with the ground water flow gradient, it's very steep over on the west side or the slope of the ground water. It's very shallow over here on the east side of the landfill. We think that the faulting -- that faulting does occur beneath landfill three, faulting to the east or south, southeast. And the bedrock may have local influence, based on the ground water flow and the projected fall location. This may move contaminants locally or near the landfill, slightly to the northeast and to the southwest.

But because we don't have wells directly to the west of the landfill or many wells directly to the west of the landfill, we don't have a lot of ground water elevation data out there to actually specify. If you'd go back, Steve, to slide nineteen.

MR. RON LEVY: Hang on a second, Josh. One of the board members has a question. What did you want to ask?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Didn't we drill one on some private property, though, on the west side?

MR. RON LEVY: One of the core locations off the installation, is that what you're asking?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: No, no, not --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, this boring --

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: That was a well, monitoring well.

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, we've got two, in the median of the highway.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I'm getting the two --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Boring three is actually located on a private parcel up here on the west side of Anniston Jacksonville Highway. This was just a boring.

What we ended up doing with these borings, we did not complete them as wells, so, we grouted them, backfilled them, per ADEM guidelines, Alabama Department of Environmental Management guidelines. We did not take water levels, we just noted water information during drilling. And we didn't complete them as wells, because we weren't -- that wasn't part of our scope, at this time.

And based upon these results, as I mentioned previously, IT is developing a sampling analysis plan. This sampling analysis plan is intended to describe locations where we want to investigate and put in some additional monitoring wells to determine if there actually may be some contamination out here to the west or to the north, to the northwest or southwest. And so right now, we're in the process of finalizing that plan and submitting it to the regulatory agencies.

MR. PETE CONROY: When would that be available?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's going to be available probably in another draft. It's probably going to go out draft. Well, it is out draft. We're

waiting for comments. And I just don't know when it will be. It will probably be a month, month and a half, perhaps, that the actual work plan that includes this work in it would be finalized. I'm just pulling that number out. I really don't know.

MR. RON LEVY: Let me see if I can't make this clearer to folks who are not geologists, like Josh. The intent -- there is really two things going on here for us; there is a decision to be made about the landfill, what exactly are we going to do about it? And then there is ground water contamination that we know is a result of that landfill, that's a given, that's already there. And how are we going to characterize that to see exactly where it's going, down gradient, and what impacts it might have. And it may result in clean-up of ground water contamination or it may result in something other. At this point, we're not real sure.

There is a document out there now that we mentioned to you before. It's an EE/CA on fill areas on Fort McClellan. It addresses landfill number three. Well, actually, it's not out there. Stand corrected. It's being developed by IT now. And

it's a decisional document to define alternatives for handling the fill areas on Fort McClellan, of which, as you all know, there is a number of them. And this happens to be one of them.

And what IT is looking at through the borings is also ground water contamination and down -- and the characterization of that downstream contamination and what we may do about it. But we don't have full characterization.

What we've done here is we've looked at the geology and we said, okay, well, we've got a unique geology out here that may present the problem, in terms of that migration of contaminants in the ground water. We need to look at off-site, we need -- the wells that we originally have, if you'll notice, as he presented them out there, in the median of Highway 21, that's really not significant. It's right off of the installation, so it's right off of the fill area.

We really don't know about migration of contaminants. This boring is going to help us place additional ground water wells out there so that we can look at whether or not we've got other

migration -- this migration going on. Somebody stop me from IT if I'm --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

MR. RON LEVY: Once we can establish that, then maybe we can talk about what we're going to do about it. But we really need to understand better about migration of these contaminants in the ground water. And because of the unique geology, we're going to use that to site our wells. Which means we're going to go after off-site locations, private land owners, to put in ground water -- additional ground water wells.

Now, that sampling plan that he was telling you about hasn't been defined, yet. And both EPA and the State and the Army are going to look at that and try to help define where those wells actually go in.

And then we'll have to approach the private land owners, the Corps will, about putting those wells in. For those of you not aware, a lot of the off-site wells have been sampled before, the one particularly, the Weaver wells. So, we know, at this point, we don't have any contaminants in the Weaver

wells, because they've not only been sampled under their own permit, but we, the Army, have sampled them in the past, as well.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: When is the last time we sampled them?

MR. RON LEVY: Off the top of my head, I can't remember.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Let's see, the last time I think that we were sampled for that, it's probably been about a year. I would have to look at the date.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Rickey, you gave me data from last summer, the summer of 2000.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: That sounds about right.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: At that point there was no detection in the organic.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Right.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: But our tests -- the tests that we have run does not test for these particular --

MR. RICKEY STEELE: During a couple of the tests I had them run, you know, for this

particular contaminant he's talking about, I had them run when they first found it in these wells. And I had it run about -- that's about a year ago when I had it run the last time. And for that -- that particular contaminant, you know, we were okay, at the time.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: These two wells provide water for approximately six thousand people. We've got two thousand connections and about three people per household is what we figure is the population out there per household. So, when you're doing that, if I need to make a written request or whatever, I would like for the Government or somebody to test our water, because in the meantime bothers me. In the meantime, lots of things can happen. And if we're without water, you know, then we're in a bad, bad situation for lots of people.

MR. RON LEVY: I understand. We are in the study phase now. And there is additional wells that we'll put out there. We'll also -- I think BCT has discussed this -- we'll also go back and sample the Weaver wells, again, as well. So, I mean, we will continue to sample wells and establish if we've got any off-site -- if we've got any down

gradient migration.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: If there is 1 percent chance that it could travel into our wells, you know, I feel like the Government -- excuse me, but I feel like the Government is responsible to assist us on this. And I feel very strongly about that. And I have said this -- I know y'all have gotten tired of landfill three.

And at one time I was told, well, don't -- there is nothing to worry about. But from what you're saying, there is some probability that this water could get into a fault and could travel in the direction that our wells and the fault that we'll -- I guess we get our water from Pell City fault?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The wells were both installed -- your wells were both installed in the Conasauga formation. The formation actually changes. And I believe the Pell City fault is over in that vicinity, so you're real close to it. I haven't actually looked at where your wells are, in relation to that fault.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Now, where do I need to officially request that? That's my

question.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, I believe we're going to do it, anyway, Mayor Kimbrough. We're going to continue to sample those wells as part of our ongoing studies, so --

DR. BARRY COX: When would you project that this study will be over, the wells will be in place and the samples will be taken?

MR. RON LEVY: You know, because the BCT is going to be looking at their sampling plans in the next two months, I would hope that we would be in the field in the spring, summer time frame. Would you guess, as well?

MR. ELLIS POPE: It would also depend on how fast we can get permits for drilling on private property, too. We have to have some willing property owners to allow us to put wells on their property.

DR. BARRY COX: Well, maybe Mayor Kimbrough could help you with that.

MR. RON LEVY: And certainly, you know, your wells are already being sampled. Those wells are not a problem. We can do those right up

front.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And from the State's perspective, your wells are high priority to me. And as anybody can tell, the geology's incredibly complex. And while we make sure -- and when we started studying it, it was they were to attack these fault zones and make sure that it satisfies -- when we put a well in, it doesn't satisfy one solution, it satisfies many solutions. And so, you know, I have a big interest in those wells. And plus, if he's pulling for six thousand people, he's pulling a serious hydraulic head on that downward. And these things are in my mind, as we go along.

MR. PETE CONROY: Philip, how often should Ed's municipal water supply be tested? I know that's a crapshoot sort of question, but --

MR. RON LEVY: It would be basically -- his permit has got certain requirements --

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah.

MR. RON LEVY: -- for testing.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Well, we test every month, right, water samples?

MR. RON LEVY: But there is only for certain parameters.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: But a chemical analysis, you know, is normally on a three year interval, but I do it more often on this particular item here, this particular contaminant.

Mr. Cox, I want to ask you a question, please. I have several questions I want to address to him. At what point will I be able to do that in this meeting?

DR. BARRY COX: Is he --

MR. RICKEY STEELE: I'm with the Weaver Water System.

MR. RON LEVY: In the limit of this discussion, it would be best to do it now.

DR. BARRY COX: Do you want to suspend it and go ahead, since it's pertinent to this discussion --

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Okay, yeah.

DR. BARRY COX: -- and you have expertise in this area. Go ahead.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Josh, some questions I wanted to ask: In your professional

opinion and your expertise and what you've found so far, what is the likelihood, in your opinion, and what period of time frame would you say that this contaminant could possibly reach our water supply?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: At this point in time, we just don't have enough information, enough hydraulic information about the units. You've got a couple of units out there and that is the major reason why we're going back and putting in more wells and doing some more studies. We just -- the data that I have looked at from your wells and the data that is available from the site -- we have a lot of ground water quality data, but we don't have a lot of data on the -- what we call the hydraulic properties of the water bearing bedrock and residual. So, we need to get an understanding of the physical properties of the rock and looking more at the actual physical parameters of the contaminant to really come up with an educated answer to that question.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: I'm sure in this new site plan that you're speaking of, that there is additional monitoring well or wells that will be going on in toward our wells, between our wells and

what you've got now.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We hope so, with property access, yes.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: During any of this -- and, you know, once you find this, at any point in time -- and he raised the question -- will there be any type velocity study done on, you know, how fast the travel is of this?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That will be probably a question that we'll want to answer as -- you know, what's -- approximately how fast is the ground water flowing, and if this -- if this was in ground water, you know, how fast is it moving along, also.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: The report that you're going over right now -- I notice you're reading off of it there -- would it be possible that I could get a copy of what -- your program, your presentation that you're doing tonight?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I couldn't give you this. I would have to clean it up a little bit.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: No, I mean a copy or something.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I don't see why not.

MR. RON LEVY: Once it's -- of course, that's --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: But I think you would be better served if you actually saw the --

MR. RON LEVY: Josh, once it's finalized, it will become part of the public record and, yes, you will be able to have it. All we're waiting to do is finalize the report.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: So, the only way to get it is when it's finalized.

MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And that should be fairly shortly. So, yes, we will make it a matter of public record and it will go in the repository.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: You said, you know, based MCLs versus your method of measurement, that it had exceeded some of your methods of measurement; is that correct?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's --

MR. RICKEY STEELE: The contaminant level?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: And it's exceeded some of our -- (inaudible) -- yes.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Would it be possible that, you know, if the City of Weaver, because of the vulnerability that we have to this, would it be possible if we wanted to sample one of these monitoring wells you've got and have our lab to sample it, would that be possible?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I don't see why not, you know, do what we call split samples where, you know, we have someone out there, accompanying you to grab a sample to submit to your laboratory. That's standard practice.

DR. BARRY COX: Let me ask one clarification. Did you say that the last time these wells were sampled was in --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: '98.

DR. BARRY COX: -- '98?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

DR. BARRY COX: None of your monitoring wells have been sampled since '98?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Not in that part of Fort McClellan.

DR. BARRY COX: And the obvious question I guess is: Since they showed contamination then, why haven't they been sampled since then?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We've been scoped to sample in certain time periods. The sampling we performed in 1998 was under a long-term ground water monitoring event, where we not only sampled landfill three, but there were some other sites in the vicinity of Fort McClellan that we sampled. We've just not been scoped to do that since then.

DR. BARRY COX: I guess I would ask Ron that question then: Why haven't they been sampled since then?

MR. RON LEVY: Well, we have other wells in the area that they're sampling, they're in part of other investigations that are being sampled. The intent to get to the borings was so that we could get to some additional sampling, because we really wanted to look at the geology first, so we're going to come back to that. But there has not been any concerted effort to resample those wells.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I mean,

part of that answer, or at least as I hear your question, Barry, and I think about -- you know, I mean, if you did sample them and you got additional data, what do you do with it?

What you're trying to find out here is what's in the water and where is it going and how fast that it's going there, so that you can eventually, if it's necessary, seek recovery wells and draw that water back in and keep that, whatever it is, from getting to wherever you don't want it to get to.

And just going out and sampling a monitoring well to see what levels are in there, it's a baby step; it doesn't really get you anything and it certainly doesn't give you any information you need to take any corrective measures. You need to get the data that these guys are talking about where you're going to go out and determine what's in the ground water and the direction and also the gradient of the contamination so you can determine the extent of the plume.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: What type of time frame are we looking at? Say, if when you get into your studies and everything, what would be the

minimum and maximum time that you could get into some type of remediation to correct that problem?

MR. RON LEVY: I think you're asking the wrong person, if you're asking me.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes, that's not part of his job.

MR. RON LEVY: They represent the Army and they're doing the technical stuff.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Yes, I understand that.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Will -- excuse me.

MR. RON LEVY: I'm still on this question here. Let me finish this.

As I pointed out to you before, the EE/CAs, the engineering evaluation cost analysis, is addressing the fill areas. One of the things that we know about landfill three was it was never capped. And everybody understands that because back then there wasn't a requirement of the law to do that. And therefore, those trenches, as he points out, provides pretty much direct conduit into the ground water.

So, one of the decisions, what are

we going to do with landfill three? And the ground water contamination, which is a result of infiltration of water coming through that fill is part of that.

So, a decision to cap that landfill may be coming. You know, at this point I can't tell you. We will have a document that addresses that and we'll look at several alternatives.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: But, Ron, my question is: For our information, what would be the timeline that y'all would make that decision and start taking remediation? Is there a timeline? You know, you --

MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: -- gave us a time on the --

MR. RON LEVY: Well, there isn't a specific time, but we hope to be able to make the decision this spring.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: This spring?

MR. RON LEVY: This spring. IT has pretty much got it ready to go out in draft to the BCT, so the regulatory agencies can look at it. And

we hope to be able to present that also to the RAB for a discussion. So, you know, we could do it fairly quickly here this spring, in terms of making the decision. And then we'll have to go into some sort of remedial design or remedial action after that to, you know, to fix the problem. And without -- you know, without knowing exactly what that decision is, I couldn't tell you, you know, when the actual address -- you know, what we actually do to -- what will occur.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Let me make sure I understood what you just said. You said this spring for what now? For -- I think his question was --

MR. RON LEVY: Decision.

MR. ELLIS POPE: -- knowing what our remedial decision might be. I mean, it's going to be this spring before we start putting the wells in, because I mean, we're in the end of January, now.

MR. RON LEVY: We're into that landfill EE/CA, that is a decisional document.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Well, my question is: How long is this threat going to be over us before we know if it can be corrected? You know,

that's my concern, is it going to be a year, is it going to be two years? And then --

MR. RON LEVY: The question I still got to answer is migration.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Right.

MR. RON LEVY: Are we really impacting those wells? Are we seeing a migration issue? And that's what those additional wells are going to tell us.

DR. BARRY COX: And as you see now, there is no concern that it would get to Weaver within the period of time that you're looking at? And the answer is: You really don't know that, right?

MR. RON LEVY: The answer is: We really don't know that.

DR. BARRY COX: Should we be thinking about a contingency plan in case the Weaver wells are contaminated?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Well now, we're connected onto Anniston water.

DR. BARRY COX: So, you have that option?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: But our

water tank is higher than Anniston, so we've got about a hundred and fifty people that would be without water if we had to turn both of our wells off and furnish water from Anniston.

DR. BARRY COX: So, they would have to install little pumping units at their --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: We would have to do a boot, if we could -- we would have to put a booster pump in to pump it to our tanks and then everybody would be within --

MR. RON LEVY: You know, Weaver wells are three miles in a northwesterly direction and --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: It's a mile -- 1.7 mile is the closest one.

MR. RON LEVY: From the --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: From the landfill. And it's 2. --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I think it was 2.3 was the other one, I believe, something. And I'm -- don't quote me on that, because I just -- I was just, you know, back of the envelope calculations based on what --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: We pump approximately six hundred thousand gallons of water a day through the system. And so, you know, it's -- and financially, God Almighty, we -- producing it from a well, you know, that's not a high cost thing. Buying it from Anniston, you know, we'd probably have to jump our water rates up to double what we're charging now.

So, this is what my concern is. You know what I mean? And I don't want -- be a false -- think that there is a false alarm, but if there is, like I said, 1 percent probability that that could happen to me, then we've got to have a plan to deal with that. And it might not ever happen, that's fine. I would rather have a plan and it never happen than to be there and it happen and not be able to do this. And that's our concern, that's our --

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Right now.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: But let me add to Ron. I think -- we've looked at this -- you showed a closing of 1967 on this?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: From 1967 to now, we haven't got a mile and seven-tenths. We don't

expect that we'll be there before we have a decision document. Obviously, we can't guarantee you that.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Right.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: That's the reason we're doing this study, the reason we're presenting these facts is so that you understand, we're out there looking to have monitoring wells to assure that it doesn't get to Weaver water. And we're going to continue to sample. You know, we are sampling, you're sampling, and we're going to continue that, to go out and sample --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I need to talk to you some time and tell you where I'm coming from, because when this thing started --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, I understand. I mean, it's certainly a concern --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: -- you know, there was an exercise that I was made aware of where the Army had prepared a contingency plan if our water was contaminated. And we had no idea of anything at that time.

Now, y'all have worked with us since that time, but I still have that red flag up

there. Why was there, you know, a contingency plan or why was there a plan in existence in the first place and it went to how they would deal with EPA and how they would deal with ADEM and the different things in there? So, this is where I'm coming from.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I understand.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: And that was how many years ago?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Well, we're still working on -- it's not a contingency plan. We're still working on a plan with ADEM and EPA to, in fact, take care of the problem.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: See, that's why I need -- I need to develop a contingency plan to be prepared in there.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes, sir.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: May I say, migration plume delineation is one of the most critical aspects of determining what correct refraction system you need, plus what kind of plan, contingency plan you might need. So, you know, that would be the proper approach, from where I see it, is contingent, and determine what your migration plume

really is and delineate that, so you would know what we really need to do.

DR. BARRY COX: Ms. Schneider?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Is this migration flow that everyone's talking about in the current scope of the EE/CA?

MR. RON LEVY: No.

MR. ELLIS POPE: It's in the work that he's talking about and in additional wells it's going -- yeah, it's in that --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Two different scopes of work.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Is that other scope of work that we're speaking about, the results of that, will that be in the spring, as well, or is that another time -- is that on a separate timeline?

MR. ELLIS POPE: It's on a separate timeline.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And what would the result of that be, Ellis?

MR. ELLIS POPE: The result -- I'm not sure I understand your question.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Of the

separate timeline, what's the end point of it?

MR. ELLIS POPE: A recommendation as to how to deal with the ground water. We're treating the actual landfill and the EE/CA as a separate from the ground water issue. We've broken those issues out, separately.

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, point that out. There is two different issues here. There is that contaminant that's in the ground water and what do we do about that, and then there is the landfill and what are we going to do about that, which put the contaminant in the ground water?

If you cap the landfill, you still got --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right.

MR. RON LEVY: -- you still got the ground water issue. And so, how do we handle that? And is it really a problem? We want to look at it from a migration standpoint. Is it really a problem? So, I mean, that's why we're talking about two different things here, Miki.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right. And I was just trying to get straight as to the end date

that the Mayor is looking for there on those two timelines, the first one being, come due in the spring, right, the decisional?

MR. RON LEVY: Right, that's the one I was talking about.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right, that's the one you were talking about is the spring.

MR. ELLIS POPE: That's on the landfill, itself, it's not on the ground water.

MR. RON LEVY: Glad you said that, Ellis.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: That's assuming and hoping that this -- it will solve some of the problems. It may open new ones. You know, that's part of the investigation, too. So, you know, when people say put an end deadline, we're really going out there.

MR. RON LEVY: We want to make a good decision, honestly. And in order to make a good decision, I need all the data points, I need to know geologically what's going on, I need to know what migration is going on out there. And to come to a plan, really need to understand what's occurring.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I want you to make a good decision, but I want to be able to make a good decision about what I need to do, too. And that's where I'm coming from.

MR. RON LEVY: And I think that input from -- and that's what the RAB is for, that input from the RAB and the community to help us make those decisions.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I'll be glad to help you make them.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Is it not a given that the landfill will eventually be capped, anyway? Is that not a given?

MR. RON LEVY: No, it's not a given. There is other alternatives that are being considered, as well.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: If the landfill was capped because of the hydraulics of the ground water, the surface water going down in these depressions, wouldn't that definitely be a plus in favor of the underground water flow?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It would stop infiltration through the landfill, theoretically, but

it wouldn't do -- you know, the stuff that's already there, would still migrate along preferential pathways.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: This seems to me, you know, that --

MR. RON LEVY: But see, when I say it's not given, there is other alternatives, and one is a removal, you know. So, you're saying, well, why don't you cap it. Well, maybe there is a removal that we might do. And we could essentially pick that up and take it someplace else, that's one of the alternatives being considered, as well. So, if your point is: Why don't you do capping, well, there is other decisions that may also impact that, as well, that we need to look at.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: But seems like a lot of time is going by, though, you know, when things seem like could be done to help some, you know, a lot of time going by, testing and looking at, you know.

MR. RON LEVY: Yes, I think we pointed out earlier there has been a lot of times, too, since that fill area was closed. We really want

to make the right decisions.

MR. RICKEY STEELE: Right. Just like he said, it's been two years since it's been sampled. You know, what if you sample it now and the concentration is three times, you know? That tells me, you know, that the flow has picked up.

MR. RON LEVY: I think there is a series of samples, too. And as Craig pointed out, they're -- and I've got to go back and look. But '98 wasn't the only time we've sampled. We've sampled it over the years. And I think you can look at concentrations over the years -- and I don't know, but I'm not sure that there has been much change in that. We need to go back and take a look at that. IT's done analysis on some of the path sampling and I don't know what --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We have historic data, but I don't have it with me and I'm not -- I couldn't just spit it out and tell you what the trends are.

MR. ELLIS POPE: I think you're right, Ron. The last time it was sampled before '98 I believe was in '95. And I don't think we saw any

significant differences between the '95 and '98 data.

MR. RON LEVY: And that's important information, too.

DR. BARRY COX: Which would be a reason not to have to sample.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Yeah.

DR. BARRY COX: One question I would add: With this horribly complex geology, you know, we may end up in the same situation like out at the Depot. Do you think that after we do all this testing, we'll really have any definitive information on what the flow is going to really be? I mean, there they've got wells that are a few feet apart and go from essentially nothing to several thousand PPM.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, that certainly is the goal. And we are finding in some sites that we are achieving that goal, in a lot of sites we are achieving that goal.

But like you said, it's very complex. And I can't -- it's difficult for me to -- I guess I'm not aware of what's going on at the Depot that much, so I'm hopeful, as being part of the investigation, that we will in fact delineate, based

upon what we see and in spite of the complex geology, because we're seeing that we're -- we've got good hypothetical models elsewhere of what we think is going on. And we hope to achieve the same success here.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And that's a good point, what he's asking that, that's not all that's going on in that geology there. This is a karst terrain. And karst means, these are old dolomites like calcium carbonate and limestones and things like that. There is a lot of holes in that.

DR. BARRY COX: And new ones could be made any day.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And these holes can run ten miles this way and three miles and two miles and come back. It's a torturous path it's got to take. And there is a lot of delusion, a lot of weird things are going in there, so it's not really showing the whole picture, the way I see it, but it's getting close.

And by getting these very prominent features in there, then we can predict regional flows of things. We can not really isolate insulated, you

know, areas, but more of a regional flow.

But that's a good -- he brought up a good question that also sticks with me, too, during the study.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I mean, we'll just -- we'll see.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: You know, this is a model of what we think is out there. And it's, you know, a lot of -- a lot of ways, you know, it's a best-guess scenario.

DR. BARRY COX: Appreciate it. Anybody else have a --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I hate to prolong this, but does anybody know what fault Anniston gets their main water source from?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: They get it from the Jacksonville fault. Coldwater Spring taps into the Jacksonville fault.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Okay. So, that's in that vicinity, also?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: (Nods head.)

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Thank

you.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: I notice in the historical data about what went in landfill three, you had pesticide containers. Did you see in any of your monitoring well data any degradation products of any chlorinated or organa-phosphorous based pesticides?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We haven't seen anything above SSSLs, anything that would actually raise a red flag in what we've been looking for.

DR. BARRY COX: In PPB or PPM, what parts are you actually seeing?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We're looking like fractional PPB.

DR. BARRY COX: Fractional PPB.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: You know, below -- probably below one PPB, if that.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: For common folk over here, is that good or bad?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's good, that's good.

DR. BARRY COX: Now, I guess on to new business. And we'll take something easy first.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Before we

close this, Barry, what would be the next logical point in time where we -- the Mayor obviously is very concerned about this, as are some other people on the RAB. When is the next logical point in time where something would be presented to us regarding the next step, a couple of months? And should we put it on the agenda or at least put it in the back of our minds to make sure it gets on the agenda?

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, the next logical step -- it's not going to be with the sampling that's associated with these borings, but we're going to talk to you about the EE/CA on the landfills. And there is a lot that depends on when we can get to that.

We got an internal review that the Army wants to put on, as it results to that. And then at some point after that, I'll have to present it to the RAB for their input. And we're talking about, we've got another EE/CA right now that I want to present to you, the ranges of Long Iron Mountain Road, that we're hoping to present to you, either the next meeting or the meeting after that, depending on how

quickly I can get to these Army comments.

I would say three, four months down the road to be able to present that. And then the sampling and whatnot, you know, if we get to that this summer, probably -- what are we looking at, after -- for a report, after -- we're talking six to eight months.

DR. BARRY COX: Well, we could have -- when you actually determine where you're going to put the wells, that would be -- you'll at least have something you can tell us then, wouldn't you?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, we can talk to you about sampling locations. And certainly that would be -- present what IT is proposing, in terms of sampling locations.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. ELLIS POPE: And we might need some assistance from RAB members here, in getting permit, getting right of entries on the properties.

DR. BARRY COX: So, we're looking at what, three months for that would be a good date to shoot for?

MR. RON LEVY: I don't know, we

could be even closer than that.

DR. BARRY COX: Why don't we just have an update in the March meeting then? And you can tell us where you are, at that point.

MR. RON LEVY: We'll look to March, to give you an update, yes.

DR. BARRY COX: Anything else on this topic?

Go down the list, determining location of the -- I assume we're going to meet back here on February. Would that be all right? And then the March meeting will be our off-meeting. I can offer the 11th floor at the library at JSU as one possible location, just as one potential.

Anybody else have a location they would like to throw out?

MR. RON LEVY: Joan, you got any recommendations?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: No. I think that we have not been up to Jacksonville in about eighteen months or so.

MR. PETE CONROY: Our library will be fixed by then.

DR. BARRY COX: Well, the inside's fine now.

MR. PETE CONROY: Divider, installation, will that be completed?

DR. BARRY COX: I'll check and see. I'll let you know in February.

MR. PETE CONROY: Hard hat area?

DR. BARRY COX: Hard hat area, yes.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: We're going to be one week earlier because of President's Day. We're going to meet on the 12th.

DR. BARRY COX: Is that acceptable with everybody then, to meet at -- assuming it's the hard hat area's intact with the --

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: We're going to meet on the 12th?

DR. BARRY COX: February 12th.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: It's either the 12th or the 26th. I mean, you all call it. But then we'd come right up again within three weeks. January and February really throws us off on Mondays, because there's the two Monday holidays.

MR. RON LEVY: Right now it's

scheduled closer, the 12th?

MR. RON MASSEY: Yes, it's presently scheduled for the 12th.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I would suggest throwing it out a couple of weeks and then holding on, not a lot's going to change, you know, in the next two weeks.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Right.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Three weeks, whatever it is.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Well, may I suggest something? We're about to have an on-board review meeting, and a lot's going to be decided in that meeting with EPA. And that's -- Doyle Brittain couldn't make it here tonight. He's representing EPA. But I know, I think that's coming up.

MR. RON LEVY: 4th and 5th of February through the 9th.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah, the 5th of February. And a lot of decisions are going to be made that week that might be interesting.

MR. RON LEVY: But that would still be in time for the 12th, if necessary.

MR. RON MASSEY: Ask the preference.

DR. BARRY COX: What is the preference for the time on the meeting? Does anybody have any --

MR. RON MASSEY: 12 or 26 February?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: If there is something to talk about, the 12th is fine with me.

DR. BARRY COX: So, Philip, you think there will be something to talk about the 12th?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I think so.

MR. RON LEVY: Always something to talk about.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Because either we do one or the other, it's going to put us back at a --

DR. BARRY COX: Put it to a vote. How many for the 12th? Looked unanimous to you? And how many for the 26th?

(No votes for the 26th.)

DR. BARRY COX: Meeting is set on the 12th then.

Next we go to the agency reports.

And, Philip, do you want to start with -- since you come first in the alphabet?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah. Well, EPA is not represented here tonight. And this isn't as big as it should be, but there is a lot on here. You're going to start seeing a lot of finals. This is exciting, real exciting news. There is probably not going to be enough -- I didn't know all these people were going to be here, but just pass them around and share them between --

DR. BARRY COX: Anybody that doesn't get a copy, if they want one, see Ron after the meeting, he'll be glad to mail one out to you.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: They've been really kind to do this for me. And I want to thank the Army for helping out with this.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We don't charge much. Put it on our tab.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: No, it's really nice and I really want to compliment them for doing that.

Now, that doesn't mean this is just ADEM's review. EPA has had some input on some of

these, but they're just not up here. And part of this on-board review is going to take care of some of the ones I have up here and also dozens more that I've been waiting for the review to get through. And good, y'all are right there to point.

Now, the ones on the first page here are the ones that I consider reviewed -- either they're going to be a final or -- a final or a draft. But this thing's going to be evolving. Right now the red -- I think, what does it say? That's the 10-16 through 11-20 in the red. The document removal, 11-20 through 1-22-01 will be in the blue, that's the ones that are on this paper. Just point out some of the blue areas here.

And this just kind of gives you just a picture of how, you know, we're reviewing these sites and how scattered they really are. And it depends on JPA priorities. And the ones in red, like I said, back -- or before this.

Now, some of these reds may turn to a blue. These may be a final draft and then they -- it depends. But in the final end, we're going to -- we started doing it. This time we're just testing it

right now. The M-7, the M-2. There's another little bitty one here. There is the 5013. These yellow ones are the ones that are final -- they're FOSTs, and that means they were assigned above me. And the yellow will always show progress.

Now, what I'm about to say here is real interesting, that -- when I say it's exciting, we have a title wave of FOSTs coming down the road. And with this new on-board review by EPA, I really like this fellow so far, his name is Doyle Brittain, and he's real proactive. He's -- I think he'll fit right in with your group. He's ambitious. He wants to make ends meet, but also he wants to get this out clean and to make sure that we give clean water to Weaver and things like that.

But is there any questions about this map? And you'll have another color on this. And they'll all evolve to a yellow, eventually.

Now, by no means is this -- this just started back in November. And there are really a lot more colored areas on here that we've finalized reports. And I'm going to work with the Army to try to get them all put on here. So, actually, you're

going to see probably about three times as many areas covered up here that are in review.

And the second page just lists a relentless pounding they're sending reports to us. But you can just kind of get an idea of all the parcels we're looking at. And each one of these things are sometimes just as complicated as landfill three. But the contamination may be a little bit different. So, they all offer a lot of complexity.

And another thing we don't -- the reason you probably don't see quite as many reports, we've had a transition of -- and this is a lot, I'm telling you. It's not a few, it's a lot. But because of EPA's transition and also we're moving into unexploded ordnance at a rapid pace here, we're going into EE/CAs. Actually, we're going to do studies to write EE/CAs, and so we've been real heavily involved with that right now, too.

So, that's where we are with ADEM. And I'm speaking for EPA, too, here.

(WHEREUPON, there was discussion off the record.)

MR. PHILIP STROUD: What Ron mentioned was is we're pretty much on a regular basis.

And like tomorrow or even today, when we come up here a lot of times, we do on-site visits and we visit with each one of the contractors out here. We do a lot of spot checks. We look at their work. I've come from a long background where, when I was a consultant, I was also looked at. And so, I use the same techniques, if not harder, because of my long-time experience behind drilling rigs and environmental clean-ups and Super Fund clean-ups. So, I expect them to hold the same standards I had when I was out there.

But anyway, it's a -- I feel -- I'm just going to say this: I've never felt more comfortable -- and I'm not trying to throw IT on a pedestal, but we have a kinmanship here and it works very well. I feel very confident in what they're doing. And so, when I walk out in the field, they're doing what I would expect them to do. And there is no, what I'd call "hiding the ball" or whatever like this.

And so these inspections, also, I may go visit a site trailer and we'll look at their field books, do standard checks of their QAQC documentation, we may look at their methodologies for

monitoring or sampling, sampling protocol, decontamination protocol, how they keep up their drilling rigs.

Not only that, we're looking at, also, other contractors that are on-site. And don't think because JPA comes in and turns over land and all of a sudden contractors move in, that I don't keep a watchful eye on these people.

By that, pretty much my job is done. But I have gone through the site and seen different contractors doing some nasty things and we'll report the violations and I'm pretty strict on that.

And also, we always need your support, too. Your eyes are as important as mine. And so, I ask as a State representative, that you also come to me. And I think all of y'all on board have my E-mails. And I expect it. And I'll be glad to help you guys out. Anything else?

MR. RON LEVY: No.

DR. BARRY COX: Appreciate it, Philip.

MR. RON LEVY: Let me say a little

bit about Doyle since he's not here. He got called out to do -- to issue a fine, I guess, at another location, so that -- I'm sure glad it wasn't McClellan is all I can tell you.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: We are, too, Ron.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I guess that was the 3-38, I'm sorry. T-38 was -- the fill areas and new fill areas and things.

MR. RON LEVY: I'm not sure what you're talking about.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Those old -- I'm trying to think of the concrete, all the stuff we found lately.

MR. RON LEVY: That's going to be covered in the CWM.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Okay. That's the CWM.

MR. RON LEVY: And I'm going to talk about that. I don't know if there is anything else from EPA's standpoint, other than, as he pointed out, EPA is on board with us. We do have a whole week that we're going to dedicate towards reviewing the SI

reports that are coming out and some of the work plans that are coming out, where we're going to -- he's going to dedicate his time so that we can continue the work moving. Miki is aware of that.

Short of that, I don't know -- my boss, Glynn, who is also the co-chair, is going to talk to you, I think, from the Army's perspective on a point.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, from the Army's perspective, just to let you know, we asked Ron to make copies for all the board members of this early transfer authority. We received a letter, the Army, from the JPA, asking for early transfer of property and privatization of environmental clean-up. The Army has agreed to review those options. What that would mean to the RAB was that the JPA would take over the clean-up and take early transfer of the property as it is before it's cleaned up.

This is just a read-ahead document so you understand what it's being asked. There is lot of questions to be answered. I would ask that when Miki has that prepared, that she present it to the RAB so that everyone understands what that is. I mean,

that's a -- as you come up with the document that you're going to present to the Army or afterwards, if they're proprietary information. I'm not sure what will be in that.

It would be a contract with the Army. There is a lot of issues of liability and responsibility. The community takes on responsibility for clean-up actions. Liability doesn't go away, it stays with the Army. Lead agency becomes the State.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: ADEM.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: It's a big change, it's a big responsibility for the community. And I think it's something that each one of you as RAB members certainly should be interested in. So, if you want to take a look at this, if you have questions, I'm sure we can try to get additional information. These are -- they're not cookie cutter contracts that the LRAs and the Army reaches agreement on. It would be something that individually, depending upon the scope that the community would want to put together. So, there is a lot of things in it. I think Dr. Cox had a presentation on this a few weeks ago, a month ago.

DR. BARRY COX: Sure, it was a few months. And I think one of the -- if you remember, somebody that's up in the chain of command -- I can't remember -- I don't have the name in front of me now -- and his suggestion was that we get a little further along with this and perhaps have some people in and talk to the RAB, because this is an issue that the RAB needs to be involved in.

One of the things that some posts have done is to make one of the requirements of early transfer that the RAB stay in place, that a RAB be maintained for community input, if there is early transfer.

So, probably some time we would ask you to maybe bring somebody from the Army in, as it gets further down the road, and have a formal presentation on the Army's position on that.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I would say we would look at the JPA to present their actual proposal, because we will only be looking at what their proposal is in evaluating that.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: And so it would

really be a JPA proposal that we would probably want to put on.

DR. BARRY COX: Thank you.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Can I --

DR. BARRY COX: Your time.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

DR. BARRY COX: You're next.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: My time. I did go to Washington last week with Mr. Ryan and we did meet with the Department of the Army and discuss this. We're looking at the EDC parcel, which is about twelve thousand acres, that would be included in the FOSET, the early transfer process.

We are at the very beginning stages of this. We are crawling. We've got a long way to go before we can walk. But this is a partnership between the community, ADEM, the Governor's office has to sign onto this. We've already met with two -- three people at the Governor's office. We've had two separate meetings. We've met with Mr. War (phonetic) at ADEM, had discussions with them about this.

We are trying to put all the pieces in place and get to a point where we can say, this is

in the best interest of the community. Mr. Ryan said it a moment ago; the Army never loses the responsibility here. But what happens is the clean-up comes out of the daily bureaucracy of the Army and gets into a private clean-up.

Some bases have done this very successfully. McClellan's look at this is complicated by the presence of UXO. We have to look very carefully at that and look at -- make sure that that is a decision that we are comfortable making.

I want you to understand that the JPA considering doing this does not mean that the six of us who work over there in that office on a daily basis will be running the clean-up of McClellan, not in any way, shape, or form. We will bring on experts. We will bring on contractors that do this. We will have to improve on our staff, bring people on who have this expertise. It will be a different picture over there if we make this -- this change.

The Army's been very gracious in meeting with us and discussing it with us. And we appreciate that and we look forward to continuing our discussions with them. We'll be going back in

February and will be having some further discussion on that.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Let me make one clarification. The Army will retain the liability, but the responsibility to actually do the work would go to the JPA or whoever took that on.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right, that's correct.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: And Miki said we would retain the responsibility.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Did I say responsibility?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry, it's liability.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We wouldn't do that. We would let you do that, as you clean it up, you would have that responsibility, that --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I meant responsibility for long term, if we find something --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, we would end up with the liability there.

MR. MIKI SCHNEIDER: -- after we

finish, the Army still has to come back and address that issue.

MR. RON LEVY: I want you to note this -- point out one thing, Ron Levy, in this -- we're not involved in that decision, at this level. Okay? Have nothing to do with that, whatsoever. These are decisions made way above me. And I can't really answer questions about early transfer, other than maybe putting a FOSET together. But those are decisions that are not really made at this level.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: As you look through this, even this real brief four page document, it's very detailed work, I mean, and no one expects it to happen, immediately. So, it's kind of unfair to ask -- you know, I know you have a lot of questions, but it's going to take JPA awhile to put together a good plan. And it's -- you know, it's not because they don't want to give you information, it's because it's going to take just some real all-out planning stages and a lot of discussion with a lot of folks.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay. Is the UXO property going to be included in this?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Yes, some of

it.

DR. BARRY COX: That was -- of course, you know, the presentation, I heard, that's a real -- as you said earlier --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Yes.

DR. BARRY COX: -- that that's the real sticking issue, is how do you deal with early transfer on property that has UXO.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: The decision whether that will ever be done is --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: For the Army --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- it can be made. But I mean, it will be presented as a part of the proposal, as I understand it.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That's right.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: What's the advantage of doing it this way as opposed to just the process we're going through now?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Time.

MR. PETE CONROY: And money.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And money.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: And money?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And I guess the easiest and quickest example that I can give you -- and, please, understand that we appreciate everything the Army and the contractors did to move the Anniston Star property along, the M-2 piece of property. I mean, they really pulled out all the stops that they could to get it to us as quickly as they could. But we looked at one near -- one year, Ron, from start to finish?

MR. RON LEVY: All I can tell is from what I've seen, it's taken in several places, almost a year to get from the start to the finish. And that's to get it transferred.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: No, no, I'm talking M-2. How long did y'all --

MR. RON LEVY: No, I think it was eight or nine months, I think, total. I know you may be counting it from a different point.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right. I'll split the difference with you, I'll go eleven months.

MR. RON LEVY: That's to get to a FOST now, okay.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Eleven months

to get to that document, to get twenty-three acres of land cleaned, to get it through all the processes and get it to a point where we could sell that piece of property.

When my board hears that, when they think about the community, we've got twelve thousand acres of land that we need to put into the development process, and they are concerned about the time that it takes to clean the property up, to go through all of the hurdles that you got to go through in through the Army hoopsfa (phonetic).

And the FOSET process saves time and saves money. The Army's got to make sure they're comfortable with, as Mr. Ryan said, the plan that we put together, to get to that point.

I will tell you, since we last met, we have negotiated with an insurance company. We now do have environmental insurance in place at McClellan. We're real excited about that. We've put -- we had our deed signing on December 12th and had the first twelve hundred acres of land transferred to the community, to the JPA.

We now have environmental insurance

on that. The company that we worked with is in with us for the long run. They understand that we're looking at early transfer. They're one of the companies across the country that has placed insurance onto properties while they were being cleaned. So, we hope that we can look at that with them, as well when we -- as we begin this looking at early transfer.

Our next big step that we're taking will be to hopefully finalize the deal on the sale of the Buckner Circle properties, as well as the Capehart Housing. And I will keep y'all informed as we move forward with that.

We closed on Auburn. And Auburn University now has approximately seventy-five acres of land and they will be operating their dog training facilities in the old polygraph building, those of you who are familiar with the buildings out here. We're looking forward to having them out here and having all of the life that they will bring to that end of the Fort.

We're continuing our discussions with JSU. JSU is -- if I can do it by close of business this week, we're going to try and finalize

the contract for the MP School with JSU. And they are going to make an offer on the child development center. With the closure of Parker Memorial, this is a great opportunity for JSU to, through their early childhood program, to bring in to play a day care for the community, partnering with JSU. And we're all looking forward to making that happen.

DR. BARRY COX: Anybody have any questions? Ron, you going to do the action summary?

MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And I'll try to go through this really quickly since the hour. Most of you know about the December 12th signing ceremony. Miki pointed out, we were involved in it from the land use control assurance plan, that was also part of that ceremony. And that's an action that we've discussed at previous BCT meetings. So, that's working.

We're in the process of identifying sites that will have land use controls on them. And that will go out to the regulatory agencies, as well as JPA for review.

The finding of suitability to transfer for tract one, if you look up here, Phil

pointed out in the review on it, it's this blue area, it's the southern portion. We've defined the eastern bypass into three different tracts, tract one --

MR. PAUL JAMES: Right over there, Ron.

MR. RON LEVY: You can see a -- oh, there you go, right there. And that tract two is the yellow piece up there. Because we want to expedite that so that the JPA can have a means into the installation while they're building the northern portion.

And then tract three, which is the toughest piece, because it's got most of the issues associated with UXO surrounding it and through that piece.

Tract one went real quick, because it was defined as a CERFA category one in environmental baseline survey, which means there wasn't contaminant issues to include UXO down there. So, we were able to generate a finding of suitability to transfer, get it to the State for their review. It's out for review, also. It went out for review, also, for the public to comment on. But for the most

part, it should be able to go fairly quickly. And I don't think we had any significant comments from you on that, did we Phil?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: No.

MR. RON LEVY: So, we're looking at that going very well, very well.

The FOST for E-2, that's the Consolidated Publishing, Anniston Star property. That was signed and the deed's working its way through. I think, Miki pointed that out, that was part of the clean-up she had a discussion with me on. Although, I wouldn't necessarily agree eleven months was the case, but our environmental piece was shorter than that.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: From start to finish, Ron.

MR. RON LEVY: Okay. We reviewed a prescribed burn plan for U. S. Fish & Wildlife that had to do the refuge defined -- or the proposed refuge area that we concurred with. They defined -- they defined how they were going to burn the property for purposes of growth for the long leaf pine. And Bill from Fish & Wildlife, sitting back here, can talk to you about it.

It involves some funding. The Army's position was, you know, we'll fund you up to a certain point, beyond that, it comes out of your own budget.

And it's also a means for protection of the long leaf pine. So, it is necessary for long leaf pine.

We also looked at -- and it's -- areas defined by Fish & Wildlife for intensive reuse. If you see the map in the middle, between the three of you here, up in the bulletin board, Fish & Wildlife did a survey. Some of their folks came out, looked at property and looked at the area within the refuge where they think they will have the most use on.

It was trails, it involved visitor center, it involved some place where they may keep their equipment, scenic areas. And what that does is it helps us focus on clean-up. You know, if that's where you're going, then we can focus on clean-up, in terms of those areas. So, that was the intent of that. And you can see that up there on the wall, if anybody's interested, particularly in that.

What we're going to do is have our

contractor focus the EE/CAs and the surveys, also, on that, too, so that we can look at what's there in terms of ordnance and then focus our clean-up in that direction.

Last part was the CWM. CWM instead of CMW. That's chemical warfare material. There is an EE/CA going on, because we have several sites on Fort McClellan that were historically used by the Army or the Chemical School for training, use of live agents. This EE/CA is going in and looking at all of these sites, sampling, and determining what, if anything, we've got there and then what actions we'll take for removal purposes.

DR. BARRY COX: Ron, since we have some people probably new, do you want to tell them what an EE/CA is.

MR. RON LEVY: It's an engineering -- what it stands for is engineering evaluation cost analysis. It's similar to -- and it's defined in the NCP. It's similar to remedial investigation with a feasibility study. So, it's an investigation piece. And then we come up with defined alternatives. So, you're investigating the site and then you're trying

to define what's there and what action you're going to take.

Hopefully, in our investigation piece, we won't find anything, but we're doing it because we do have a history out here of that type of training. And the point I wanted to make about this was that it's been delayed. There is some assets within the Army that have been sent in other directions, one is Tech Escort and they were out in -- they're out at Rocky Mountain Arsenal because of issues that went on out there.

So, since it's -- there is only a limited amount of these assets, it's caused us, every time they send them someplace else, to delay our investigation, because we have to have them on site. So, it's been delayed.

Originally, we were going to kick off here first of February and now we're going to kick off here first of March. It's been delayed a month.

We won't get to the field, field activities until the first of April. But we'll start the mobilization around the first of March, get into some training and other things that will lead up to

the field activity in April. And that's where we stand with it right now.

And that's all I've got, at this point.

DR. BARRY COX: Certainly appreciate it. One thing I would like to ask is: For the next meeting or the next two or three meetings, do any of you have any agenda items that you would like to see on the next couple of meetings? And I think -- if you think of them after this, I think Ron, E-mail those to Ron Massey or call him. Would that be the appropriate thing?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, Ron, Joan, or myself or anybody on my staff, you've got our E-mail. If you'll let us know, we'll try to get them on the agenda for discussion.

DR. BARRY COX: And one thing I would like to ask, too, when we have a presentation, it might be good, since we're sitting a good ways away, to make some handouts, you know, copies of the slides, because some of us, from back here it's really hard to see.

MR. RON LEVY: In fact what I'll do

is we'll produce the slides and we'll get them out for this particular briefing.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. RON LEVY: We'll get them out in the next mailing of Josh's --

DR. BARRY COX: I appreciate it.

MR. RON LEVY: -- discussion with everybody.

DR. BARRY COX: I appreciate that. Any RAB members have any other questions, anything that's happened so far?

Now we'll go to the audience comments or any audience questions, rather. And what I would like to ask you to do: If you have a question, if you would, first off your name, because, as you can tell, we're taking minutes of everything that occurs.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: My name is Wanda Champion. And one of my basic questions that I've got is what he was talking about up there and the situation with El Salvador and the fault line that was on the news the other day, and they was talking about the fact that that comes straight up into Alabama.

So, how would this that you presented here affect, in other words, with the moving of the underground, of the earth and the rocks and all and everything like that, would this possibly tie into making something move quicker than what y'all have discussed here this evening and so forth, and checking into that because, you know, that was on the news, telling about that. So, that's one question I have, but I have some others.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Could you state for the record who you're representing, please.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: I'm representing myself as a concerned citizen of Calhoun County.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Okay, that's fine.

DR. BARRY COX: Do we have an answer for her question?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The answer is it's generally thought that this will not affect any earth movement. I believe there has been no historical record of any active faults within the area of Calhoun County. And I've got that information from the Alabama Geological Survey. And I personally don't

know when the last recorded earth movement or earthquake, if you want to call it, was in this area.

MR. ROY MACKY: I've got a question. I'm Roy Macky. I'm here with -- and her, we're here together and all that.

I don't know how y'all look at this for a transferring the land from the government, from the federal government to the community and all that, but some of the other places that's been closed throughout the country at other forts -- I don't know how they're transitioning, but it may be a good idea to look at them and see how they do it. Theirs maybe went smoother than ours.

DR. BARRY COX: Miki, you want to field that one?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I will say that the laws that close all of the bases are the same laws. We all have to operate under the same ones. However, we do have a national organization called the National Association of Installation Developers, and we all -- we -- I'm a member of that organization. And we meet yearly and a couple of times a year in other events, smaller groups, and we talk a lot and

share ideas, because there is just a small group doing this across the country. And we have to work together. They have a website, if you're interested in looking at their website, and looking at some of the information that's on there. It's NAID.com.

MR. PAUL JAMES: If I could also point out, Miki --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. PAUL JAMES: -- the economic development conveyance under which the property was provided to the JPA was a little different than some of the other earlier ones, because it was a no-cost.

In the past, the JPA or an equivalent organization, was required to pay the government so much money. So, from that standpoint, we're kind of leaders, if you will --

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Right.

MR. PAUL JAMES: -- in that area.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And that was a benefit to the community.

MR. ROY MACKY: In other words, we're making more progress than some of the other places out there?

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Yes, sir.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Correct.

MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Yes, sir. You also have to remember that in defense of the guys sitting around this table from the Army, the Fort did not close until September of 1999, September 30, 1999. They trained here until that date, so, you know, we've had a lot happen in that short period of time since they closed.

MR. ROY MACKY: The other places that have closed, have they made as much progress in the short amount of time as we have?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Let me address that. From the Army's perspective, we have a number of places and we work together all the time, and, you know, we have people who work on Fort Ord, California and a lot of other places throughout the country. We meet annually with other Army installations that's closing and the people who actually deal with it. We meet with Department of Defense, other agencies, Air Force, Navy, annually, and discuss how the progress is going, not only from our perspective, but we also meet at the Department of Defense level, we meet with the

LRAs, the JPA here, they're in attendance of the meetings. And so, you know, we try to use lessons learned and it goes pretty well.

There is always problems. And each state, because of the requirements by the state for clean-up, has an effect on how fast property transfers.

MR. ROY MACKY: Okay. I understand about the clean-up and the red tape and a lot of that stuff I don't understand and all, but this stuff, the reason (inaudible).

MR. PHILIP STROUD: When I inherited the project, when I came on to it, I learned from the Department of Defense on how complicated this site is compared to others across the nation. And I think just the sheer complexity of the terrain here, also, I hear it all the time, it just adds a completely new dimension to clean-up and how fast and things like that.

And you're hearing about the complex geology. And some sites are in different regions and they mean different things.

MR. ROY MACKY: But the landfill

don't cover the whole post and all -- the rest of the post. Thank you.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: My question is: Can you tell me these two chemicals that you're talking about that are in the landfill? Are these two chemicals, can they be airborne, even in -- I know they're in the ground water, but when you're moving the landfill, can they be airborne? And how dangerous and what kind of chemicals are these?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: If in fact there is any movement, there will be some type of air monitoring associated with any type of construction or dirt moving activities. And that's generally a standard practice, those will be monitored. If this gets into a vapor form, then there will be guidelines for either stopping the vapor movement or stopping the work until vapor movement has stopped.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: In fact, that would be one of the reasons we might not choose to look at a movement of a landfill. It would be a cap and leave it as it is.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: Okay, but if you cap it, then it's going to go -- continue going

into the ground water, right?

MR. RON LEVY: No, not necessarily.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: Not necessarily? Okay, if you do decide that you're going to move the landfill, where would your places be to move it to? Would the incinerator be one of the names in question?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No, the incinerator wouldn't. It would probably be relocated to another landfill on post and just another method of encapsulation of that landfill.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: Would you put it close to a place that you're cleaning up that would be a place where JSU is going to put maybe a child --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No.

MR. RON LEVY: Certainly, no, certainly not that.

MS. JEANETTE CHAMPION: There is not one place that you're going to take and put it all in one place here at the Fort, everything you clean out, that one place here at the Fort?

MR. RON LEVY: Part of the

consideration would be to consolidate our landfills into one location. We'll look at that location, in terms of where it's at and, you know, what impact it might have across the rest of the property. But if you can free up other -- the thought there is -- and I'm not saying this is what we're doing -- but the thought there is, if you can free up other property that has these fill areas into one location, then you can conceivably say that property is no longer burdened with some sort of control on that and make it available for reuse.

DR. BARRY COX: But if you did that, you would have to use the modern-day standard for landfills; is that correct?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. And you may never, ever get away from saying that it's completely usable. I mean, that's part of the issue that we're getting into.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: That's one of the thoughts that's coming out of this EE/CA that Ron talked about earlier for landfills. And we really haven't reached that decision factor. And it has a lot to do with, you know, is it really technically

feasible to move some of these; maybe, maybe not, depends on --

MR. RON LEVY: And does it buy you anything? Does it really give you something from a cleanliness standpoint or from a land reuse standpoint? I mean, there is some real good discussion that can go along with that.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: The gentleman was talking about here with the water, with the Coldwater Springs, the other gentleman was talking about here, a couple of them, in other words, with the Weaver water and with the well. Okay, my question would be, also, the fact that since Coldwater Springs does contribute to, I think you said, 99 percent of the water usage in Calhoun County, so, therefore, where would we go if this ever got into the water that supplies all of Calhoun County and who knows where else?

DR. BARRY COX: Of course, that's, I think out of the -- I don't think anything here is going to get there. But there is a contingency plan in case the Anniston water supply was contaminated. The Depot has had that in place for some time.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Could you tell me what the contingency plan is?

DR. BARRY COX: Sure. If you call the Depot, I'm sure they could give you a copy of it. There is a written contingency plan.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Would this be found within that file at the public -- Anniston Public Library?

DR. BARRY COX: I'm sure it is. But, you know, the easiest way is just simply to call the environmental office at the Depot and they'll provide you with one.

MR. RON LEVY: I think her point is that our landfill is going to impact the county's water.

DR. BARRY COX: No.

MR. RON LEVY: I think that's what she was pointing out.

DR. BARRY COX: Was she asking that question? I'll let you answer that one then.

MR. RON LEVY: I think your question as to, are our contaminants of concern here going to affect the -- and we don't believe that to be

the case. We're obviously concerned about Weaver and its wells. But as far as the city and the county's water supply, we don't see that as an issue, particularly since the distance between here and -- we just don't see that as an issue from McClellan's standpoint.

Now, what Dr. Cox was pointing out was there is another issue going on with Anniston Army Depot and the water supply, but that's a whole different RAB and a whole different place to go discuss it.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: But one of the things about the water, in other words that I was trying to make, is the fact that, if the -- wherever the contaminants could come from -- because I've been raised up in Calhoun County all my life -- and I'm forty-seven years of age -- so, in other words, the point is, that if the water supply, which is Coldwater Springs, ever does get contaminated, Calhoun County is doomed as a town.

DR. BARRY COX: But I think what Ron's saying is that's not the concern of this RAB, that as far as that area there.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Okay, it should be a concern of this RAB.

MR. PETE CONROY: We care about it, it's just not our charge.

DR. BARRY COX: Yeah, it's not our charge.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: You need to put it on your agenda.

MR. PETE CONROY: That's a different RAB. And we'll give you the date for that meeting.

DR. BARRY COX: Sure. And if you want to come to that RAB meeting, we'd be more than happy to have you meet for that RAB.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Well, that was another question. Who was the RAB and what meeting are you talking about?

MR. PETE CONROY: Ms. Champion, give me a call and I'll give you all that information.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Okay. Another question that was not answered for Jeanette Champion down there that I didn't hear was the chemicals. What chemicals are y'all talking about that have been

found?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The chemicals that I mentioned were 1, 1, 2, 2-tetrachloroethane.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Can you spell that?

MR. STEVE MORAN: T-E-T-R-A-C-H-L-O-R-O-E-T-H-A-N-E.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: T-E-T-R-A-C-H-L-O-R --

MR. STEVE MORAN: -- E-T-H-A-N-E.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: -- E-T-H- --

MR. STEVE MORAN: -- A-N-E. And 1, 1, 2-Trichloroethene. The same word, except instead of tetra, it's tri.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: On these chemicals, what are some of the things that health-wise that they could cause?

MR. STEVE MORAN: You're asking the wrong people.

MR. RON LEVY: You know, it's probably a good question, but, you know, there is a lot of things that go along with defining what the health impacts are from a particular chemical concern.

One is the concentration, how long a person has been exposed, whether a person has been exposed. And we don't know that that's the case here.

So, I'm sure it's a good question. My point is that we couldn't tell you specifically without going back and looking at these particular solvents. And also, who the persons -- appears the persons of being exposed, that would take us some time to go in and look at that. And again, we don't know that that's the case, either.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: That evaluation, Ron, is at some point in time a part of the process?

MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: But most of that is cleaning. Is that again, in the common terms, is that cleaning solvent part of that and then what else?

MR. STEVE MORAN: Chlorinated solvents are used in typical industrial practices for cutting -- it's used as a cutting oil, as cleaning or as a cleaning solvents, are PCE, which is very similar to TCE, is used in your dry cleaners, things like

that, yes.

DR. BARRY COX: Very good degreaser, yeah.

DR. BARRY COX: Any other questions?

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Well, I do have another one here. The gentleman spoke about the fact that permits to the well on private property. And then the other questions, which I didn't really like that you comment was, in other words, depends on how long it will take to get the permits, blah, blah, blah. To me, that is red tape, that is a bunch of -- another word I'm not going to say.

But in other words, I think what my run-in is with the gentleman here, no -- you know, to you, if you're with ADEM -- you know, ADEM, when you turn this stuff over to Joint Powers Authority, you got all this legislation, all these issues coming up with the Joint -- Calhoun County Commission, with just a litter patrol, you know, with them trying to zone Calhoun County.

DR. BARRY COX: What is your question?

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: The point is, is the fact the permit that he was talking about --

MR. RON LEVY: That was Ellis that was talking --

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: -- depends on how long it will take to get permits. So, what do y'all have in effect, in other words, to get started on this instead of dragging it through the red tape?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I think it was the permits on the wells.

MR. ELLIS POPE: Was talking about the right of -- what we have to do is get written permission from the property owner to install a well on the property. Once we choose where those wells will go, then we have to get written permission from the individual property owners, on whose property that well will be. And it's just sometimes that takes time. I mean --

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: My next question would be: What steps have y'all taken to go ahead and start talking to property owners to get permission?

MR. ELLIS POPE: We haven't talked

to them, yet, because we haven't determined the locations of the wells, yet. That's in the planning process right now.

And once we establish where those wells will go, then we'll approach the property owners and talk to them about it.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Where would the proximity of the wells be that y'all would be looking at to begin with?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We are looking to the west of the landfill, at this point in time, and we just haven't nailed down the site's location. (Inaudible) to the west of the Anniston Jacksonville Highway.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: I would like to say one other question. And this is a question that I have put to a lot of the environmental groups is the fact that we get handed out phone numbers, given phone numbers, over and over and over. There has not been one group, environmental group, yet, to come up and put a booklet together to give to the citizens of Calhoun County or anywhere else in The State of Alabama that are concerned enough to come to

environmental meetings and address their issues and speak up for their community, because I have two daughters, I have three grandchildren, I am a concerned parent, and I am a concerned member of this community, and I don't see why, with all the money that the federal government puts out and the state government puts out, that we cannot come up with some kind of a booklet with information that has ADEM and all their phone numbers, fax, E-mails, whatever you want to call it, websites, also, the fax of EPA, putting it all together, because Pete Conroy right here, I've talked to him before and some of the others and stuff, that y'all could put all these numbers together and make that available to the public, and I don't see why you do not, like a phone directory, instead of going and digging through the phone book --

MR. PETE CONROY: I think I can get you one as soon as you need it. Leslie (phonetic) has put it together.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Not just me, but for the whole community.

MR. PETE CONROY: As of your phone call tomorrow, I'll get you a whole stack of them.

MS. WANDA CHAMPION: Okay.

DR. BARRY COX: Anybody else have a question? I want to remind you that if you haven't already and you're not a member to, please, make sure you sign the sheet as you go out.

And certainly want to thank all the non-members for coming. It's great to have a large crowd and great to have a lot of interest. And we certainly appreciate that.

And do I hear a motion, at this time, for adjournment?

MR. PETE CONROY: So moved.

MR. BUFORD: Second.

DR. BARRY COX: Appreciate everybody's attendance again. Thank you for coming.

(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 30th of January, 2001.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2001.