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 16th day of July, 2001, commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.

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

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: If we could go ahead and get started, please. Need a gavel. Order, all you. We'll start with the roll. Dr. Cox is apparently not here. Mr. Ryan is --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Present.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- present. Mr. Hood? Mr. Beckett? Mr. Branchfield? Mr. Buford? Mr. -- and I apologize if I pronounce these names wrong -- Mr. Clendenin?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Conroy? Mr. Cunningham?

MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Elser?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Ms. Fathke --

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- is here. Mr. Franklin?

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Freeman? Dr. Harrington?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'm here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Hopper?

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mayor Kimbrough? Mr. Stratton? Mr. Thomassy?

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Turecek? And we have Mr. Levy, Mr. --

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- EPA, and Mr. ADEM are all here.

Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes from June or would anybody like to take a couple of minutes to review the minutes from June?

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yes, one correction I have in here. Let me get to it. No, the only ones I have were May. I didn't get the June. Oh, okay, I've got them here, and it has me present. I missed the June meeting.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay. We can make that correction.

Mr. Buford is here.

Do we want to approve the minutes, assuming that change will be made, or do we want to wait until the next meeting? Does it matter? What's the --

MS. DONNA FATHKE: I move we approve them with the changes.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay, let's do that. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes with the change that Mr. Thomassy be deleted as being present at that meeting?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Just don't delete him permanently. I so move.

MR. JERRY ELSER: Second.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: The minutes are accepted, except Mr. Thomassy's name will be deleted. Is there a need to reissue the minutes to everybody or is there an official copy kept somewhere? I don't know.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: What we'll do is, we'll make this part of the official minutes here, and so the correction will show up on the next month's minutes.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay, that

sounds good. Good, moving right along.

Old business? Is there any old business? I was not at the last meeting, so I don't know if there is any old business. No?

Before I move on to new business, I've been delinquent already in my responsibilities. I would like to go around the room and have all the guests, please, introduce themselves and their affiliation or association. Start right over here, please.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Josh Jenkins, IT Corporation.

MR. POPE: Ellis Pope, Corps of Engineers.

MR. JOE DOYLE: Joe Doyle, Legal Office, Transition Force.

MR. RICHARD SATKINS: Richard Satkins, Parsons.

MR. BILL GARLAND: Bill Garland, U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Joan McKinney with the RAB.

* MR. JOE CUDNEY: Joe Cudney with

Parsons.

MR. JEFF ULMER: Jeff Ulmer with Parsons.

MS. DEBBIE TAGUE: Debbie Tague, Corps of Engineers.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James, Task Force, Environmental Office.

MR. BOB DAFFRON: Bob Daffron, National Guard Training Center.

MR. BOB SELFRIDGE: Bob Selfridge Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

MR. DAN COPELAND: Dan Copeland, Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson, Fort McClellan, Transition Force.

MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks, Transition Force, Environmental Office.

MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Lisa Kingsbury, Transition Force, Environmental Office.

MAJOR MORRISON: Major Morrison, Transition Force.

MS. DIANE WILKERSON: Diane Wilkerson, RAB.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay, good. Thank you. Moving on to new business. Take it from here, Ron?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I'll take it from here. I want to introduce Joe Cudney. He's the project manager from Parsons. If you'll remember, Parsons is a contractor for Huntsville Corps of Engineers. And their mission out here was to characterize for chemical warfare material.

This was briefed at, I believe it was the February RAB meeting up at JSU, that we were going to start on the field work. Well, we've completed the field work. And Joe is going to give you what the results -- what we know of the results at this point are. It pretty much concludes the effort that went on in the field.

I believe, Joe, you're going to talk a little bit of background --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Yeah, I'll talk background --

MR. RON LEVY: Bring folks back up to speed --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: -- of what we're

doing.

MR. RON LEVY: -- as to what we have going on.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Like Ron said, I'm Joe Cudney, I'm the project manager with Parsons. We came out to do the chemical warfare EE/CA, which was kind of a precursor in certain areas to the conventional, the HTRW investigations backed out.

And to kind of help you guys along, I've thrown up two maps on either side of the room that kind of depict where our sites are. There is a little red box which will show you, you are here. That's really where we're sitting in building 215.

And the rest of the map shows you kind of where our sites are spread out. So, as I reference this and I go back through each site, you'll be able to look at the wall and kind of get an idea where that site lays on Fort McClellan. And if you have any questions -- I'm going to keep this as informal as possible -- just raise your hand, stop me at any time, and ask the questions. Okay?

What we do can get very technical, and so if you have any questions, if I use an

abbreviation, just ask me. Sometimes I do it second nature in my sleep.

What I'm going to brief you on is what we did for the chemical warfare material EE/CA. We started about twenty weeks ago. And before we can do any work, what we have to do is we have to go through an extensive safety training.

And the Army comes out and they test it. They run us through scenarios and they make sure we can do it safely and we can do it the way we said we would do it.

These two pictures are just examples of some of the testing we had to go through. Those guys are in special equipment, they call it protective equipment, so that we're safe when we're dealing with stuff that we're not sure what it is. But those are just two examples.

What are we out here to do? An engineering evaluation and cost analysis. We're really trying to assess whether or not there is any potential chemical warfare material left at some of these training sites at Fort McClellan. These sites were identified through the ASR, the archive search

report and previous studies.

Once we can resolve whether or not there is any CWM -- we're going to use that terminology a lot -- once we resolve those issues, then we can revisit these sites, other contractors can go out and look at OE concerns and also HTRW concerns. So, we're focusing just on the CWM side at each of these sites.

Who is involved? Well, first and foremost is the BRAC transition team; the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District; and then U. S. Army Engineering Support Center, Huntsville. You've heard these names. These people are here. We work for Huntsville directly and we have subcontractors.

Human Factors Applications, they're our ordnance contractor. They help us with any ordnance issues we find while we're out here dealing with CWM.

U. S. Army Technical Escort Unit called TEU, they work for Huntsville directly. They are a government agency that handles response to chemical events, releases, emergencies. They're on site whenever we do work, so in the event that we

would find something, they handle it.

Also, we have what's called Edgewood Chemical and Biological Command. They do all our air monitoring. They monitor the air around where we're working to make sure that we don't have any detections for agent in the air.

We also keep an ambulance on standby, right here at the site, while we're doing the work. And we work closely with Northeast Regional Medical Center.

What was done out here at Fort McClellan? I'm going to briefly go through history. Just in general, this was the primary chemical site for the Chemical Corps School in '51. In the '50s and '60s, they did training in confidence, decontamination of chemical, response, chemical filling, demonstration.

These training procedures usually involved small amounts of agent. When I say "small amount," I'll preface this later, when I say a certain amount, I'm going to try to show you what in reality -- just to put it in context -- what small amounts of agent are.

But it was training in agent handling, agent decontamination, agent identification. It's not -- they didn't fire live rounds of agent, but they trained with agent in these areas.

The Chemical School departed in 1973. And they decontaminated the sites and moved the agents to Edgewood Arsenal or Anniston Army Depot.

Here is some of the agents that we were looking for. Mustard or H&HD is a blister agent. It's a liquid that's got a vapor point of about 70 degrees, turns to a gas.

Lewisite is a lot like mustard. It's a blister agent.

The next two agents are called nerve agents, and they attack the nervous system; that is GB, sarin, or BX. Phosgene is a choking agent. And BZ is an incompacitating agent. They called it -- it was kind of a psychedelic agent. It was nicknamed at one point, agent buzz.

We're also going to -- issues -- other agents of concern really are the decontamination stuff, the stuff they used to decontaminate the agents. STB is super tropical bleach. Think of it as

a powdered bleach, okay. DS-2 and DANC are also other decontamination agents they used when they did training.

Previously, in the '90s, a number of investigations were done to sample some of these sites to see if there had been any use due to chemical training. In 1998, the archive search report provided general summaries of a lot of these sites. And that helped, along with interviewee comments, to depict which sites we would need to go back out and take a look at.

A little over a year ago we went out and we did what's called a geophysical survey, where this is kind of a precursor to our investigation. This tells us where we need to look and what we need to look at. And I'll kind of give you a little summary on what that is.

Thirty-three potential sites were identified through the ASR and subsequent records reviews. After reviewing the data on those sites, sixteen sites were deemed that no further data needed to be collected this time. Doesn't mean they're not going to be addressed in the EE/CA, but we're not

going to collect any more data during this field effort.

That leaves us twelve training locations and five mustard spill areas that were addressed during this investigation. This is just another copy of the two maps I've got up on the wall. That shows the locations of the twelve training sites and the five mustard spill locations.

The first site we're going to look at is called the smoke ranges. Just to let you guys know, we just finished digging on these sites last Monday. We're just getting in the process of demob'ing, so a lot of this information I'm going to give you is just straight out of the field. This is what we're starting to look at.

The smoke ranges were used for smoke generating equipment and fog oil training from the '50s to the '70s. The reason it ended up in a chemical EE/CA is because it was deemed a chemical area. They used to deem chemical as -- smoke as chemical.

So, what we did in this area, as you can see by this yellow dashed line right here, the

lower southeastern corner of the smoke ranges actually overlay some conventional ranges. So, there was a concern that there may be some conventional ordnance along the southeast corner.

What we did is we spread out twenty-four grids. Really, what these are is one hundred by one hundred foot areas that are staked out. And we ran geophysics over those areas. And I said it again -- and I'll get to that in one minute as to what exactly that is.

We ran geophysics over these areas. We detected what I call anomalies. Really, those are metallic anomalies that we found in the subsurface after running the geophysics that we want to investigate and see if they have anything to do with OE, with CWM, or any of the above.

What is geophysics? What does it look like? We used what's called an electromagnetic instrument. It's called an EM-61. This is a picture of a guy right now towing that EM-61. It's a real fancy metal detector. It picks up iron, picks up aluminum. And these come up as anomalies on a picture. And what we do, we go back out and we

re-find those anomalies and we go ahead and we dig them up and find out what they were.

You can't tell the difference between things, but you can narrow down by the signature the size and you can estimate somewhat the depth of what you're looking at.

What did we find in the smoke ranges? We found smoke grenades expended, pop flares, dummy grenades, practice grenades, found a lot of wire mesh, barb wire, fence posts, a lot of just trash in that respect. We did find some OE, but no CWM.

Which brings us to the next area. T-38 is kind of in the middle of the smoke ranges. T-38 was a reaction area used by the technical escort unit, or TEU, from the '60s to the '70s. They did training up there on mishap training. They had accident sites where they'd send them out to see how they would respond to accidents and train in responding to accidents. They also stored agent at T-38.

And we looked at -- what you see by these little red areas is where we did geophysics. Basically, we staked out these whole areas and ran

EM-61 in three foot spacing so you cover the entire area. And what we're looking for is we knew they had a disposal pit left up there from when they did training, they kind of deposit all their decon stuff into. That disposal pit is this little pink blob right here.

And we also know from interviewee comments that they supposedly buried a drum of mustard agent that was kind of a little worse for the wear in that area. So, we're looking for the drum of agent. And the interviewee comment said they either buried the agent on the south end of the compound, which is this area down here, or it could have been to the east of the storage pad, which is this pink square right here.

So, we surveyed those two areas. But after actually getting out in the field and actually talking with the interviewee, it turns out they never used this southern half during that time frame. So, that put the suspect drum area actually up in this area right here. So, we went ahead and we brushed cleared that and surveyed that while we were out there. So, we can go ahead and see if there is

any remnants of a drum left at T-38.

What did we find? The smaller individual anomalies that we dug, we found fence posts, barb wire, reinforced concrete, sheet metal, communications wire, scrap, nails. We did find one empty 75 millimeter projectile casing. We found two disposal pits or could be one disposal pit, right in that same disposal area. That disposal area is right here. (Demonstrating.)

Just for your reference, the 75 casing was found down here. And that was actually partially on the surface. But what I want to do is I want to look at those disposal pits.

We did some soil sampling. We put in some borings. And the preliminary results showed non-detect for agent and what I call agent breakdown products. Basically, that's what the agent breaks down to when it's left in the soils for an amount of time. When I say ABP, that's what I'm talking about.

This is a blow-up of what we think was the disposal pit. These pink lines are trench lines. We used a backhoe and we trenched through the pit, trying to determine what's in it, how deep it is.

This is what we found. We ran four trenches. We found a total of three, 4.2 inch chemical mortars. We found STB drums, or super tropical bleach drums. We found two fifty-five gallon chemical drums. We found some -- a glass vial and some glassware. And we found some FS smoke balls. Now, I'll show you pictures of what all that looks like so you can get an idea of what we looked at.

This is what it looks like when we excavated out there. We used a backhoe. And the protective equipment the guys wore, which was called level B, is they were in suits with supplied air when they dug these.

We also monitor the air while we're doing all the digging. And we didn't getting any detections for agent while we were doing the digging.

This is an example of a 4.2 inch chemical mortar. All three that we found were empty. This is an example of an FS smoke ball. We found bits and pieces of a lot of them.

This drum you see right there is an STB drum. It's also called a fifty pound drum. It's about the size of a ten gallon drum. And this here is

a fifty-five gallon chemical drum, with the real thick side walls as an indicator.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Were you able to identify the original contents of the drum?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: No, these drums were empty or they had bits and parts of soil in them. We sampled the soil in the drums and underneath the drums. And the results -- the preliminary results are that there was no agent or breakdown products in the soil around the drums.

We also dug into this anomaly on the other side of the street to see if it's the same kind of thing. This is a picture of what it looked like when they were trenching in that anomaly.

What did we find there? We found bits and pieces of a fifty-five gallon drum that was empty. And that was a chemical drum. We found some more STB drums.

We also found fabric. What it was is they laid a road on top of these pits after they put them in. And they put a fabric down underneath the road. So, we cut through the road and we got to the fabric, then we got to the stuff underneath the

road.

Again, there weren't any detections in the air or soils for agent. What we did find, remnants of the stuff they trained with.

Which brings us to our next site we're going to look at, and that's T-31. It's immediately north of the smoke ranges. This is an area that the technical escort unit used before they moved to T-38 for training.

What they did here is they used sarin or GB, the nerve agent, and mustard, in small quantities, twenty to forty milliliters, to decontaminate objects. Well, they'd put it on objects to contaminate them and then they'd decontaminate them.

This is a vial that's a forty milliliter vial, just to give you an idea of how much forty milliliters of agent is, so you can have an idea of how much that is.

What we did here is we focused our investigation. We used old photos of what T-31 looked like at the time they used it. And what we did is we focused on areas where they did trainings. Where were

the clear areas? Where were areas that looked like they would have buried something? A scarred area?

And these little hatched lines you see are areas where we ran geophysics to try to pinpoint where they would have done training and where they could have left something behind.

We also used kind of field reconnaissance. We were out at these sites, we'd look around. If we saw something that was kind of suspicious, we would go ahead and look at that, as well. And that's kind of where this grid here comes from.

We found a mound that looked like it was pushed up by a bulldozer. And there were anomalies in the middle of the mound, so we decided that was suspect enough that we put a grid on it and surveyed it.

We also threw in six soil borings along the road network that used to be T-31 to try to sample for any residual agent in the soils.

What did we find? We found fence posts, fencing, barb wire, sheet steel, pipes, communications wire. We did find one M-2 magazine.

We found nails, lot of nails. Hoe, scrap metal.

The preliminary soil sample results were non-detect for agent and breakdown products. Just to give you an example of just the pictures are of terrain of what T-31 looks like up in that area.

MR. RON LEVY: Joe, tell them what you mean by preliminary soil samples.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Well, we've got soil samples back, but we're still working on validating the results to make sure that they're right. Right now the results show no agent.

When we take a soil sample, it has to be cleared before it can leave the site. So, basically, to check the vapors of the soil to make sure there's no detections of agent before it goes off-site. And then they analyze the actual soil itself. Right now the soil results that have come back, have come back clean or non-detect for agent.

Naylor Field is the next site we looked at. Naylor Field, to give you guys an indication, is down here. (Pointing.) It's right down past the kind of the cantonment area, right in the middle. Naylor Field was identified on a 1956 map

as the howitzer hill decon area.

Basically, they would train on techniques of decontamination here. They'd pour amounts of agent on things and then decontaminate them. Usually, they used around forty milliliters, but some of the interviewees comment they used up to two gallons of something.

There is eight training areas that were located kind of on the north end of it that also were set up for training for decon.

What we did was we focused our investigation on taking soil samples from this training area. And what we did is we took soil samples from the drainage areas where everything, the drain, the ditches from these training areas.

We also put a one hundred by one hundred foot geophysical grid right in the middle of Naylor Field. And the reason we did that is that if you look at old historical photography, there is a road that goes right down to this grid and stops. And then you got an open area. So, it's a logical dumping area where they could have disposed of things. So, that's why we focused the grids.

But what did we find is the big question? Found lots of drum lids. Speculation is the guys would hurl the drum lids off the top of the hill to the bottom. A lot of drum lids from STB drums in the range.

We found one partial STB drum. We found some concrete bombs on the surface. These were just concrete bomb-shaped like projectiles that they would -- I'm not sure exactly how they would train with them. I'm not sure. A lot of people say they used them as road markers or, you know, markers of entrances and exits to the areas.

The soil samples also on those ten locations we put in in the drainage network came back non-detect for agent and agent breakdown products. Again, we didn't get any detections in the air while we were doing the investigation.

The next area I want to look at is Cane Creek training area. And that's really almost right across the street from Naylor Field, right next door.

This area was on -- again, was on a 1956 map showed as a chemical corps training area for

decontamination. And if you look at the old maps, all the training was done on the west side of Cane Creek. So, that's where we focused our investigation.

The geophysics we ran were kind of focused a little more toward the road. The reason being is we couldn't brush clear up real close to the creek, but we did schonsat some of that and didn't finds any anomalies. But we did find six anomalies in the area we did survey. We went ahead and we put in soil borings all along the creek to look for agent and agent breakdown products.

Nobody's done any work at Cane Creek, previously, so this is the first work that was done out there. What did we find? Mostly scrap, nails, conduit, rebar, hinges. We did find one magazine full of blanks.

The soil sampling results, again, were non-detect for agent and agent breakdown products. We didn't find anything related to CWM. The only ordnance item would have been the magazine.

While we were out here -- let me back up a little bit, if I can do that. While we were out here, looking around, again, we found an area that

was kind of suspect to us. We found a depression about six feet around that had ring-offs in it. So, we went ahead and we dug that depression, as well. It turned out to be trash, steel, rebar, some drain pipe. It wasn't anything.

That's kind of a picture of what Cane Creek, the whole area looks like, real close to Cane Creek.

Agent ID area, that's the next area we're going to look at. It's right in the middle of the cantonment area. You guys familiar with the area? It's kind of across from the credit union. It's in that big, open field between the PX and the credit union. Right now there is a circular track out there.

The only reason we looked here is that on a '59 map there was a little block that said agent identification area where they could have potentially done identification of agent, training for the troops.

There is no other information available. We wouldn't expect them to use live agent right in the middle of the cantonment area, but we went ahead and we stuck two one hundred by one hundred

foot grids right over the top of that footprint so we could go ahead and look exactly where it said the agent ID area was.

We found twenty-one anomalies. We also found some utilities, older utilities, very old utilities, from the results that we looked at.

What did we find? Found a lot of storm drain pipe. Found reinforced concrete. Found a manhole cover, we found a partial one, and there is also a full one that says in the neighborhood of Camp McClellan, 1918, 1919.

MR. RON LEVY: Where did the manhole cover go?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: I'm still working on that. I'm going to have to drop that manhole cover from this talk pretty soon, because I'm not sure where it is.

MR. RON LEVY: It's a historic piece of --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: But we did get what we wanted. We found the foundation, we think, of where that building would have been and the area around it. And again, there were no detections in the

air when we were doing the work. And the soil results came back non-detect.

The old burn pit, this is kind of a strange site. This site was added during the ASR site visit. They were out walking around in the woods and they found this depression, another depression. It's our third one, remember. This one was out in the woods behind the motor pool.

The old burn pit is actually -- I'm not sure I have it -- yeah, it's right here. Not that that means a lot. It doesn't mean a lot to me right now, either.

But it was a six foot depression. It was close to where they did chemical training. So they said, well, let's go ahead and take a look at this. So, we called it the old burn pit. It had a wire mesh through it and it had some, looks like, some protruding metal off to one side.

What are we looking for? We're not really sure. We used the agents that were used in those areas, which would have been mustard and sarin, and we set up what we call a nose. And really, that's our area where we keep the public out from where we're

working, for safety reasons.

What did we find? Well, the first depression yielded us kind of something we weren't expecting. This first picture right here is the ordnance items we pulled out of that first depression. No less than twenty ordnance. All practice and inert, but there were a lot of ordnance items in that pit. And again, that was just -- so, we didn't expect this, but it was ordnance items.

We didn't find any CWM stuff there. No detections in the air.

While we were walking around there, we found two more depressions right next door. We went ahead and looked in those, too. The second depression, we found an empty metal box with some smoke canisters. And the third depression, we found some just trash, no EO, no CWM, no nothing related to it.

So, it was interesting to find. That was just to give you an idea. That's an 81 millimeter mortar, those are 60 millimeter mortars. And most of these are bits and pieces of rifle grenades.

Training area 24 Alfa. That's located way to the southeast on your maps. Training area 24 Alfa was used for chemical munitions disposal field training for the troops. What they did is they trained on disposing of chemical rounds. They used chemical in containers and actually trained on how they would dispose of it.

This fenced area in the area that is now fenced of 24 Alfa, and there is also -- and from the '69 map, they picked up what could have been a former pit on the north side of the road. What we did is we ran geophysics fence to fence this entire area. We also ran geophysics over here to try and determine what would be left on the north side of the road of 24.

The other thing that makes this kind of interesting is this range also overlaps a lot of conventional ranges. So, we were looking for disposal areas, but we were also going to dig some of the smaller anomalies to see if there was any ordnance also in that area.

What agents did they use out here? They used phosgene. They used sarin and mustard, but

they also used BZ, that was that incapacitating agent that I talked about before.

The site was decontaminated in 1973 by DS-2. And the training agent they used normally were projectiles. There are a 105 millimeter and 155 millimeter projectiles. I'll show you a picture of those in a little bit.

This next map you're going to see is the results of the geophysics. Don't get thrown off by these red lines that shoot out. It's kind of a three dimensional picture of what we saw.

The pink blobs are the big anomalies. To give you a reference, this pink blob down here is about eighty feet across. It's a big area. Some of the smaller anomalies are eight to ten feet across.

We picked out eight to ten large anomalies, very large anomalies, to look at. We also assessed about twenty-three smaller ones to see what those were. We didn't dig all the smaller anomalies, but we dug a percentage of them.

Those bigger anomalies, what we did is we trenched into them. We actually dug a trench

line across them to try to determine what was in the pit or disposal area and how deep it was.

What did we find? In the disposal pits we found an empty 105 millimeter and 155 millimeter projectile. We found a 4.2 inch mortar that's not on here. We found expended five inch rocket motors. We found concrete bombs. We found charred soil and debris. We found charred wood.

The individual anomalies were mostly car parts and metal scrap. And when I mean car parts, I mean big parts of cars, really big parts of cars. We found one 81 millimeter and one 60 millimeter practice mortar, also, from the smaller anomalies.

To give you guys an idea of what it looks like when we're digging, this is it. This is 24 with all the different anomalies that we investigated with the backhoe. This is a picture of them digging with the backhoe and trenching along trench lines within the anomalies.

But what's better, if you want a picture of what we found. This is a blow-up of kind of what we found. These are 105 millimeter

projectiles. These are the -- the empty casings of 155s, so-called. That's a 105 millimeter projectile. And these long -- look like pipes, are five inch rocket motors.

This is the front end of a car. This is a seat out of a car with some other debris. And those are concrete bombs, bits and pieces, with some charred soil in that one right there.

The remaining sites that we looked at were soil sampling sites. Basically, we picked areas -- these areas were identified during the ASR as areas where we needed to look.

What we did in these sites is we didn't dig with a backhoe or do geophysics, what we did do is install soil borings and take soil samples.

Anywhere I said we took soil samples, we take them at two depths, a foot -- about a half a foot to a foot, and then three and a half to four feet. We take two samples out of each boring, just to give you an idea.

Black top training area. This area was used by the chemical corps as a training area. Really, what we think it was was a demonstration area

for flame throwing, smoke, decon equipment. What made it interesting is it had an inner fenced area right here, depicted by this pink line, where they had a fence within a fence, where it's possible they could have stored something.

Nobody has done any work out here previously, so what we did is we spread eighteen soil sample locations in and around the black top training area. What I neglected to tell you is where it is. That puts it kind of just west of Naylor Field on the other side of howitzer hill.

That's just a picture of the black top training area. The results have come back as non-detect for agent and agent breakdown products.

So, we did -- and when we installed these soil borings, we did it by hand with what we call a hand auger, which is just kind of a manual -- boy, I don't know how to describe it. It's very simple. It's almost like a post hole digger, very similar. That's the best description I can give you.

The next area we looked at was a dog training area. This area wasn't even deemed a chemical area, but again, this is another area that

during the ASR they were walking around and -- near the dog training area, and they saw this pad. And as you can see, it's heavily corroded and stained. So, what we did is we went ahead and put soil borings on either side of the pad and we ran them for agent and agent breakdown products.

Again, it came back negative. No air monitoring indicating anything when we were doing the digging. Just didn't really find anything.

The next area was the field personnel decon area. This area was used mainly for decontamination of the troops after they trained at Naylor Field. It's actually -- to give you guys an idea, it's right here, Naylor Field is over here. It's just on the other side of the black top training area.

The rest of the sites I'm going to talk about are all in this general area.

MR. RON LEVY: You might point out that the reason why there is so many sites down in that area is because that's where the original -- that's where the chemical school was originally situated for the MP school was before it left.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: So, what we did is the concrete pads that are sitting here are circa about 1940s. We did and we took and we put soil borings all the way around the pad and -- to see if there was any agent or agent breakdown products in the soils. Again, we didn't detect any from the sampling results that we've gotten back so far.

Old toxic training area. This area was used in the '50s for detection and identification of agent. They used really small amounts of agent. And they were most likely placed on the ground and they were used to -- so the troops could detect that's what agent smells like.

There is a fenced area in the purple that was deemed the old toxic training area. TEU, or technical escort unit, looked at that area back in '93 and didn't find anything.

But one of the interviewee comments said, well, maybe it wasn't on the south side of the building, maybe it was on the east side. I think that's where it might have been.

So, to close the loop, what we did is we went ahead and took some soil borings and put

them in right on the east side of the building where it would have been if it were there. That's what it looks like today.

This is the spot where the soil borings went in. We put them in -- since we're putting them in in black top, we had to actually core through the black top and asphalt to put in our soil borings. And that's just a picture of the guys coring.

Mustard spill sites. There were five sites identified as mustard spill sites. Four of them were identified from a 1977 map which showed basically these exact polygons or circles, those areas as mustard spill sites. We're not sure what it was related to.

A fifth site was added in 1998 by the environmental baseline survey. I'm pretty sure it was this one right here. But we think they could have had something to do with a transport mishap they had coming from T-38 on top of the hill to Naylor Field with agent. Maybe the guy was driving all around the base, I don't know.

But to close the loop on these

mustard spill sites, we put in four soil borings in each of these areas, spread out over the area and took two samples from each boring for the mustard spill sites and ran them for mustard. And we didn't get any detections for agent. Soil samples came back clean.

This is an example. It shows you what the guys look like when they're taking the samples. We set up air monitoring equipment around them. And that's what it looks like when they take a manual hand auger sample.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And those are based on wind direction?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Yeah, when we set up our area of exclusion, they set up sampling pumps all the way around them, one at them, two down gradient, and two upgradient. And also, we set up a perimeter that isn't really based on wind direction as much as it is a completely big circle all the way around the guys.

MR. FERN THOMASSY: What instruments were you using to monitor?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Edgewood comes out and they monitor with what we call near realtime.

They call them mini-cams. They're essentially a field GC. And it's near realtime.

We also have sampling pumps, which they call DAMMS tubes, which go out and collect it, over like a four hour cycle on an absorbent pad, and they run that pad for agent over that period. That tells you if you picked anything up in those four hours.

MR. DAN COPELAND: Ring (phonetic) fighter, also, Joe.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Oh, and the out (phonetic) fighter, that's another instrument we use, too. It shoots across the path, down gradient where we're digging.

MR. FERN THOMASSY: The what?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: They call it an out (phonetic) fighter. It shoots a foyer (phonetic) beam from an instrument to a reflector and back. It picks up particles across that path and analyzes those particles to see if they fall within what would be an agent.

To give you an idea, a summary, what did we do? We looked at twelve sites. We looked

at five mustard spill sites.

We confirmed what the training record said we found, remnant training materials. We found decontamination materials, STB drums.

We didn't find any evidence of chemical agent, which leads you to believe that it indicates they did do proper decontamination when they left these areas.

Again, we've been out of the field about a week, if that. Questions? That's a lot of material. If you guys have any questions, be really happy to back up all the way to the beginning, if need be.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: In the T-24 Alpha, you said some of the anomalies were eighty feet long. Would those -- was that just a group of some of the bigger objects?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: The objects we pulled out are a sample of what's in some of those pits. Let me back up, if I can, and elaborate on it.

MR. RON LEVY: You hit escape, then you can go to the --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Oh, man, I'll

never get back. I'm real close. Bear with me.

Like for instance, this anomaly down here, we trenched three trench lines through it. And what we picked out of that was a lot of charred debris and one 155 millimeter projectile that was charred.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, you didn't find a training car or anything down there, it was just --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: No. What we did is we looked across these. We cut across them and then we cut across at angles. We try to find out how deep it is. This is an EE/CA. So, we're trying to find out how deep it is and apparently what's in it. What have we found? We're not trying to remove everything out of that pit, we're just trying to get a sample of what's in it.

Any other questions?

MR. JERRY HOPPER: What lab were you utilizing for your soil sample analysis?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Edgewood. Actually, ECDC sends it to their own lab in Aberdeen.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: Okay.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Do the results that you got, Joe, I mean, do they pass the common-sense test? And the only reason I ask is they're using chemical weapon material out here for I don't know how many years. I assume it was a fair number of years. Granted it was thirty years ago, and I don't know how this stuff might naturally attenuate in the environment or break down in the environment. I mean, based on experiences of other Army sites where they did this type of training -- if there were any, I don't know -- I mean, when you guys started this investigation, did you expect to have such positive results as you obviously have come up with?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: You're going off my opinion here. And from my experience, what you're most likely going to get is if you get it in a container, are you going to have agent. If it gets in the soil, the odds of it retaining itself in the soil for thirty, forty, fifty years are pretty slim.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And that's because it breaks down naturally in the environment over time?

MR. JOE CUDNEY: It can happen. I

can't speak to that --

MR. RON LEVY: The fact that McClellan was never a manufacturing site for agent or agent and related ordnance material, I mean, speaks a lot. You know, we did training -- trained soldiers how to use the stuff, so you used limited quantities. And nothing was fired out here. And there wasn't any bulk amount of ordnance that they were trying to dispose of, either, because it all really was restricted training. You know, that says a lot about what you might find or what you wouldn't find out here.

MR. FERN THOMASSY: And I think all that comes to my question. When are you going to have a press release? For years this is the thing that we've been sitting on and haven't been able to answer. And it's really an important piece of information that needs to get out to the public as soon as possible.

We have a large segment of this community, from top to bottom, that thinks this place is contaminated, that thinks it's a horrible mess because there was chemical training here, that thinks they're going to find munitions, they're going to find

puddles of agent, they're going to find a number of things that we can continue to describe along the line that I've already described, and it's not there. And I think this is pretty conclusive proof, going into the areas that have been suspected all the way back from 1951, on up through the present time, and found absolutely nothing, not even agent breakdown products. And so that needs to get out, I believe.

MR. RON LEVY: And I agree with you. We have a public process we're going to follow under the EE/CA. And one of the things is once they complete the EE/CA and if we send it out for public -- we'll also have a separate public meeting to present that. And hopefully, the press will get in on that. Generally, they're invited to come here, too. So, they're not here today.

And then they'll be an action memorandum associated with that, in terms of what, you know, what we intend to do, which is really no further action, assuming that everything stays the way it does with the sampling.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: We still have some soil samplings that are out.

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah, you've got to close the books and get that last --

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Close the books and --

MR. FERN THOMASSY: -- couple of percent down.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: Exactly.

MR. RON LEVY: But we'll publish that in the newspaper, too, in accordance with the requirements for conducting an EE/CA. And EPA and ADEM, which when the document is completed, will also have a review period that they'll go through it and have their experts look at it. So, if there's anymore questions that come up, we'll try to address it. So, there is a lot more review to be done.

The other thing I wanted to point out to you, too, is that when we put the work plan together to investigate this site, see, it was not done strictly by the Army. The BCT, which includes the EPA and ADEM, was intimately involved in review and approval or concurrence to move ahead with what we said we were going to do in the field. I don't know if you -- do you want to add anything, Doyle, to that?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: No.

MR. RON LEVY: Phil?

MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Well, I just -- again, I've been out there watching them do this, if you want to call it sneaking, occasionally. And, you know, I've been in level B, too. I've appreciated what they've done. I've personally been involved from a consultant side, looking for chemical warfare material. For example at the Memphis Depot and a variety of other things. It's extraordinarily dangerous. But it's been a hot -- you know, a fairly hot summer, and I just want to commend y'all on a good job.

And under the constraint, they basically met their deadlines, they came in and -- but also, I want to heed caution, that we've still got a lot of investigations to do here, even with them gone. They will be called back if we ever see anything in the future.

MR. RON LEVY: In fact, Pelham Range --

MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Yeah. So, just, good job. I appreciate it.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: If you guys have any questions, at all, feel free to ask me. Be happy to answer any questions.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay. Good. Thank you.

Off to the agency reports. And Philip told me before the meeting that he wasn't prepared for this meeting. So, now is your opportunity to really beat him up.

MR. PHILLIP STROUD: No, I -- it's not that I'm really not prepared. It's just we've --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: That's not what you told me earlier.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: ADEM's going through a little restructuring in the land division. And I've got new bosses and I'm really getting them up to speed. The last month has been very tough, going through a new reorganization. And I'm dealing with guys that are directly and have always been involved with RCRA. And this is a CERCLA like process.

And I just want to let y'all know, that's going real good. I'm bringing good news, that they are getting up to speed and I'm able to start to

get the process rolling.

We lost Shannon Golden, and I've been reorganizing all his work that he's done and going through the filing system. And it's an enormous task.

But anyway, besides that, a couple of other notes. I have been doing an enormous review on the Charlie EE/CA. It's been one that's been a real big concern of mine, so I've spent many, many days, and it's been a big concern to ADEM. And so, it's going through a lot of iterations. And so, that's been a big issue.

So, I don't have a lot of reports to present, because we're not turning off a lot of clean land right now. We're dealing with very serious subjects now that take a lots of review. So, the grinder is slowing down a little bit.

And another note: The NAOC, when I had gone out to -- Las -- I mean -- I'm sorry, where did I go? Las Vegas, yeah.

Anyway, I'm still getting back incredible feedback from when I had gone out and done a presentation for the state's perspectives on the

unexploded ordnance, ordnance and explosives.

And it's remarkable the states that are calling me and e-mailing me. They're still wanting to -- they being the states, want to know why Fort McClellan is doing so well. And they hear it from a lot of people, apparently, the Pentagon and a variety of other sources.

And so I'm enjoying this. And I got a real nice letter back from the NAOC, thanking me, that it's a refreshing experience to them to have something like Fort McClellan in Alabama leading the nation.

Where I'm going to give the credit down to, it comes down to this RAB. And I let them know that, that the RAB was, in my opinion, one of the most important areas, because we have a very smart group here and we work well.

Some of the RABs have fallen apart around the nation. It's because, I think, they don't put out trust on the table and talk to each other.

I just want to let y'all know that the states are very interested in us. And there is a group called the ITRC, it's a -- this group allows

states to transfer technology nationwide. And it's all by the click of a button through the internet. And it's an incredible, powerful tool that I'm using, too, to understand what's going on with other sites around the nation. At any one moment, I can get a -- If I have a question, I'll get a thousand answers in a minute.

But what I'm saying is, is that the ITRC, that group of folks -- I've explained it before in the past -- but they want to actually come here and sit through a BCT and a RAB meeting so they can educate other people. I told them, I said, I don't -- I'd have to talk with everybody else here, but I have no problem with them, down the road, if we can make that -- may have a couple of guests from the ITRC, I'm all for it.

And also, just one quick note, I've been with IT and EPA and we've been looking -- we did spend a lot of time out at the ranges where they -- the small arms ranges quite a bit lately, and been looking at the questions of how far these things have really gone. They're big ranges, but they have big mountain sides, and we're trying to figure out is it

this much or is it this much. Is it a big range.

So, we've been really enjoying walking around these ranges, trying to make some serious decisions lately. And it will have a major impact on the future of our decisions on the small arms ranges, how those are going to be cleaned up. Y'all will be in the loop as we make these decisions.

I think that's all I have.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Good. Doyle?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Just echo what Phil said. You know, I'm reviewing documents and looking at ranges and trying to get the process moving. And I think we're making a lot of progress. Not aware of any problems.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And JPA is not here tonight. Ron, are you going to go through the action summary sheet?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I think we'll do that. As part of the first point bullet from the action summary sheet, what I'm going to do is, instead of going through what's in the action summary sheet, is let Josh Jenkins, who is sitting behind me here

from IT, give you an update of where we're at in the placement of the wells and the work that's being done on the investigation of landfill three. Josh.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I have a few maps here I just want to post again. Folks that were here at the RAB last month are going to recognize these. I think I'll just go through them one at a time since I have some limited space up here.

But what I wanted to just update you on is the work we're doing out there. We are installing monitoring wells off-post, one on-post. We also are sampling some monitoring wells and some homeowner wells in the area.

As of the last meeting, we had one well left to sample, which was S-5 up here to the north of landfill three. That well has been sampled. We have received the results. And with the exception of a suspected lab contaminant, methylene chloride at an extremely low level, two parts per billion, I believe, there was no contaminants detected in that sample that would indicate anything from landfill three up there.

So, to date, we have sampled the

off-site well locations shown on this map, with the exception of S-14. That location we deemed was not a good location, based upon some foreign material in that well. And that was -- made that decision a couple of months ago.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: What is foreign material?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, in this particular case, we actually saw an oily substance in the water. That gentleman's well was struck by lightning way back when. And when we pulled the pump out -- first of all, the pump in the well did not operate. And as most of you are aware, you got --if you have a homeowner well, you have a pump in the well, a submersible pump.

Well, this was an old pump. It had been struck by lighting. The pump acted as a lightning rod, so, as the electricity went through there, it got to the bottom and it just caused the pump to explode.

And in doing so, there was a little bit of oil in the well pump, itself, that got into the well. We felt that it would not -- trying to clean

that well up, would be almost impossible. And to get a representative sample of the actual water in the formation was really almost probably an impossible effort. So, we made a determination that that was not a good location to sample.

Now, this map shows some of our proposed well locations. And last month, at this time, I explained that we had these two wells up here on Blarney Drive in the City of Weaver. They were in the ground.

We have started on wells in the median. To date, we have installed all four wells, two up here to the north, one in the middle, and one to the south of the landfill. Those are all in the median. We have sampled -- or excuse me. We have installed one well on the church property. And that's a total of seven wells we installed to date.

We have one well left here. OLFG-20 on post. And there is also a deep well on the church property that remained to be installed. We are hoping to get those wells completed this week. But because of some equipment problems, it may go into next week when we actually get those wells complete.

We are sampling some of these wells here on the median that are coming up on our time frame to sample. We've sampled 21 last week. We sampled 22 today. We're going to sample OLFG-23 tomorrow. And at the end of the month, we'll sample 24.

And then the one -- the one well that we do have installed in the church property, that well will be coming up to be sampled in a few weeks.

On post, we have sampled sixteen wells around the landfill. There are two wells that were dry in March 2000. And those wells remained dry in May when we went out to check those, check the -- for the presence of water in those wells, so --

MR. RON LEVY: Go back to the other chart, Josh. Point something out. I'm going to put Ellis on the spot here. I understand we have potentially some good news about the well there by Cave Creek, that we may be able to sample or install, Mr. Brown's property.

MR. POPE: Well, we thought we were, but we -- they haven't gotten back with us. And we've repeated -- we tried to contact them and we --

they haven't returned calls, so it's kind of iffy right now.

MR. RON LEVY: We're still pursuing it?

MR. ELLIS POPE: Yeah, we're still pursuing it, but we haven't been given the green light, yet.

MR. RON LEVY: What's the well number on that one?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That proposed well number is OLFG-31.

And as I mentioned, just to show you this map, we have sampled sixteen wells on post, two of them are dry. And we should expect to start seeing preliminary results in the next week or so on several of these wells.

That's pretty much it. Any questions?

MR. RON LEVY: So, we should have some well data to present to the RAB at the next monthly meeting?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I anticipate that. I expect to have all of it. It should all

start coming in quite a bit in the next month. So, I think September was when we talked about having all the preliminary data.

MR. RON LEVY: That's right. September, that's right.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: On that first map, where you found the foreign material in the well, since that is so close to one of Weaver's water supply wells, could you absolutely eliminate any other type of contaminant other than the oil from the pump or could you isolate an oil that would be consistent in a pump? In other words, to make sure that there was nothing else in that well, as close as it is to Weaver's water supply? In other words, that's the closest well you've got to a Weaver water supply.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Uh-huh.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: And to not be able to sample that --

MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Was that a sheen on it or was there a thickness to that or was --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: There was actually some oil on the -- as we pulled the pump out, the pump was coated.

MR. RON LEVY: But you've got other wells over there off of Blarney Road that --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: These wells, yeah, in the other map, the purpose of these wells up here along Blarney Drive, our intent is to use these wells as a century-type location to get them closer to the City of Weaver, monitoring wells.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: But that other well is much closer to Weaver's water supply than those are on Blarney Drive.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes, sir, it --

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: And that was what concerned me, to have a well that close and not be able to get some kind of reading of any other contaminants that might be in there besides the oil from the -- that might have come from the pump.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, I think if you look, though, I mean, you've got wells that are essentially circling the landfill right directly across the road. Depending on what you see there, I mean, if they come up clean, then you obviously aren't looking at a down gradient -- or you shouldn't be looking at a down gradient, depending on which way the

water is flowing. So, you've got a means to jump off.

In other words, you're looking between the landfill and the wells to begin -- the landfill and the Weaver wells to begin with.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This well was originally proposed to be included in our sampling program because it was a known well location, it was in some publications that it referenced that location, so we thought we would go out and check on that particular location. And when we did, we just thought it was in poor condition.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: If it was a floating oil, you could take a subsurface sample and probably get a degree of accuracy. But being actually in the water, you -- even if you went through an aqueous matrix cleanup, if you did detect something, you wouldn't have any certainty that it was still not matrix interference.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

MR. JERRY HOPPER: So, another well would probably be the best bet, close to that.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Where are those -- those are two different scale maps. Where are

those two wells compared to S-14?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Those two wells are up in this general area up in here. (Pointing.) So, these two wells are actually closer to the Weaver supply well number two.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: What about the geology, is it staying consistent with what we've seen all along?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: What I've seen so far is, yes. I need to look closer to determine if we do have any type of brecciation and deformation in the rock that would suggest we got faulting over there. But we're looking at red mud stones over in here, which is consistent with what we've seen in some of the previous work. Up here, we are seeing some limestone-type rock, which is also consistent with the formation.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: This is not the spot where you thought you saw a geologic anomaly that might suggest the water was going out and just looping right back around and going back under the landfill? Or am I thinking of something different?

MR. ELLIS POPE: This is it.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We're still -- well, at this point, we're still -- we are seeing some deformation in these borings, in the geology that we're seeing. So, what we have yet to do is actually sit down and plot this data. We're still -- we still have the data preliminary at this point. And we haven't integrated that with the stuff that we've done, previously.

No more questions?

MR. RON LEVY: Let me go back into the other points in the action summary sheet. During the last RAB meeting, I believe you were given a briefing on the Alpha, Bravo EE/CAs, so you got a little bit of the status on that. And we're nearing completion of the investigation, which is the EE/CA portion of the Alpha. And those things that, to this point, have been identified in the Alpha area -- I mean, we're coming across very little surprises, I think, in the Alpha area. We are seeing some things that we expected to see. And we're still in the process of trying to delineate.

Bravo area, they're moving through the grids. It's slow going. I know part of it's

vegetation issues and trees and whatnot. But they're still moving through that.

And we mentioned some of the things that have been found to date. Now, that's not -- it doesn't tell you anything until we really look at it in total from the standpoint of the report. And I believe all of this was briefed to you during the last meeting. This is just a little bit more update in terms of things that we found. Let me mention also that there is a lot of personnel out there with Foster Wheeler working on site.

Joe Cudney just gave you a brief on the CWM. And that's all pretty good news.

The eastern bypass, one of the things we're working presently now is an action memorandum, because we're moving to do clearance in the tract two portion. And we're also working in explosive safety submission, which is discussed there. Both of those are documents that go through Army and DoD channels. Well, at least the action memorandum goes through Army channels for approval, which says this is what we propose to do and this is what we're going to do. And the explosive safety submission

basically says how we're going to do it to ensure that the folks out there are safe.

There has been some work already started out there that's not intrusive in nature. It's essentially the brush clearing that's going on. This is an addition to the logging operations that's going on by the -- that the Army has put in. But Foster Wheeler has to do additional brush clearing so they can get down closer to the ground by removing more of the trees that were left on site and a lot of the brush that's still out there. So, part of our discussion goes into that.

Also mention that ALDOT's placing a fence on the southernmost portion. It's tract three. Don't have a map up there. It's the other one over to the right, the furthest one to the right, Joe, to my right.

ALDOT's also talked about wanting some additional property, right-of-entry property, so that they can build some catch basins, some dams, because of water run-off that's going to be coming off of the tract three property, which we're in discussion with them on. We're expecting them to define --

better be able to define what it is they're looking for before we give them any approval on that.

MAJOR MORRISON: Tract one.

MR. RON LEVY: And as was talked about during the last RAB meeting, the prescribed burn for Caffee Hill has been put off. And, Bill, I understand that given weather conditions and it doesn't look like they'll be able to do a burn.

MR. BILL GARLAND: Probably just go back to winter burns. The next --

MR. RON LEVY: This summer?

MR. BILL GARLAND: -- consideration will be sometime November on.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Well, no danger of a forest fire this summer, though, huh?

MR. BILL GARLAND: No so far, not here.

MR. RON LEVY: I'm prepared to take any questions about restoration activities that are going on around post.

Before I turn it back over to Craig, I think, Joan, you wanted to talk about the election process?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes. This was the first RAB meeting that we tried sending it out to you all on e-mail, and we wanted to find out if that was satisfactory and did it all work real well? Now, we like it. Obviously, it makes it much easier for us.

But also what it does for us is it gives us feedback, because many of you responded and said, I got it and I'll be there. Which leads me to my next question: Do you want us to continue with that reminder call? You know, we've been calling. I mean, you know, we'd like to eliminate that, too, but we'll do whatever the RAB needs us to do to help you get to the meetings and participate. We can eliminate the calls?

MS. MARY HARRINGTON: E-mail is better for me.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Yeah, me, too.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Well, we'd still do the e-mail, but then we'd -- if you wanted us to back it up with a reminder call for the meeting, we'd do that. You know, we got a really good response this time from you all that said, I got the e-mail and

I'll be there. All right then, because it's coming in towards the end of the week, then we'll just continue like that and eliminate the phone call, if that's okay.

Now, if any of you have any problems opening that attachment, if you would contact Diane, she'll work with you and make sure that we get it to you in the format that your computer receives it, your eudora or whatever system you're using, we'll get that in the proper format.

MR. RON LEVY: Joan, I wanted to make available Joe's slides, if we could do that either through e-mail or send them out during the next go round for anybody that wants them. I mean, don't want to overwhelm anybody with paper.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Right. And using this is going to give us a lot of opportunities to give you a lot more information. And so you can tell us if you want copies --

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Make it a part of the minutes.

MR. BOB SELFRIDGE: Wait, guys. No, no, this is a really big --

MS. MARY HARRINGTON: That's big. Just like that is big.

MR. JOE CUDNEY: About thirty megabytes.

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. And the only thing we may be able to do is send it out by mailing because of the size of it. It will lock the system up, turn it off and --

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Can you cut it on a CD? Is it in Power Point?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Could we just put something in the message to Joan that says, if you want it, e-mail me back and we'll mail you a copy of the presentation? Would that be all right?

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes, we'll do that.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: That way anyone who wants it can get it and anyone who doesn't want it, you don't have to bother with it.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: This is going to be a much better communication. Thank you.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Good. Thanks. Anything else, Ron?

MR. RON LEVY: No.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Does anyone on the RAB have any questions or items they would like to add to the agenda before we turn it over to the audience for any comments? No? Any comments or issues the audience would like to raise?

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah, one thing, Craig. I still -- I would like to have a follow-up at the next meeting on the chemical materials investigation, see where we are and see how soon we can get that press release out and the information to the JPA, because I haven't seen anything more important to the perception of the community and the things that the JPA can put out now safely than the conclusions that are coming out of this study.

MR. RON LEVY: When you say an update, what's come out of the sampling to --

MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah. So, we're at the point now, we're not playing in the margins anymore, we've got certainty, and we can go ahead and make public statements.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Good.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Do you still plan to have your September meeting in Weaver? That was mentioned a couple of meetings ago.

MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Okay. I'm sort of new on here, but something that concerns me, I'm sure that there will be a good representation from the citizens of Weaver, because water is a major concern, and I would urge whoever makes the presentation on water sampling, get it in language that people can understand. They don't understand technical terms that well, and I think that -- I'm convinced that we don't have a problem, but you need to reassure people that come there probably with a notion already slanted toward, you know, we're going to be poisoned, because frankly, some of the media doesn't really help allay those fears.

And I think working on getting it where the people can understand and be reassured can be very important to this group and to this effort. And I think that we'll probably have a good group of citizens there. And I know that sometimes they can get riled up. And I think they need to be reassured

and I think that you've got the information to reassure them.

MS. MARY HARRINGTON: We met in Weaver before, correct?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Yes.

MR. FERNAND THOMASSY: Yes.

MS. MARY HARRINGTON: We've met in Weaver before.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: I agree with Mr. Franklin, because we've kind of become immune to the barrage of acronyms. And even then, I mean, even today, I had to search around to see what one meant. But now, we're going to be going in front of people who don't come to these meetings regularly, and we really need to bring -- get rid of the acronyms and bring it down to lay terminology.

MR. RON LEVY: I agree. We sometimes forget who we're talking to. And I will be the first to admit --

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Because some people, they get a little bit suspicious. Or let's say it reinforces their suspicions, you know, if you start using acronyms and technical terms too much.

And I think that this group does a tremendous job. You've got a lot of resources here. But getting the word to the people is going to be the secret to it.

MR. RON LEVY: We actually try to -- when we first make a presentation -- when we first decide we're going to make a presentation, to pre-brief it so that we can try to bring it to a level that's understandable by just a basic laymen, but sometimes we don't get there.

But from the RAB's perspective, to help us out, if we say anything, if we give you an acronym, stop us immediately, and we will take that question and make sure we answer it fully in terms that you understand, as opposed to just letting it go by.

MS. MARY HARRINGTON: I agree with -- because we are used to the acronyms. But not only that, but -- maybe I'm kind of missing it, but as members of the RAB, when we know that meetings are going to be in our perspective areas, then that's kind of our responsibility to let the people know and serve as ambassadors for the people, you know, well, this is your time, you need to come out because some positive

things are going on and this is what they're going to be talking about. And if there is something that you may not understand, you know, you need to stop them, because they are used to doing it, but they'll break it down for you. And that's kind of our job, to let them know that they can do that.

MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: And rather than relying on rumors or what somebody said or what somebody heard, they can come to those meetings and get facts from this group.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I also believe that, taking it a step further, I mean, as members of the RAB who are here to help represent the interest of the community, that for those of us who are familiar with the acronyms and familiar with the issues at hand, to express our view in public, whether it's positive or negative, is very beneficial to those from the community who are attending who aren't so familiar, because we are independent, we have -- you know, our interests are parallel and, to some extent, identical to the rest of the community. And we're sort of an independent observer. And so hopefully, I would hope that, you know, the RAB has enough

credibility with the community that if we express an opinion, be it positive or negative, the community, it would reassure them one way or the other regarding what's been presented.

Any other comments or questions? I think that's a very good point and a good discussion right there. No?

Okay, before we toss out -- wait, real quick. Audience comments? Did we have any comments or questions from the audience?

Before we toss out a motion to adjourn, I just want to mention real quick for the purposes of the minutes that Mr. Freeman and Mr. Buford walked in after we took the attendance. And with that said, do I have a motion to adjourn?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: So moved?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Second?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Second.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: We're out of here. Thanks.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

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 20th of July, 2001.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2001.