

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at
Houston Cole Library, Jackson, Alabama, on the 19th
day of March, 2001, commencing at approximately 6:30
p.m.

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

CAPTION SHEET	1
REPORTER'S INDEX	2
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD	3-72
CERTIFICATE	73-74

1 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: If you'll take
2 your seats, we'll go ahead and get started. To start
3 off, we'll do the roll call. Dr. Cox is not present
4 tonight. Mr. Ryan?

5 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes.

6 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Hood?

7 MR. RON HOOD: Here.

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD:

9 Mr. Beckett?

10 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Here.

11 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Buford?

12 MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here.

13 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. -- I

14 apologize if I get some of these names wrong --

15 Clendenin?

16 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

17 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Conroy?

18 Mr. Cunningham?

19 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Elser?

21 MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

22 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Ms. Fathke?

23 Mr. Franklin? Dr. Harrington? Mr. Hopper?

1 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Here.

2 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD:

3 Mayor Kimbrough? Mr. Thomassy? And Mr. -- well, I'll
4 get this one wrong -- Turecek? Okay, and we got Mr.
5 Levy?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Here.

7 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD:

8 Mr. Brittain?

9 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Here.

10 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Stroud?

11 Taking a day off. Mr. Golden?

12 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Here.

13 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: If we could
14 take a couple of minutes -- we've got Mr. Thomassy
15 here.

16 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

17 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Take a
18 couple of minutes and go around the room. We have a
19 number of guests tonight. If we could start back here
20 in this corner and just kind of work our way around.
21 Please, introduce yourself and tell us the name of
22 your organization.

23 MR. STAN BIDDICK: Stan Biddick,

1 ALDOT.

2 MR. CAREY KELLY: Carey Kelly,

3 ALDOT.

4 MR. DAVID WILLINGHAM: David

5 Willingham, Barge, Wagner Sumner & Cannon.

6 MR. DEJARVIS LEONARD: DeJarvis

7 Leonard, Alabama Department of Transportation.

8 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Joan McKinney

9 with the RAB.

10 MR. THOMAS WILSON: U. S. Army Tech

11 Escort Unit.

12 MR. DAVID HORN: I'm David Horn

13 with Noble & Associates.

14 MS. DIANE WILKERSON: Diane

15 Wilkerson with the RAB.

16 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Start down

17 there and kind of work our way up the aisle here,

18 please.

19 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Curtis

20 Franklin, City of Weaver.

21 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: Oh,

22 Mr. Franklin, hello.

23 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: We have a

1 seat up here at the table for you.

2 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Right here.

3 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Right up
4 here.

5 MR. ROBERT DAFFRON: Robert
6 Daffron, Alabama National Guard.

7 TOM McMEANS: Corps of Engineers in
8 Huntsville.

9 MR. BOB WUNKLE (phonetic): Bob
10 Wunkle, Corps of Engineers, Huntsville.

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

13 MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Major Jim
14 Morrison, Fort McClellan.

15 MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James,
16 Environmental Office.

17 MR. JOE DOYLE: Joe Doyle,
18 Fort McClellan Legal.

19 MR. LEE JAYE: Lee Jaye, Fort
20 McClellan Transition.

21 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Lisa
22 Kingsbury, Fort McClellan Environmental Office.

23 MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks,

1 Fort McClellan Environmental Office.

2 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Rufus Kenney,
3 concerned citizen.

4 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Thank you.
5 I believe we have two new members that are attending
6 the first RAB meeting tonight. Mr. Clendenin.

7 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: That's good.

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And
9 Mr. Franklin.

10 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Got you.

11 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Is that the
12 right way to pronounce it? I'm not making too much of
13 a mess of it?

14 If you two gentlemen wouldn't mind
15 just taking a couple of minutes and telling us a
16 little bit about yourself and what has you interested
17 in the RAB, we would certainly appreciate it.

18 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: My name is
19 Monty Clendenin. I'm the pastor of Covenant
20 Presbyterian Church in Lenlock. I've been in Anniston
21 since the May the Gulf War started. So, I have about
22 ten years history here.

23 I did a lot of archeology work when

1 I was in seminary, and interested in that aspect and
2 also in the environment, and interested in the
3 redevelopment of the Fort, so, I thought I would try
4 to do this.

5 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: I'm Curtis
6 Franklin. I've been a resident of this area all my
7 life. Been a resident of Weaver for thirty-nine
8 years. Since the mid '70's, in my employment, I've
9 been involved in safety and environmental. Presently,
10 I am safety and environmental engineer at General
11 Dynamics Ordnance and Tactical Systems, which formerly
12 was Defense Research.

13 And very interested in the
14 environment of this area. I was a Scout Master for
15 thirteen years, so I saw things that could happen to
16 our environment. At the same time, I work in
17 industry, so, I see both sides of the picture.

18 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay, good.
19 Welcome aboard. We're glad to have you with us.

20 The next order of business is
21 approval of the minutes. Has everyone had an
22 opportunity to review the minutes from the last
23 meeting or do we need to take a couple of minutes to

1 allow everyone to do that? No.

2 MR. RON LEVY: Has anybody not been
3 getting their minutes by the mailing?

4 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: I didn't get
5 them.

6 MS. JOAN MCKINNEY: They're not
7 really members, so we have not -- but we certainly can
8 send them to them. But just for historical purposes,
9 be happy to do that.

10 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Yeah.

11 MR. RON LEVY: I guess what we need
12 to do is --

13 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry y'all,
14 I'm further away from y'all tonight, so y'all are
15 going to have to speak up for me.

16 MR. RON LEVY: I guess what needs
17 to be noted is that the BCT members need to receive
18 copies of the minutes. And as such, we'll surely send
19 them.

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Do I hear a
21 motion to approve the minutes from the last RAB
22 meeting?

23 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: So moved.

1 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Second.

2 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any
3 opposed? Motion is approved. The minutes from the
4 last meeting, then be earmarked as official.

5 Old business. Is there any old
6 business that anyone would like to discuss before we
7 move into the new business?

8 Moving right along. First thing we
9 have on new business is, I believe, Mr. Levy; is that
10 correct, Ron --

11 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

12 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- is going
13 to give us a presentation on chemical warfare
14 material.

15 MR. RON LEVY: Let me just point
16 out that you have the slides in front of you. If
17 you'll dig through the papers that you've got, there
18 should be a briefing package in there. Some of it's
19 got black and white. So, if you can't see them, you
20 can see the screen up there, because we'll go through
21 them on the screen, as well. You can just refer to
22 the slide.

23 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Ron, you're going

1 to have to come over here.

2 MR. RON LEVY: For those of you who
3 don't know me, my name is Ron Levy. I'm the
4 Environmental Coordinator at Fort McClellan. I have a
5 responsibility for the clean-up, investigation and
6 clean-up of the installation. Work for Glynn Ryan,
7 who is the co-chair. And pretty much can answer the
8 questions as we move through this briefing.

9 The attempt of the briefing is to
10 talk about the CWM or chemical warfare material
11 engineering and evaluation cost analysis. So, move to
12 your first slide, which talks about the purpose.

13 Three things that we want to
14 accomplish. The reason for the engineering evaluation
15 cost analysis or what we call an EE/CA -- and a lot of
16 the RAB members are familiar with the term EE/CA,
17 because we have talked about other EE/CAs that are
18 ongoing on the installation. Some of you who are new
19 probably and not familiar with it, but I'll get into a
20 little bit of the specifics about what an EE/CA is.

21 What's the intended outcome of the
22 EE/CA and what are the activities that are associated
23 with this EE/CA as we get through the investigation.

1 Next slide. Simply put, the
2 purpose of the EE/CA is to determine if, where, and
3 what, in terms of whether we have chemical warfare
4 material and presence of OE. And OE is ordnance and
5 explosives. Particularly one site's, the smoke site,
6 smoke R&S site, which is a site that's listed in the
7 EE/CA.

8 What are we going to do with the
9 EE/CA? Well, we want to identify the objective of the
10 rule action. We want to look at alternatives for
11 cost, effectiveness, and ability to implement and a
12 strategy for risk abatement.

13 The overall objective for the EE/CA
14 or for the field investigation is to intrusively
15 sample areas where we have the highest potential to
16 contain remnant CWM, chemical warfare material, or
17 agent contaminated soil.

18 Now, what's an EE/CA? Simply put,
19 an EE/CA is similar to -- well, an EE/CA is an
20 investigation, which also leads to some conclusions or
21 it leads to the alternatives, defined alternatives on
22 what you do with what you find out there. It's
23 similar to a remedial investigation feasibility study.

1 Some of you are familiar with that.

2 But it's probably, in terms of its
3 comprehensiveness, not quite as comprehensive in the
4 process. It is defined in public law. It is found in
5 the National Contingency Plan, under the NCP.

6 There are criteria for evaluation.
7 Some of those criteria involve overall protectiveness
8 of human health and the environments, compliance with
9 applicable regulations. There may be other
10 regulations that the State has. Long-term
11 effectiveness and performance, short-term
12 effectiveness, the ability to implement, cost, State
13 acceptance, and also community acceptance, which is a
14 key piece, all these are wrapped up under the three
15 pieces that I mentioned up there: Cost,
16 effectiveness, and ability to implement.

17 If you'll move to the next slide.
18 In the EE/CA, itself, there are thirty-three sites
19 that are identified. And where do the thirty-three
20 sites come from? Well, there is a history on
21 Fort McClellan of training with chemical warfare
22 material.

23 And the history spans back to the

1 inception of post, but the focus really happened when
2 we started seeing agent show up at McClellan from 1951
3 and was used through 1973 outdoors. And there were a
4 number of actions that happened during that time
5 frame, where the -- what was once known as the CDR
6 Agency on the installation now, and then the chemical
7 school, actually trained with live agent outdoors at
8 various sites on and around Fort McClellan.

9 What you see up there is
10 thirty-three sites. There has been a history of
11 activities from an investigative standpoint. And
12 looking at a history also from a paper trail, We put
13 together what's known as an archive search report.
14 And many of you RAB members have seen the archive
15 search report and actually looked at the document.
16 And that's where the thirty-three sites were actually
17 -- were originally identified.

18 The EE/CA takes into account, in
19 the discussion in the EE/CA, of all thirty-three
20 sites. Right off the bat, fifteen were eliminated,
21 either from previous work or from information we had
22 that relates that there isn't an issue associated with
23 the site.

1 What's moved forward is thirteen
2 training sites and five suspect mustard spills. And
3 of the agents that we're looking at, you see them up
4 there; HD being mustard; GB and DX are nerve agents; L
5 is a Luicide (phonetic) or a blood agent; and CG,
6 which is a choking agent. And those are the agents
7 that we're looking at, in terms of the investigation.

8 The next thing you should have in
9 there is a map. That's the foldout. It lists all
10 thirty-three sites. The ones that are in red are the
11 ones that we're investigating.

12 And the thing I would probably like
13 to point out to you from an installation perspective,
14 this being Fort McClellan, the area where you see the
15 most of the sites is around building 3181, which was
16 the old chemical school back in the '70s and the '50s.
17 And that's where you see most of the activity
18 occurring around there. And that's why the focus of a
19 lot of the sites, from an investigative standpoint and
20 also from a historical standpoint, is down in that
21 area.

22 MS. DONNA FATHKE: What's a goat
23 yard?

1 MR. RON LEVY: The chemical school
2 used to train with goats. What they'd essentially do
3 is they'd put a drop of a diluted agent in the goat's
4 eye, let it go into a --

5 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It wasn't
6 diluted.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Let it go into a --
8 into a -- I want to say an anaphylactic shock or
9 actually go through the motions of what somebody would
10 go through and then try to bring him out of it with
11 antidote. So, there was several goat yards around the
12 installation where they kept the goats.

13 MR. RON HOOD: Ron, one of the
14 things (inaudible) --

15 COURT REPORTER: Speak up for me,
16 Ron, please.

17 MR. RON HOOD: The biological
18 warfare AT4, what, if any, biological agents were used
19 there?

20 MR. RON LEVY: There were two.
21 Both of them -- just -- both of them -- both of the
22 agents were --

23 MS. LISA KINGSBURY: Simulants.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Simulants, that's
2 not really what I wanted to say. One of them is a
3 laboratory -- one was a laboratory --

4 MR. PAUL JAMES: Bacillus Globigii
5 was one, and the other one was --

6 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Serratia
7 Marascens

8 MS. KAREN PINSON: Serratia
9 Marascens.

10 MR. RON LEVY: I think the Bacillus
11 Globigii had a half-life of just several days. And
12 the other one was powder, but was fairly innocuous.
13 In fact, I've got the data sheets on those two agents,
14 if you'd like to see them. But they, for the most
15 part, weren't anything that -- of concern from a
16 long-term liability.

17 MR. RON HOOD: Or even maybe a
18 short-term.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Or even -- yeah.
20 But I believe they still use them in training, now,
21 around the country.

22 MR. RON HOOD: Okay. Just curious.
23 I didn't think there was anything to it.

1 MR. RON LEVY: That site also is a
2 site of -- it wasn't just biological warfare, either,
3 there's a site -- there is some information there that
4 relates to mustard use, as well. So, we're also
5 investigating it from that standpoint, but the term
6 T-4 still holds.

7 Next slide. These are the players,
8 in terms of who is involved in the investigation.
9 Obviously, Fort McClellan, has the overall
10 responsibility of implementing the investigation and
11 any clean-up actions.

12 Our regulators, EPA and ADEM, they
13 have oversight of the work. They do reviews and
14 comments on all work plans and draft documents.

15 And I would point out for those of
16 you in the audience, Shannon Golden, from ADEM, and
17 Doyle Brittain, from EPA, are here.

18 And then the Corps of Engineers,
19 which is in the contract, our contractors in this
20 case, are responsible for implementing the
21 investigation plan and to conduct intrusive
22 investigations, Parsons Engineering. And, Ken, hold
23 your hand up there, representing our contractor doing

1 the investigation and its sub, HFA, which will do the
2 intrusive work. I don't think anybody from HFA is
3 here.

4 Some other support players involve
5 TEU, which is the U. S. Army Technical Escort Unit.
6 They'll conduct all the handling of CWM items that are
7 uncovered.

8 ECBC or Edgewood Chemical and
9 Biological Command, will conduct the sampling and
10 monitoring. And program manager for non-stockpile,
11 they will do the planning and disposal of any CWM
12 uncovered during the investigation. And, Tom, Tom's
13 from TEU. He's here.

14 Next slide. This is a quick
15 snapshot of the schedule in terms of what we're doing.
16 This work started far before this point now. There
17 was a lot of fieldwork done up to now.

18 Parsons in Huntsville had been out
19 in the field looking at sites so that we could put the
20 EE/CA document together. There was a chemical site
21 safety submission that was completed to ensure what we
22 do is done in a safe manner. And that was submitted
23 through channels to DA safety for approval.

1 Mobilization for this work actually
2 began in February. Right now we're in the training
3 phase. They're training the folks that are going to
4 be out there. They'll be a pre-operational inspection
5 that will go on by DA safety. That's to look at all
6 the practices and procedures and check to ensure that
7 we -- you know, we are prepared and ready to go. It's
8 kind of like a dry run or a test run.

9 Actual intrusive work will begin
10 around the middle of April. And we anticipate
11 completion in about four to six months.

12 The draft report expect some time
13 out in October. And there will be a public comment
14 period, as it relates to this. So, that will be
15 opened up.

16 Next slide. I think this is
17 important to mention, in terms of recovery, of any
18 material. There is -- what we intend to -- what we
19 find out, we don't expect to move off-site. In fact,
20 we have an interim holding facility on the
21 installation. There is a kind of a graphic up there,
22 in terms of what it looks like. And it's really not
23 that far from what that looks like up there.

1 It's presently being set up now.
2 Our plan is for on-site disposal. However, the final
3 disposition of anything we find -- and again, we don't
4 know that we're going to find anything at this point,
5 yet -- will be determined at the end of the
6 investigation and will come out in the EE/CA, which
7 will be open for public comment, as well.

8 The next slide.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ron, where are
10 you setting up the holding facility?

11 MR. RON LEVY: T-38 on your map
12 there, if you're interested in where the IHF sections
13 are located. T-38 is number two on your map, top
14 right hand corner, inside of the big -- big area
15 that's circled.

16 The last slide -- and we're doing
17 this -- we're briefing the RAB now so that you know
18 and understand what's going on prior to us conducting
19 a press release, which will go out tomorrow. We're
20 also planning a media event, set to bring folks on
21 site, kind of show them how we're going to set up and
22 how the process is going to work. We'll take a site.
23 That's still being looked at.

1 And Major Morrison, who is in the back
2 there, is the person, point of contact from a public
3 affairs standpoint on questions that will be coming
4 from the media. With that, I'll open it up to
5 questions relating to the work that we're going to do.

6 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Ron, some of
7 these possible mustard spill areas are like in the
8 middle of the parts of the Fort that are inhabited or
9 have been inhabited. For instance, there's one very
10 close to Buckner Circle. How come they're not
11 cordoned off or something from the public?

12 MR. RON LEVY: We're -- again, they
13 are suspect sites. We're not actually sure, in some
14 cases, they're even there. But we're going after --
15 going out there to look at them. There is some either
16 anecdotal information or information that there might
17 be something that occurred there.

18 So, we got -- we've been using
19 these sites for years and years. Some of the sites
20 I'm aware of, too, where we've had spills before, they
21 actually went back in and actually deconned, actually
22 deconned the site, went through and sprayed it down.
23 So, it's doubtful that there will be any mustard

1 there, but our intent is to go in and actually conduct
2 some sampling and look.

3 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Okay.

4 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Ron, I have
5 a couple of quick questions. The first one is: Can
6 you talk a little bit about how this stuff behaves in
7 the environment? I mean, is it -- it's obviously
8 persistent in the environment, because you suspect it
9 can still be there after probably a number of years.
10 But does it typically just adhere to soils or can it

11 move through water or is it very volatile and you
12 expect it to go airborne or --

13 MR. RON LEVY: I might ask Ken if
14 he might want to talk a little bit about that.

15 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Some of the
16 agents are -- have a very short time, like phosgenes
17 are very volatile and disappear.

18 Mustard have been found to
19 coagulize (phonetic) within soils and remain for forty
20 or fifty years. But it will biodegrade, so, there
21 shouldn't be a lot of it, unless it's in a container.

22 One of the things we're focusing on
23 in the sites is to make sure there is no containers

1 left. And inside the container would be fairly
2 effective, even today, as it's been contained all
3 these years. So, that's one objective.

4 In the environment, itself, though,
5 few of them are very soluble. GB is a little bit
6 soluble, but none of them are very significantly
7 soluble. So, there shouldn't be migrating (inaudible)
8 much. Most of them will degrade.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Even mustard, the PH
10 is -- and particularly, in Alabama, where the PH tends
11 to be high, it will degrade very quickly.

12 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Because I
13 notice, looking at the map, that there is -- I mean,
14 some of these areas are very large and you're -- based
15 on what you said, you're not expecting to find a whole
16 lot out there. But there's clearly a lot of surface
17 water drainage running through a lot of those areas.

18 Is there a need to follow that
19 surface water or -- given the behavior of the stuff in
20 the environment?

21 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: This
22 investigation is focusing on what, under the HTRW side
23 of the house, would be the sources, they're looking

1 for sources, really to clear it for the remainder of
2 the other investigations that are going on.

3 Once it starts to migrate in the
4 environment, it's really an essentially hazardous
5 waste issues, which is being addressed within -- quite
6 extensive (inaudible).

7 MR. RON LEVY: What Parsons and CWM
8 is going to do is really look for the source. And if
9 there isn't, we still have to go back and finish the
10 contaminant issues, if there's breakdown products or
11 if there is anything associated with the decon that
12 went by, which is very possible. In fact, we're
13 seeing some of that in ground water contamination. We
14 have to address that. And we'll address that through,
15 not this contract or not this EE/CA, but the work
16 that's being done by IT Corporation under Mobile's
17 contracts.

18 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And my
19 second question is probably more directed to EPA and
20 ADEM. I know when we were talking six, eight months
21 ago, about unexploded ordnance and the issues that
22 were surrounded with managing that from a regulatory
23 perspective, there are a lot of gray areas,

1 particularly when it came to risk evaluation, things
2 of that nature. Is it the same case with chemical
3 warfare material or are the guidelines a little more,
4 I guess, easily understood, I guess is the word I'm
5 looking for, not so gray?

6 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: I think that
7 the difference between -- this is my personal opinion
8 -- the difference between chem warfare and the other
9 hazardous waste is a basically conventional
10 determination. They're both chemicals. They're in
11 the environment. So, it's a programmatic issue, who's
12 going to look for it, more than the way that it would
13 manifest itself in the environment.

14 And as the gentleman said here a
15 minute ago, there is a good possibility that the chem
16 warfare may still be present in some kind of
17 container, whereas with the hazardous waste, it's
18 probably been as a result of a spill or disposal or
19 something like this.

20 So, I feel a lot more comfortable
21 in working with the chem warfare, simply because of
22 the fact that it is a chemical in the environment,
23 behaving very similar to your typical hazardous waste.

1 Ordnance is a different ballgame.
2 That's a little harder to get your hands on. But
3 we're working with the Army. And I think I feel
4 comfortable with what they're doing. I'm still very
5 much playing catch-up, because I've only been with
6 this base now a couple of months.

7 I've spent a lot of time doing a
8 lot of reading, trying to do my homework, see how we
9 got to where we are on these sites and what is going
10 on. I've spent a lot of time talking with the
11 ordnance people off-line, and I have confidence that
12 they're doing the right kind of things.

13 Certainly, if it gets to the place
14 that we start having any surprises, you know, then
15 we'll back up and talk again. But I don't really see
16 any problem there, as far as EPA and the Army being
17 able to work together to do the right thing for the
18 long run. You got any comments to add on that?

19 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: I feel the
20 same way.

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ron, question:
22 In the action summary sheet, you have referred to the
23 ordnance and explosive actions that are taking place,

1 also. That is EE/CAs being started?

2 MR. RON LEVY: Right.

3 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Four of them.

4 One from M101 and then the others, Alpha, Bravo, and
5 Charlie. What are those?

6 MR. RON LEVY: We've got -- there
7 is a conventional ordnance piece, which are those
8 EE/CAs. I mean, we're looking at fired munitions, not
9 just from the CWM standpoint.

10 So, the CWM piece, is, in itself, a
11 different investigation focused on chemical warfare
12 material.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: No, I meant,
14 what are those four areas?

15 MR. RON LEVY: Oh, they're split up
16 into Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, and the M101. The Alpha
17 area is -- and I wish I had a map here -- is directly
18 off the cantonment area in the northern part of the
19 installation. And it goes up to -- it goes towards
20 the east, up to where the -- let me see if I can't
21 point it out on this map here.

22 This is the Alpha EE/CA right in
23 here. It goes up to and borders just exactly where

1 the Fish & Wildlife National Wildlife Refuge is to be
2 put in.

3 The Bravo area EE/CA encompasses
4 all this property down here, except for a piece up in
5 here, which is M101. And the reason that that's been
6 separated out is because it has a direct impact on the
7 eastern bypass and the ability for us to clear that
8 property. And we're trying to fast-track that. So,
9 we've separated it out in a smaller piece to focus on
10 the clearance for the eastern bypass. Because of its
11 proximity to the eastern bypass and the access road,
12 that's the focus.

13 And then the Charlie piece includes
14 all of what's known as the national wildlife refuge
15 and various sites out here in the Choccolocco
16 corridor, which is state-owned land, where we've
17 trained on. So, those are the various EE/CAs.

18 And again, you see the CWM EE/CA
19 involving sites that were identified through a
20 process, mixed amongst locations on the installation.

21 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Ron, you
22 mentioned that there is no planned off-site movement
23 of any of these agents, if you find them, and you do

1 have planned on-site disposal.

2 What is the accepted disposal
3 technology for the potential of what you have to find?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Jim, do you want to
5 talk about that?

6 MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Right now the
7 Army has two different systems that they're using in
8 other places. One is called the explosive destruction
9 system and the other one is a rapid response system.

10 The rapid response system is being
11 used at Toelle and the other one; that is, EDS
12 explosive destruction system, is being used in Rocky
13 Mountain Arsenal right now.

14 They're designed to handle
15 different kinds of issues. But that -- right now,
16 those are the things that are being used, the systems
17 that are being used in the plan. And they're no
18 emissions. The one in Rocky Mountain Arsenal has
19 taken care of some pretty -- 139, GB, bomblets. The
20 State is extremely ecstatic and happy with that. It
21 took them awhile to get to that, to using that system.
22 But no emissions, handled on-site. All -- both of
23 these systems are portable, come in on a truck, take

1 care of it, and when they're done, it leaves.

2 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Is it a type of
3 burn technology or what, the rapid response, what
4 actually is involved with that?

5 MAJOR JIM MORRISON: The rapid
6 response system is developed to neutralize agents
7 associated with the chemical training kits and
8 detection training kits. The other system is to --
9 more designed to handle rounds where there are
10 chemical contained in a round. And that uses an --
11 contains the round in a stainless steel container,
12 where the round inside the container is blown up and
13 then a neutralizing chemical is put into the
14 container, neutralizing the -- whatever that agent
15 particularly was, reducing it to a hazardous waste,
16 and then it's handled that way.

17 So, those are the two technologies
18 that the Army has right now that they're using. I
19 think it's important that, as we get through the
20 EE/CA, and the EE/CA actually says, okay, this is
21 what's here and recommends how we're going to handle
22 it, when they get to that point, then we'll be able to
23 really say, okay, this is the technology that they're

1 going to use in these different phases.

2 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Once, at that
3 point it's reduced to a hazardous waste or substance,
4 how is it still handled on-site, as far as disposal?
5 Would it, at that point, be buried or --

6 MR. RON LEVY: No, at that point we
7 handle it exactly how we handle all hazardous waste,
8 assuming that it meets the criteria established as a
9 hazardous waste, and we'll manifest it to an approved
10 hazardous waste site, because it won't be agent, it
11 will be a hazardous waste, whatever the product is.

12 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: That's the
13 same thing. I mean, you said that you would expect
14 your primary -- I don't want to say primary objective,
15 but what you anticipate finding, as far as stuff in
16 canisters, as opposed to stuff free in the soil; is
17 that correct?

18 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: That's correct.
19 If we do activate some amounts of contaminated soils,
20 they'll be handled as hazardous waste, which the
21 treatment is off-site incineration, they'll be shipped
22 to a licensed hazardous waste incinerator, assuming
23 it's just a plain chemical hazardous waste. It's just

1 the containers that can't be handled commercially.
2 They have to be handled by the Army.

3 MR. DAVID HORN: Will any of this
4 stuff be, by chance, shipped to the incinerator at
5 AOD? Would they be equipped to handle any of this
6 stuff or is this just totally something different?

7 MAJOR JIM MORRISON: Right now, the
8 plan -- and just what -- we can only address what we
9 have in the plan, is for on-site disposal. And it's
10 really not until they get to the EE/CA, the completion
11 of the EE/CA, and have remedies, that they can
12 actually -- that we can actually say that the method
13 of disposal will be either the RR or EDS system. And
14 at this time there is no plan to move any of this
15 stuff off the installation.

16 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Are there
17 anymore questions or comments?

18 MS. DONNA FATHKE: I have a couple
19 of questions just on the key to this map. The areas
20 are numbered with numbers that are either in orange or
21 red. What's the significance of one color or the
22 other?

23 MR. RON LEVY: If you remember, I

1 pointed out, there were thirty-three sites that were
2 identified. Those in red are the ones -- there were
3 eighteen or thirteen that were training sites and five
4 that were suspect mustard spills. Those that are in
5 red are the ones that are going on for further
6 investigation. That's the total -- that's the
7 eighteen sites. If you count them up, you'll see that
8 there will be eighteen sites there. The rest of them
9 have all been eliminated. The ones that are in this
10 -- I guess it's a orange or a yellow color.

11 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Thank you.

12 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other
13 questions?

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Ron, number two
15 here, it shows a further investigation area with a
16 much larger circle around it. How is the smaller
17 circle different than the bigger circle?

18 MR. RON LEVY: Other than the fact
19 that the area happens -- it is an area inside of
20 another area, and it's a significant area T-38, in
21 terms of the history out there. It's a site inside of
22 that large area or that site. Ken, maybe you can
23 explain it better than I can.

1 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Yes. You're
2 talking about the bigger area here?

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Yes.

4 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: That's the
5 outline of the smoke ranges R&S area, which really are
6 not considered chemical warfare agent sites.
7 Historically, smoke and --

8 MR. RON LEVY: Has been --

9 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: -- things like
10 napalm were considered chemicals, in the list of
11 chemicals --

12 MR. PETE CONROY: So, it's actually
13 the boundary of the smoke training area, pretty well?

14 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Right --

15 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, and if you
16 look --

17 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: This is the
18 boundary of the smoke ranges and this is -- within
19 that is the T-38 area.

20 MR. RON LEVY: And we're really
21 looking more for the presence of OE, ordnance and
22 explosive in that area. That's the second bullet
23 under that second slide that I have in there, smoke

1 area R&S.

2 But because it was identified --
3 and again, you know, the history is, that linked
4 smoked operations and use of smoke with chemical
5 warfare or chemical activity. And it ended up coming
6 through our investigative phases or I should say our
7 documentation, as a site to be investigated.

8 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Ron, how are
9 the fifteen sites eliminated? What process did you
10 use?

11 MR. RON LEVY: Some of the sites
12 were done based on what we were able to glean from
13 history. Like I believe area 21 on the map, area 21,
14 was identified in documents that said that the school
15 wanted to use this area for training purposes, but
16 never actually got to that point.

17 So, it was identified in some
18 document, but they didn't get to doing that -- they
19 didn't get to actually use the property for that
20 purpose. And there is no history that we can find
21 they used the property for that purpose. So, it was
22 an area identified.

23 We talked about it in the EE/CA and

1 what occurred, what we understand occurred there or
2 didn't occur there. And therefore, we eliminated it,
3 at that point.

4 Other areas, we've already done
5 investigative work on. In other words, our program
6 for investigating sites didn't start at the inception
7 of BRAC, at inception of closure. We actually started
8 investigating property on McClellan prior to closure
9 under the IRP program or installation restoration
10 program, like all military installations did. And
11 those sites, we've got a -- concluded, based on the
12 sampling that we've done, that there isn't anything
13 there. And, Ken, if you've got anything you can add
14 to that. Did I --

15 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: The sites like
16 that are in the sites that are listed, which were
17 flame throwing training, which we said don't really
18 have constituents of concern from a chemical warfare
19 standpoint. So, those are -- they're all going to be
20 addressed in the report, in which they eliminated.
21 They're not requiring further investigation to gather
22 data, to draw a conclusion.

23 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ron, I thought

1 I'd expand on something, because there's a significant
2 difference between smokes, napalm, flame devices, and
3 chemical warfare materials, and chemical warfare
4 munitions. They were all handled by the chemical
5 corps. They grouped them together.

6 But only the agents that we're
7 talking about and other agents all the way back to
8 World War I, were chemical warfare materials. The
9 smokes were never associated as chemical warfare
10 materials. They were purely smokes or a variety of
11 reasons from screening to direct attack with white
12 phosphorous. Same with the flame agents, handled by
13 the chemical corps, they were never part of the
14 chemical warfare materials.

15 Probably the closest and the most
16 confusing over the decades has been the relationship
17 between chemical warfare materials and riot control
18 agents and treaties over the last forty years and
19 activities have separated them out now. So, you
20 actually have chemical warfare materials as one type
21 of munition and material and riot control agents,
22 something completely separate.

23 MR. RON LEVY: And I think as we

23 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Are there

1 any other questions? Thanks, Ron. Next on the
2 agenda, we'll go to the agency reports.

3 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: You have in
4 your handout, I have passed out a list of documents
5 that we have reviewed since the last RAB meeting.
6 There's a picture to go along with that list. There
7 is extras. I've got extras if anybody that doesn't
8 have one wants one.

9 Here on the map, the purple area
10 you see are the updates as of March 19. And the red
11 areas is the document review prior to January 21st.
12 And I think it comes up to be a little over fifty
13 parcels. So, we've all been pretty busy.

14 The yellow area shaded in are the
15 final findings of suitability of transfer. And that's
16 a picture of the list.

17 One thing, ADEM has a new section
18 -- a new government facilities section chief. His
19 name is Jim Graciano (phonetic). He, -- probably,
20 about two weeks ago, he got promoted, taking Larry
21 Bryant's position. And he's familiar with Anniston
22 and some of the problems it's facing. He was ADEM's
23 project manager for the PCBs and worked a lot with

1 Solutia. He wanted to be here tonight, but couldn't
2 be. He said he's looking forward to meeting everybody
3 at the next meeting. And that's --

4 MR. PETE CONROY: What is his title
5 now? Section Chief for --

6 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: He's the
7 government facility section chief. And it's --

8 MR. RON LEVY: He replaced
9 Larry Bryant?

10 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Yes.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Where is
12 Larry Bryant?

13 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Larry Bryant
14 is the solid waste branch chief. So, he took over
15 solid waste.

16 MR. RON LEVY: Promoted?

17 MR. SHANNON GOLDEN: Yes.

18 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any
19 questions for ADEM? Doyle?

20 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: I don't have a
21 list of documents. Not quite as well organized as
22 Shannon is. But whenever I took over the base as EPA
23 representative, a few months ago, I inherited quite a

1 backlog of documents to be reviewed. And I have been
2 busy trying to get caught up with that backlog.

3 My predecessor was working
4 full-time with Fort McClellan, and Fort McClellan is
5 only part of my work load, so, I am working part-time
6 here. So, I still have a backlog of documents and it
7 will probably be another two months before I'm caught
8 up on those. But I'm working feverishly to get caught
9 up on those.

10 So, I think we're working together.
11 A lot of this is being done through on-board reviews,
12 where we're sitting around the table and working
13 through how these documents need to be finalized or
14 any changes that need to be made in them. And then
15 I'm sending letters through on those. But we've made
16 significant progress in the few months that I've been
17 here, but I've still got about a two month backlog
18 before I'll be caught up.

19 MR. RON LEVY: I think -- I want to
20 add something to that. For those of you who are not
21 aware, we have BRAC clean-up team meetings, we have
22 them on a monthly basis. The intent of the BRAC
23 clean-up team meetings is to expedite the clean-up

1 work, face-to-face reviews, and comments from both the
2 regulatory agencies with the Army.

3 The thing that's really been
4 working well for us lately, with Doyle now here -- he
5 replaced Bart Reedy, for those of you who remember,
6 Bart Reedy was our previous remedial project manager
7 for EPA -- is these face-to-face reviews, or we call
8 them on-board reviews, where we physically sit down
9 and hash through the documents and go over them piece
10 by piece and try to conclude, at that point, where we
11 need additional work or we need to change something
12 based on regulatory input, where we can safely say
13 that the site needs no further action.

14 And I want to tell you that the
15 on-board review meeting we had back in February, we
16 were able to conclude twenty-two sites, no further
17 actions, based on results coming from the sampling
18 that had been done across McClellan. And that really
19 is significant and it involved a lot of work and a lot
20 of effort, both on the part of the Army and on the
21 part of the regulatory agencies to come to that
22 conclusion.

23 And what didn't -- it didn't just

1 conclude, at that point. We had been going through
2 reviews, ongoing reviews, but we were able to
3 conclude, at that point, that twenty-two of the sites
4 had no further actions, meaning that they were clean
5 from the standpoint of transferability, could transfer
6 the property.

7 I know that it's important to the
8 JPA. So, I got to tell you, I think it's been real
9 successful, being able to sit across the table, going
10 through the documents, with the regulatory agencies.
11 Sometimes it's brutal, but sometimes it's really
12 helpful, too.

13 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: It's progress.

14 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Anything
15 else, Doyle?

16 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: No.

17 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Who is
18 talking for the Army tonight?

19 MR. RON LEVY: Again, part of what
20 I want to do, in terms of where the Army is, just to
21 go through the action summary sheet. And again, these
22 are part of your mailings, so, you should have seen
23 them. If not, I think they're in front of you. There

1 should be a copy in front of you. There is three
2 points in there. A lot of you remember that we
3 entered into an agreement with the EPA, with the
4 State, ADEM, and also with the JPA, local reuse
5 authority, upon a land use control assurance plan.

6 The assurance plan was signed back
7 in December. It's in effect. Part of the requirement
8 for that plan is to identify -- initially, identify
9 sites that we think will have land use controls on
10 them.

11 For those of you not familiar with
12 land use controls, property can be transferred -- some
13 property can be transferred without us getting to full
14 clean-up, but being able to put controls in place that
15 will preclude you from -- that will preclude
16 individuals or the transferee from doing things that
17 would expose them to something.

18 To give you an example, if you had
19 a piece of property that you wanted to use for
20 development purposes, we knew we had maybe -- we had
21 some -- maybe we had ground water contamination of
22 some nature on that property, we certainly wouldn't
23 want to transfer that property and -- in a state where

1 there was no restrictions on it and thereby allow
2 folks to potentially drill and use the ground water.

3 Well, if we've got a remedy in
4 place or we know that we're -- we expect over time for
5 natural attenuation to occur, we may transfer the
6 property, get it into the community's hand so that
7 they can develop it with controls in place. Those
8 controls may say, no dig, no putting ground water
9 wells in for the purposes of drinking. That's just an
10 example.

11 So, as we looked across the
12 installation and we knew what property we've got
13 controls on, we identified up front an appendix A,
14 what property we felt needed to be controls on. One
15 of those sites is T-38. We're working that as a land
16 use control implementation plan. Both EPA, the State,
17 and the JPA, get to comment on that. And that's what
18 we're working now. And that's what that plan is all
19 about.

20 Some of that we're also trying to
21 do face to face with EPA and the State. All this
22 becomes part of the administrative record, so -- and
23 we will share this with the RAB, too. I think the

1 next meeting we intend to provide copies to the RAB.

2 Is Karen here? Provide copies to the RAB. Am I
3 right?

4 MS. KAREN PINSON: (Nods head.)

5 MR. JOE DOYLE: (Inaudible.)

6 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. Joe mentioned,
7 they are interim, in some cases. In some cases, we
8 don't know specifically that we've got an issue there.
9 But we're taking strides to ensure that we put
10 controls in place, because we haven't completed the
11 clean-up or we haven't completed the investigation.
12 So, we're trying to put interim controls on property,
13 now.

14 If at some point we define it as
15 not having a contaminant of concern or something that
16 may impact health, human health and environment, then
17 we'll take the controls off. The opposite may be a
18 fact, too. We may find property that we originally
19 thought did not, prior to completion, have a
20 contaminant of concern. If we do, then we'll put
21 controls on that, as well.

22 MR. RON HOOD: Ron, are any of
23 these controls intended to last, let's say, forever?

1 Has everyone had the final say that you think the
2 agent will biodegrade in let's say a hundred years and
3 so you wouldn't want to control it more than let's say
4 two or three hundred years?

5 MR. RON LEVY: Potentially, that
6 could be the case. In the case of ground water, we
7 might find ourselves in a remedy where we have to do
8 long-term monitoring for thirty years. And we may see
9 in fifteen years that the levels have gotten to a
10 point where they're not above drinking water standards
11 or something along that line. So, potentially, it
12 could be very -- in terms of long-term, thirty years
13 or better. And what we would put into the deeds will
14 say specifically that, these are the restrictions.
15 And in the State of Alabama, those restrictions come
16 with the land, in the deeds.

17 MR. RON HOOD: That's what I'm
18 asking: Will there be a time limitation to those or
19 will they carry on forever until something happens?

20 MR. RON LEVY: They could, they
21 could very well be long term. My answer to you is:
22 They could very well be long term. Where we can
23 define it less than that, we'll try to do that. But

1 they could very well be long term.

2 MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Typically, the
3 way that we do it at other bases -- and I'm still
4 trying to come up to speed with how it's handled here
5 -- but typically, at other bases, we have what we call
6 a five-year review. And that is that every five years
7 we go back and take a look at the ground water
8 monitoring data and see over the last five years, do
9 we have contamination that is there or has it all
10 degraded to the extent that now it's clean water,
11 contamination is all degraded or what we call
12 attenuated or whatever, it's gone away.

13 At the end of the five-year review,
14 then we can conclude that we don't need to do anything
15 else. We can go to no further action.

16 I don't know exactly how the
17 program is set up here. I'm going to take a guess,
18 that some of the sites that are here will have those
19 five-year reviews, especially, if you do have that
20 long-term monitoring like he was talking about there a
21 minute ago.

22 A typical site for that would be a
23 landfill, landfill number three, classic example. So,

1 you know, I don't know enough about the base to say
2 that, you know, you're going to have contamination
3 here time and eternity. But it's the kind of thing
4 that if you do have these LUCIPs, that we could
5 probably do the five-year reviews, in terms of whether
6 or not they can be removed.

7 MR. RON LEVY: And we'll define
8 that in the LUCIPs. You'll see that in part of the
9 discussion on the LUCIP. So, you'll get a better feel
10 for it whenever we get to show you what the LUCIP
11 says. That's the actual implementation plan of the
12 land use control.

13 The next bullet talks about our
14 discussions with ALDOT. There is several things going
15 on, for those of you not aware, and it doesn't show
16 the corridor up here or the right-of-way here for the
17 eastern bypass. But this yellow part is part of it
18 right down here. And it comes up in this general
19 direction.

20 This piece down here is being
21 prepared for transfer now. Finding of suitability of
22 transfer has gone up. We're hoping to deed that very
23 quickly. Based on what we know of the area, there

1 isn't any ordnance or other contaminant issues down
2 there, so our intent is to transfer that. Both the
3 EPA and the State have signed off on that finding of
4 suitability to transfer.

5 This is, again, to try to expedite
6 the eastern bypass. So, we expect that property to go
7 rather quickly here, depending on how long it takes to
8 get the deed signed.

9 The other piece, which you all --
10 most of the RAB members are aware, is this northern
11 piece up here and some of the access roads -- which I
12 can't show you, since I don't have a good map of it --
13 that we have been working with. We've got known
14 ordnance where we've been doing work on.

15 There's two things going, one --
16 and ALDOT can speak better to this. Is that they are
17 moving to get a logging contractor and to start
18 clearing this southern piece down here for (inaudible)
19 and clearing so they can prepare for the eastern
20 bypass, based on a right of entry that we've given
21 them to this point.

22 The other piece up here in the
23 north, the Army's moving to cut down the timber so

1 that we can further our investigation of that property
2 from an ordnance standpoint. We've already done some
3 surface removal, but now we've got to get in and do
4 some more.

5 And the only way we can do that is
6 by removing the trees. So, we've also been talking to
7 ALDOT about the fact that we've got to contract out
8 (inaudible), in the process of putting a contract out
9 to remove the timber up there. And that's what that
10 point goes back towards.

11 We have monthly meetings with ALDOT
12 at Fort McClellan to discuss the progress and where
13 we're going with -- and with the clean-up and the
14 construction of the bypass. I mentioned the M101
15 piece, that's a -- needs to expedite. The M101 piece
16 is up here in the north of the property. It's
17 impacting on the bypass because this access road that
18 the community feels the need -- need right away to get
19 into the installation. We're moving that as a
20 separate EE/CA so that we can move quicker.

21 But this point was going back to
22 the fact that we're looking at doing some actual
23 logging operations up there in the north, and we're

1 going to let a contractor do that.

2 Anybody have any questions about
3 that?

4 MS. ELIZABETH BLUEMINK: How big is
5 that bottom part? How much property is that yellow
6 section at the bottom?

7 MR. RON LEVY: Actually, I don't
8 know how many acres that is. Anybody know how many
9 acres that is?

10 MR. BILL SHANKS: Two seventy-one.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Two hundred and
12 seventy acres. And that's the right-of-way for the
13 eastern bypass. That's everything from Yahoo Lake
14 south of the installation.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: And when do you
16 expect a deed to be signed on that?

17 MR. RON LEVY: Actually -- other
18 than I can say shortly. I mean, Glynn, can you
19 comment on that?

20 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We've got it
21 sitting at our headquarters now. It will be
22 forwarding with their approval. I mean, all the
23 paperwork's there. I don't know what the time frame

1 on --

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Less than a
3 month?

4 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Should be shortly.
5 I mean, I would say less than a month. Depends on if
6 the right guy's there to sign it. I mean, signatures.

7 But they have a right of entry now
8 and are awarding contracts.

9 MR. DEJARVIS LEONARD: That's
10 correct. And we had a pretty big conference this
11 morning with all the contractors and they went and
12 looked at the site. And scheduled for letting that
13 project was the last item (inaudible).

14 MR. RON LEVY: The last point goes
15 back to what Fern had brought up, in terms of the
16 EE/CAs, that we had been discussing. I think I
17 briefly explained to you that the various EE/CAs that
18 have been kicking off in Alpha, Bravo, Charlie, and
19 M101 EE/CA, and their schedules. And you can see that
20 here.

21 There is a lot of activity, in
22 terms of ordnance investigation, going on right now on
23 the installation. We've got several contractors out

1 there. Foster Wheeler is coming up to full strength.
2 Parsons is coming on board to do the CWM piece.

3 But as you can see from the
4 schedules that we're talking about kicking off for
5 those various areas that I mentioned earlier, there is
6 a lot of work about to be accomplished in
7 investigating those sites.

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: While Ron's on
9 that, as you see all of this work, we have over two
10 hundred contract and other employees, besides our
11 staff, working on just the clean-up out there and the
12 ongoing investigation. So, I mean, we have a very
13 robust staff -- as you start seeing folks coming in
14 and out -- that are working with us through
15 Huntsville, through Mobile district, through all of
16 the contractors working through the -- either UXO,
17 CWM, or just the hazardous waste.

18 MR. RON LEVY: A lot of people are
19 not aware of what's going on out there with the --
20 most of the area is closed off where we're doing
21 ordnance work because of safety reasons, exclusion
22 zones. But there is a tremendous amount of activity
23 going on at Fort McClellan, from a clean-up

1 standpoint. And if you're interested in coming and
2 sitting down and talking with me, I can give you
3 specifics about the actions that are going on.

4 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any
5 questions for Ron?

6 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Ron, on your
7 EE/CA investigations, I noticed you had on your map
8 listed old burn pit and several decon areas. How did
9 you find the historical documentation of the
10 activities that went on at those sites, to be fairly
11 comprehensive and complete or --

12 MR. RON LEVY: You going back to
13 the CWM briefing that I --

14 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Yeah, what you
15 had talked about earlier on the EE/CA study, about the
16 -- where it's all on the map, the old burn pit and
17 several decon areas, you talked about historical
18 archives and documentation of the activities.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Is your question how
20 did we conduct those or --

21 MR. JERRY HOPPER: How did you find
22 the records to be, in your opinion, as far as the
23 activities that historically had been in place at

1 those locations?

2 MR. RON LEVY: What actually
3 occurred was, we went out and looked at all the
4 records that were available. So, we may have gone to
5 other locations would have records where they may have
6 shipped stuff in here, we went to national archives,
7 we went to Army archives at various places like up in
8 Edgewood. We pulled all those records together. We
9 even had maps from previous training activities that
10 occurred. We interviewed individuals who worked out
11 here, people like some of the old -- some of you folks
12 that actually worked at Fort McClellan, and tried to
13 get them to point out exactly on the ground, you know,
14 where the areas were.

15 There were a number of things we
16 did to collect records in trying to get together
17 information to define sites. A lot of cases, we
18 already had information and we were investigating
19 those sites. I mean, there was just a history, one
20 right after the other, where we were able to just pull
21 it forward.

22 In other cases, you know, through
23 discussions and interviews and what we found in the

1 archives of the Chemical School, the MP School, the
2 archives up in Edgewood. We even went down to the
3 State level to look at the state archives. We were
4 able to glean information there.

5 And it all came together in an
6 archive search report, which is also a public document
7 and is available for anybody that wants to see it.

8 The other thing I want to point out
9 is all of our documents are public and they go into
10 the repositories, one here at JSU, in this library,
11 and one at the Anniston Calhoun County Library. And
12 for the RAB members, specifically, we will provide
13 copies as requested.

14 Did I answer your question?

15 MR. JERRY HOPPER: Thank you.

16 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other
17 questions for Ron? On to the JPA.

18 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: The biggest
19 news of the JPA, our executive director has retired
20 and we are -- hopefully, tomorrow our board will be
21 announcing a new executive director. And we're
22 excited and anxious to hear who that will be.

23 The lawsuit that we have been -- we

1 have now been to court twice with that and had a
2 favorable ruling from the judge -- has now been
3 appealed to the State Court. So, all of the JPA's
4 activities, as far as the sale of property, is on
5 hold. I'm sorry to say that, because we were looking
6 forward to closing some contracts with some
7 developers, but at this point we are on hold.

8 We have been able to lease two
9 buildings, building 65 and 66 in the historic district
10 on Buckner Circle. We've leased both of those
11 buildings to an engineering and architect's office.

12 Those buildings are being
13 renovated, according to the Secretary of Interior
14 standards, because they are in the historic district.
15 The Alabama Historical Commission has been monitoring
16 those renovations. And we hope to have someone in
17 those -- the offices occupied soon.

18 We're excited about it. It's nice
19 to have somebody on the hill besides the six JPA
20 people every day.

21 I would just like to give my
22 appreciation to EPA and ADEM and the Army in the
23 on-board reviews and the hard work that they have been

1 turning out. It's nice to see a lot of these sites
2 coming back NFA and knowing that we're not going to
3 have a red line on the map any longer.

4 And the cooperation that we've
5 received from ALDOT and the Army in moving the eastern
6 bypass project along has been critical. And,
7 Mr. Leonard, thank you very much. I know your staff
8 has -- they cornered me the other day and said how
9 hard they were working and long hours they were
10 putting in.

11 As you know, the eastern bypass is
12 critical to the future development at McClellan. And
13 seeing this project move forward -- and I think we'll
14 probably have people call and complain once they see
15 trees being cut down, but at the same time, I think
16 it's a positive step towards furthering development as
17 soon as we're able to free up property and sell it.

18 At this point, hopefully, next
19 month, I will bring our new executive director to
20 introduce him to you. Any questions?

21 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I have one
22 question. I'm not sure whether the Army or JPA is the
23 most appropriate group to answer it. But it was

1 either the last meeting or two meetings ago, we were
2 told about some discussions that were going on about
3 privatization of the efforts out here. Are those
4 still ongoing? And if so, can somebody give us an
5 update on that?

6 MR. GLYNN RYAN: JPA.

7 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Okay. We are
8 still pursuing the issue of privatization for parts of
9 McClellan for clean-up. We have met in Washington, at
10 the Pentagon a couple of times, with the higher Army.

11 Our attorney is working that, our
12 Boston attorney, David Nizely (phonetic), Ray Clark
13 has been very helpful to us in that. And we're still
14 pursuing that.

15 When we do have a plan in place and
16 know the way we're going, we'll certainly come to the
17 RAB and bring you up to date on our ideas and which
18 way we're going to go with which areas.

19 Seeing all the documents come out
20 NFA, you know, certainly shrinks the area that we
21 would be looking at. But it's still a very critical
22 point for us and something we are actively pursuing.

23 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Is there a

1 time frame that you see, Miki, on some of these things
2 getting privatized or is that --

3 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Part of the
4 time frame is the -- the time frame of privatization
5 is what we're going to be working out with the Army.
6 Exactly which areas we would look at and -- would be
7 something that we'll do with them.

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: So, this is
9 probably something that's many months away instead of
10 a month or two away, would you say? Six, eight
11 months, something like that?

12 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: A few months,
13 yes. We had hoped to have something a little more
14 concrete, but again, we've had problems with the
15 lawsuits slowing us up some.

16 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Before we
17 move on to audience questions or comments, does anyone
18 else for the RAB have any other issues they would like
19 to see discussed?

20 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I had
21 mentioned that I was interested in archeology. Have
22 there been any Native American burial sites or camp
23 sites identified on the Fort that are --

1 MR. RON LEVY: There is no burial
2 sites on Fort McClellan, Native American burial sites.
3 There are several sites on the main post that have
4 been identified in phase one and phase two
5 investigations, and those will be protected and
6 mitigated when we transfer the property.

7 A lot of those sites are in the
8 area that's going to the National Wildlife Refuge.
9 So, when we transfer on a fed-to-fed, that will be a
10 requirement for Fish & Wildlife to protect those
11 sites.

12 And there are others that -- there
13 is one site within the eastern bypass which ALDOT will
14 either have to mitigate or protect, which they'll
15 inherit. Other sites in and around the installation,
16 as it goes to JPA, we'll negotiate in accordance with
17 what we've got now, which we've got a programmatic
18 agreement with the Advisory Council, State Historic
19 Preservation Office, and the Army to tell -- kind of
20 define what we do as we transfer property to protect
21 sites.

22 Miki mentioned it because it -- was
23 mentioning historic buildings, which is part of that.

1 So, we're not only looking at archeological sites,
2 we're looking at historic sites from a building
3 standpoint, as well.

4 If you're interested, we can
5 provide you specifics on that. In fact, if you want
6 to get with me, separately, I'll be glad to show you
7 what we've got.

8 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other
9 questions or comments from the RAB? Does anyone with
10 the audience have any questions or comments they would
11 like to -- yes, sir.

12 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Regarding the
13 particular January 22nd meeting, I was not here -- and
14 I've never attended a meeting before in fact -- but a
15 friend of mine was here at that meeting and --
16 Jeanette Champion -- and there was a great deal of
17 discussion about landfill number three and the
18 problems with landfill number three.

19 And Jeanette reported to me -- she
20 took extensive notes at the meeting -- and said that
21 it was revealed that there was a trailer park on
22 Anniston Beach Road that utilizes well water and that
23 that well is contaminated. And so I asked Pete for

1 the minutes and got the minutes from Pete and there
2 was no mention of it. There was a great deal of
3 discussion, obviously, about landfill number three.

4 But was that stated, that there is
5 a well that is contaminated that is being used by
6 residents of a trailer park on Anniston Beach Road?
7 What do you recall of that? And if you can't recall
8 -- I'm asking Pete or anybody who was here. See, I
9 wasn't, I've never been to a meeting before, so --

10 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Maybe I can
11 help out with that. I still have the transcript, the
12 verbatim transcript.

13 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: You do?

14 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Yes.

15 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Could I get a
16 copy of that transcript?

17 MS. JOAN McKINNEY: Well, let me,
18 after the meeting, sit down and talk to you and we'll
19 see if we can't work something like that out.

20 Lots of time we summarize minutes,
21 you know, we don't make every statement. But the
22 verbatim transcript is certainly available.

23 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: I would greatly

1 appreciate speaking with you about that.

2 But while I still have the floor, I
3 was wondering, Pete, what you recall of that? What
4 was -- and the others who were here, what do you
5 recall, just --

6 MR. PETE CONROY: I don't remember
7 any discussion about a trailer park with a
8 contaminated well.

9 MR. JERRY HOPPER: I believe the
10 well we talked about and discussed at that meeting was
11 a well in Highway -- the center of Highway 21 down
12 here at the median that is the well that was impacted,
13 is the only one I remember we talked about that was
14 impacted.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: She may have put
16 two conversations together.

17 MR. RON HOOD: (Inaudible) to the
18 well, not that there was contamination.

19 MR. JERRY HOPPER: That's the only
20 contaminated well I remember any discussion about
21 anything.

22 MR. RON LEVY: From the Army's
23 perspective, we're not aware of any contaminated wells

1 in that trailer park on Anniston Beach Road.

2 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Could we get --
3 could it be -- could we have it tested, have the water
4 tested to be sure? Because I was out there the other
5 day, checking into this, for the benefit of the people
6 who live there. They're not the kind of people who
7 are likely to come to a meeting like this. And so I
8 was speaking with them. And one gentleman who lives
9 there said that he was told six years ago that his
10 well is -- you know, his water is contaminated and he
11 had done nothing about it. And, of course, that's
12 just something the guy said to me.

13 MR. RON LEVY: If it's a community
14 well, if it's a community well, under State
15 requirements, it would have to be tested on a certain
16 basis. So, I'm not --

17 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Do you know how
18 frequently that is?

19 MR. RON LEVY: I would have to go
20 back and look. But if it's a community well, it will
21 be permitted and tested for certain variables, which I
22 can't tell you off the top of my mind.

23 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Well, we found

1 four or five trailer parks on Anniston Beach Road,
2 right off 21, and only one of them has -- uses well
3 water. And so it may be that she didn't hear it
4 correctly. So, what I'm assuming then is that from
5 the January 22nd meeting, there was no such statement
6 that anybody recalls, and if there were, you would
7 have done something about it a long time ago, right?

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: The well that I
9 believe the contaminant showed up in was actually a
10 test well we sunk specifically to pull samples of
11 water --

12 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: In the median of
13 21?

14 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes.

15 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Yeah, I know
16 about that one.

17 MR. GLYNN RYAN: And that's --

18 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Right.

19 MR. RON LEVY: I wasn't here at the
20 last RAB meeting, but that's always been a discussion
21 that's gone on about what the Army's doing to
22 investigate landfill number three.

23 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Her notes were,

1 as she gave them to me, said it was S-14, I believe,
2 or a -- yeah, that's what she said to me. She was
3 going to be here and she was unable to come because of
4 an illness in the family.

5 So, I appreciate that. I'll speak
6 with the lady. Thank you.

7 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Real quick.
8 I apologize. Could you state your name for the record
9 so we can --

10 MR. RUFUS KENNEY: Rufus Kenney.

11 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Thank you,
12 Mr. Kenney. Are there any other questions or comments
13 from the audience? No. Okay.

14 That's everything on the agenda.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: I have one thing.

16 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Pete?

17 MR. PETE CONROY: I appreciate
18 everybody coming to Jacksonville State University
19 tonight.

20 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: We
21 appreciate you hosting us. Do I hear a motion to
22 adjourn?

23 MS. DONNA FATHKE: So moved.

1 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Second?

2 MR. JERRY ELSER: Second.

3 MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Anyone

4 opposed? Motion approved.

5 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)
CALHOUN COUNTY)

I, SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Notary Public in and for The State of
Alabama at Large, duly commissioned and qualified,
HEREBY CERTIFY that this proceeding was taken before
me, then was by me reduced to shorthand, afterwards
transcribed upon a computer, and that the foregoing is
a true and correct transcript of the proceeding to the
best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY this proceeding
was taken at the time and place and was concluded
without adjournment.

1 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
2 set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,
3 on this the 25th of March, 2001.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2001.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE

Notary Public in and for

Alabama at Large