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 19th day of August, 2002, commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.

P.O. BOX 544
OHATCHEE, AL 36271
256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001

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

P.O. BOX 544
OHATCHEE, AL 36271
256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: If we could have everybody's attention. We'll go ahead and get started, please. We're starting. We'll start off by calling the roll. I'm here. Mr. Ryan is here. Mr. Beckett?

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Buford?

MR. BUFORD: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Clendenin?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

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

MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Elser?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Ms. Fathke? Mr. Franklin? Mr. Freeman?

MR. FREEMAN: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Dr. Harrington?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'm here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Mr. Hood?

Mayor Kimbrough?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And we have Mr. Grant --

MR. RON GRANT: Here --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- who's here. And Mr. Levy is here.

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Doyle, Mr. Brittain is here.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay. If we could, why don't we start down here and we'll just work our way that way and ask the members of the audience to, please, introduce themselves.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda Cunningham with the Environmental Office, Fort McClellan.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I'm Josh Jenkins, with Shaw Environmental.

MR. HUGH VICK: Gannett-Fleming, EPA contractor.

BETTY VICK: And I'm Betty Vick.

MS. SARAH CLEMENCE: I'm Sarah Clemence, environmental reporter for the Anniston Star.

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

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

MR. LEE JAYE: Lee Jaye, Fort McClellan, Environmental.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, Fort McClellan, Environmental.

MR. JIM MILLER: Jim Miller, Anniston Water Works.

MR. BEN BENTKOWSKI: Ben Bentkowski, Gannett-Fleming.

MR. BILL HEGMAN (phonetic): Bill Hegman, Shaw Environmental.

MR. ART HOLCOMB: Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler.

MR. DAN COPELAND: Dan Copeland,

Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

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

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James Transition Force, Fort McClellan.

MR. LEE COKER: Lee Coker, Corps of Engineers, Mobile.

MR. CHIP PARROTT: Chip Parrott, Corps of Engineers, Mobile.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson, Transition Force, Environmental.

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

MS. LINDA WINSTON: Linda Winston, Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay. Good, thank you. Has everyone had a chance to look at the minutes from the last meeting? Or does anybody have any questions or concerns with the minutes from July? No. Okay. I practiced this before I came, so, hopefully, I'll get it right this time. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes for the month of July?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: So moved.

MR. JAMES BUFORD: Second.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: All those in favor? Opposed? Show the motion is carried.

Moving on to old business. Landfill EE/CA, public comment period ends on August 19th, which is today. I will go ahead and pass this around right now, although I don't know if we'll hit on this later. Mr. Grant did go through the comments that were provided by the EPA and ADEM and just provided a brief summary. I did E-mail it to everybody earlier today, but if you didn't get a chance to check your E-mail, I have a hard copy right here. So, if we could pass them around that way if we could. And if you have any questions on Mr. Grant's comments, we can -- we'll just find a spot here a little later in the agenda where we can allow anybody to ask questions on his comments there.

And then one other item, we have had a number of resignations from the RAB over the last couple of months. Mr. Hopper has resigned. Mr. Stratton was removed because he hadn't been attending the meetings. Mr. Thomassy resigned.

We have received a number of new

applications. We have three old applications and two new applications. And I think we may have a couple more applications on the way, I think is what Glynn was telling me just a couple of minutes ago.

I guess the plan right now, if anybody has or knows of anyone that would like to submit an application, we'd like to have those applications by the 10th of September. We'll get, I guess -- we'll have copies of those, I guess, sent around to the RAB.

Oh, they're on the table. Okay. So, we should pick one up on the way out. Pick up some copies of those applications on the way out, if you would, and try to take a look at them before the next meeting.

At the next RAB meeting, we'll vote -- let's see, are we looking at October now voting? Is that when we're proposing? Okay. Then at the meeting on the 21st of October, we'll plan on nominating new members to the RAB.

That's everything on the agenda for old business. Are there any other topics from the last meeting that anyone would like to bring up before

we move on to the program for this evening? Nope? Okay.

Well, let's move on ahead. Ron, do you want to --

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. The first thing we want to talk about is the off-site groundwater monitoring results in relation to landfill three. We've been telling the RAB members that we'd provide them with the results of that -- of the well installations and the monitoring of those wells for the past six months. It's been -- this has been briefed already to the RAB.

Good news here, a couple of things I want to mention, one is that we did -- some of the property out there belonged to Ms. Brown. And Josh Jenkins from Shaw Group was going to brief us. But we'll show you what -- excuse me, Mr. Brown. We'll show you where that property is and where we put those wells in. We did inform, as of today, Mr. Brown, his daughter, who happens to be -- hold power of attorney, a letter that we did present to the mayor, today, also, the results associated with the sampling of those wells.

I do want to talk just briefly about this. You know, after years of work and millions of dollars in investigation, we're now receiving part of the answers to our questions. We can say with a high degree of certainty that the data shows that the contamination from landfill three does not and will not pose a threat to the City of Weaver's potable water supply.

Our models of the underlying geology indicate that the groundwater and in turn any contaminants transported by water are not heading towards the City of Weaver.

The models show the extent of the contamination plume in the east, west and the south. The plume appears to be heading in an northerly direction, generally following Highway 21. Josh is going to show you that in just a moment.

The focus of the investigation will be now to look further to the north in order to define the northern boundary of the plume and confirm the direction and the rate of flow.

While we continue to monitor selected wells, and in particularly those in and

around Weaver, it appears the geology in the faulting to the west of landfill three inhibits any flow in that direction and prohibits a threat to Weaver's water supply. And I think that will come out clearly as Josh presents his data.

And with that, I'm going to -- Josh Jenkins -- all of you know who Josh is. Josh is the geologist who's been working this project for a very long time.

I think, for those of us who are sitting on this side, if you want to turn your chairs around.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Okay. Thanks, Ron. I just want to give this evening's presentation. I basically want to bring out four points. First of all, I want to tell you what we know now, I want to give you a brief chronology of the work that's going into the data, and then I want to give you some background, try to give you some background understanding of geology, some of these block diagrams we've made, these cross sections we've made, give you an understanding of the geology and of the groundwater flow, that will help support why we understand what we

do about where contaminants are in the vicinity of landfill three. And lastly, just briefly touch upon where we need to go, we believe, to go, moving forward.

Okay. So, what we know. First of all, the groundwater contaminant plume is defined to the west and the south of landfill three in fractured mudstone and silt stone. The map of landfill three is right here. The groundwater contaminant plume is defined over here to the west, east, and south. This area up here north of landfill three is still an area that requires some further investigation.

Now, there's a structural feature. That structural feature I'll talk about in a few minutes, but it's basically how the rock lays. That appears to be creating a preferential groundwater flow path and hence a groundwater contaminant flow path. So, that's influencing the groundwater and contaminant movement. Next.

The City of Weaver wells, which are located approximately one point seven to over two miles from landfill three have not been impacted from contaminants from landfill three. Next.

What we've been able to determine is there are at least three faults. And over here on this block diagram -- which I'll explain in a little bit more detail in a few minutes -- we have some faulting over here. This is landfill three. We have some faulting beneath Highway 21. We have some faulting out here on the Brown property well -- or Brown property.

And then we also have the Pell City fault, which is a major fault that's been mapped in many Alabama geologic publications. And that's located out here to the west.

So, we have at least three faults that are between landfill three and the City of Weaver water supply wells. And the significance of those are that they may -- that they appear to be impacting the direction of groundwater movement and influencing the groundwater flow and thus contaminant movement.

Okay. The bedrock contaminant plume trends south, north along Highway 21 and appears to be moving with groundwater flow direction. Again, looking at a map of landfill three, the contaminant plume, it's moving in a south to north direction is

what it appears to be.

And in the northern down gradient extent of the contaminant plume has not been defined. And the northern is up here on top.

Next slide. In the vertical extent of the plume has not been defined, the north. So, what we're saying is the depth, we've put in a well up here, approximately, two hundred and fifty feet, and we haven't defined the bottom of the plume. So, that's what we know right now. Next.

Now, I want to give you just a brief history of landfill three and a brief chronology of the investigations that have transpired to date. Landfill three was used a post sanitary landfill from 1946 to 1967. It was constructed as a series of trenches filled with sanitary waste, and it's approximately twenty-three acres in size. Next.

Here is landfill three. This is the outline of the main post at Fort McClellan. You can see it's up here in the northwest corner. These trenches trended in a northwest southeast pattern and were pretty much parallel within landfill number three. Next.

Okay. I want to talk about briefly, chronology of investigations. The Army began investigating or looking into the groundwater conditions around landfill three in 1986. At that time there were five wells installed. These wells were installed primarily in residuum bedrock.

And when I talk about residuum in bedrock, what I'm saying is -- just your attention to this cross section, which I'm going to talk about. But the residuum is this yellow -- yellowish tan material up here near the surface, and it's highly weathered bedrock material, something that an auger could drill through. Pretty easy to drill.

But what that means is the wells were installed relatively shallow, anywhere from ten, fifteen, thirty, to up to maybe seventy feet deep.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Is that the deepest part of residuum?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We've actually seen residuum to extend as deep as over a hundred feet along the highway. You can see out in here. We can talk about that some more. Next slide.

All right. 1993, the Army continued

their investigation in the vicinity of landfill three. Five additional wells were installed, OLFG six through ten. They were installed during a site investigation, and they were installed to fill data gaps that were perceived from the previous work out there. And they were put in in areas primarily along the western perimeter of the landfill, because these were the areas that were believed to be receiving groundwater flow off of landfill three.

Now, when these wells were installed, there were sampled along with the previously five installed. And OLFG seven, which is right here on the western perimeter, that well had some chlorinated volatile organic compounds. And I'll explain those in a few minutes. But that well had the chlorinated VOCs in it.

And at that time, that was the -- that was then determined to be the contaminant associated with landfill three. Next slide.

In 1994 and '95, additional wells were installed, OLFG eleven through nineteen. Next slide.

With the well installation and

sampling of these wells, not only did they verify with the continued sampling that G seven did have contaminants in it, but also this well, OLFG twelve, here installed in the median of Highway 21, chlorinated VOCs were also found in that particular well. Next slide.

The City of Weaver potable water supply wells and Medders' well, which is a domestic well, an used domestic well, located up in this part of the map, that I don't have on here, they were also sampled at this time. And there were no VOCs detected in this time period. Next slide.

Okay. That brings us to the current time frame, 2001 to present. Beginning in 2001, the Army has undertaken an aggressive approach to defining the western extent of the groundwater contaminant plume in the vicinity of landfill three.

There have been numerous monitoring wells installed up here on Blarney Drive, City of Weaver right-of-way, OLFG thirty-one and thirty-two, thirty and twenty-nine and thirty-seven, these wells are all on Mr. Brown's property. Then there's also been additional wells installed here in

the median of Highway 21.

As the slide states, most of the wells were installed in pairs or clusters to monitor more than one vertical zone or to look at different depths within the saturated or the groundwater saturated bedrock. These wells range in depth from a hundred and seventy-five to approximately three hundred feet deep.

They're time consuming and expensive to install. And obtaining access to private property here on the Brown property has taken a bit of time to accomplish. But both -- the Army has been able to actually achieve that.

Also, during this time frame, 2001 to present, the City of Weaver wells have continued to be sampled. We've actually sampled them three times since May of 2001. And we've also sampled the Medders' well again and also another unused domestic well, which we call the Lowery well. Next slide.

And this shows landfill three. This is the Medders' well, which I discussed, and this is the Lowery well, which is coming through a little light on this slide. This shows landfill three in

relation to the locations of the Weaver supply wells two and three. Next slide.

Now, I want to talk to you about the geology and the bedrock structure. And the reason why I want to bring this up is because this information, combined with the groundwater flow directions we've been able to find, influences where the contamination is and also where we believe we need to focus future investigations, to fully define the extent of the contaminant plume.

And first of all, I want to give you just a brief summary of what the bedrock is in the vicinity of landfill three. Bedrock consists of the Rome formation.

I brought a couple of cores here. It might be difficult to see in this lighting. But the Rome formation is primarily a mudstone and a silt stone. It's a very hard material. It has some small interbedded layers of carbonate, very small contorted. You can see the lines are squiggly in this stuff.

This is typically a red, brown, or brick colored. If y'all drive up Highway 21 and see Waldrop's Awning or Coverings, where the old drive-in

is, you look back in the back, there is a lot of red rock back there, that is the Rome formation.

Bedrock to the east of landfill three -- and what I want to say, east and west, I'll point out on this map. There's an imaginary line running northeast southwest. Bedrock to the east of this area consists of this material, which is called the Conasauga formation. This rock is more of what's called a carbonate.

The difference between the Conasauga and the Rome formations is primarily how they weather and what happens to them when they undergo a natural degradation. Groundwater will move through the Conasauga formation. It will tend to move in what's called conduits. It will form like little pipes within the rock, itself. Whereas, water moving through the Rome formation will tend to stay within the fractures within the bedrock.

Now, what we're able to do with the geology information that we've collected, we've put together a cross section. And this actually represents one cross section. If you look up here on this map, this is landfill three. This line, AA

prime, it represents a cross through the ground of what we're looking at from A northwest to A prime southeast. So, this is one continuous view of what's going on from here, up on Blarney Drive, within the City of Weaver, down here to the southeast side of landfill three.

And the major points on this cross section is -- not only does it look pretty neat from a geology standpoint, but it indicates that we've got some faulting going on right in here, just along Highway 21. And there's also some inferred faulting out here on the Brown property. This is the well up on Blarney Drive, G twenty-seven, up here.

The other major thing is: You can see the colors change. The colors over here represent mostly mudstones and silt stones. As you move to the northwest, you get more of a -- more carbonates are interbedded or mixed within those silt stones, and -- but we still know we're in the Rome formation because we have some of this red material, this red silt stone down here at the bottom of this boring.

Now, one of the things you may want to -- you may inquire about is faulting. I just want

to touch on that, what the faulting represents. The faulting -- for you all that aren't familiar with it -- faulting is simply a process where you've got one set of rocks from here, moving over another set of rocks, which is right here. And what the faulting does, is it tends to move, at least around in the Weaver area, it tends to move rock of one type, such as this white, next to rocks of another type, such as what I'm showing in green.

And it will tend to disrupt the weathering process, and it will also tend to make groundwater flow in more of a -- more of a preferred pathway, which is instead of moving along lines within the bedrock, itself, to within fractures that are along this flat face of this fault. So, that's kind of -- briefly explains, you know, why the faulting is important in this area.

Another cross section I want to bring up is BB prime up there on the map. That's this cross section right here. This rock is all within the Rome formation. This cross section also shows a fault here and here. This is actually the same fault, but the perspective you're looking at it on this cross

section, the fault actually bends into the board. So, you're not looking at it all in one complete section.

Again, this is southwest. This is northeast. That's southwest, northeast. So, this is the line you're looking at. And this is right along -- this would be as if you were looking through -- you were driving north along Highway 21.

Now, the folding and faulting, I have briefly discussed. We've got inferred faulting. The reason -- we actually didn't actually see a fault here. And we suspect a fault here being inferred. The reason why is because we have this type of rock that we've seen in these cores. It's called brecciation. If you can click on that, Bill.

The brecciation shows a lot of -- this looks like gravel, almost. But what this is is you've got the red material up in here. It's all broken up. It's combined with this light material here which is more of a carbonate. The brecciation just really describes rock that's been chewed up and rock that has moved a lot.

And again, that is important because of what it may do with the groundwater movement in the

vicinity of all this brecciation.

Now, I want to talk to you about this block diagram over here. What we did was, we took cross section AA prime, and what we want to do is put it over here on a block diagram and kind of show you on the ground surface where landfill three is and where Weaver supply well number two is. And what this cross section shows and what this block diagram shows, it shows cross section AA prime, extending from here to here.

It also shows this brown, brick colored material. This is also mapped as the Rome formation. And we know that based upon Alabama geologic survey publications, dating back at least fifty years, describing this as Rome formation.

This feature right here, this line, this represents what's called the Pell City fault. And some of you have heard about the Jacksonville fault. The Pell City fault is also an important fault in the vicinity of Anniston and Weaver. And what the Pell City fault does, is it separates this rock over here, this Rome formation from this material over here to the west, which is the Conasauga formation.

Again, that's important. Landfill three is over here. It sits primarily in the Rome formation. We've got a little Conasauga over here to the right, to the east. This stuff is primarily fractured, broken up. Groundwater moves through fractures.

Whereas you get over here, and in the City of Weaver's wells, their wells are in more of a conduit-type material where groundwater flows through these pipes within the rock, itself.

Now, we don't know the structure over here. We don't know if there is all this folding and faulting. We suspect that there is. But because we don't have a lot of information, we just colored it one solid color, blue out there.

Okay. Now, we know a little bit about the geology. What do we know about the groundwater flow direction? Well, what we did was we looked at wells that were put in in the residuum and then we looked at wells that were put in the bedrock, because we were thinking that wells installed in this yellow, yellowish tan material, versus wells installed in this bedrock, the groundwater may behave

differently.

There may be some type of barrier that would preclude or prevent water from moving either down from the residuum into bedrock and thus maybe prevent contaminant movement into bedrock.

So, what we wanted to do was look at it two separate zones as I speak. So, residuum. So, what we looked at in the residuum wells, we basically took water levels, water levels indicated that groundwater flow direction is from southeast to northwest. These arrows here, here, indicate the general direction of groundwater movement through the residuum in the vicinity of landfill three. Next.

Okay, the average velocity, we took some -- we ran a few tests and used the spacing on the wells and came up with a calculation that the groundwater velocity is approximately, on average, thirty-six feet per year. So, this is moving slow.

Now, we also wanted to look at the bedrock. We have fewer bedrock wells. Most of them are the to west of landfill three. But with those particular wells -- go ahead and click on that -- bedrock flow is showing the -- in the direction of

Highway 21, generally to the northeast. These arrows are kind of showing we've got flow a little bit from the west and also a little bit from the southeast.

This is somewhat different from what we saw in the residuum where we just had groundwater flow here at landfill three going to the northwest. The average groundwater flow velocity, based on calculations we've made, is approximately three feet per year. So, this is very slow, much slower than what we had seen in the residuum.

Also, as I previously mentioned, the groundwater flow appears to be mostly through fractures within this Rome formation, this red stuff. Next.

Lastly, one of the ideas going into it, that there could be some type of separation between groundwater within the residuum and bedrock. What we have found, based upon groundwater levels, is that the water appears to be hydraulically connected. So, what that -- that term basically means is that there is -- there is an avenue to allow groundwater flow and thus potential contaminant flow to move from the residuum into bedrock. Next.

Okay. We know the geology. We know the groundwater flow direction. Now, where is the contaminants? Where are the VOCs in the groundwater? Next slide.

First of all, the City of Weaver wells, as I mentioned before, have been sampled. They've been sampled three times, even a fourth time when you consider the sampling taking place in '94 and '95. Each time, there have been no detectable concentrations of VOCs.

Chlorinated VOC distribution appears to trend along the orientation of the faults. The groundwater analytical results indicate that the VOCs in the groundwater extend along Highway 21 to the northeast at increasing depths. And the extent of the VOCs to the west appears to be defined.

What I would like to just point out are a few maps here, showing the VOC distribution, not only on a map view, but also in a cross-sectional view.

As I -- as with the bedrock, we looked at cross sections in -- with groundwater. We also look at the cross sections. This is cross

section -- this is cross section BB prime, same say cross section which I showed you over here. It extends along Jacksonville Highway here from southwest to northeast.

What this shows is we've defined the extent of contaminants, VOCs to the southeast. We are at or near the bottom of the plume, along here, which is approximately two hundred and fifty feet, right in the vicinity of landfill three.

But as you go to the north, the plume appears to be sinking. And out here on the northern extent, which is up here, along Highway 21, we have not fully defined the extent of the plume.

Now, looking at a cross section, a northwest, southeast cross section, which is right here, CC prime on this map, goes across the northern part of landfill three. What this shows again, these wells out here are wells that were installed in Blarney Drive, City of Weaver right-of-way, Brown property wells. And then Highway 21 is right in here.

And this is the faulting that I had previously discussed, that I showed here on the block diagram and in the cross sections. That's the

faulting going on right here.

What this shows, is landfill three being -- extending along in this area, is that the contaminant plume appears to end here to the west, along the structural feature, this faulting, which we have looked at. And also, we appear to have contaminant maps to the east, as well. The bottom of the plume is a little bit undefined right in that area.

Now you're asking, what are these VOCs? What are these chlorinated VOCs? Well, this is a tag map showing the actual volatile organic constituents in the groundwater. These are the wells along here, which have had hits, which have had contaminants detected in them. These are primarily Trichloroethene and 1,1,2, Tetrachlorethane. There are a few other chlorinated compounds, such as vinyl chloride.

What this map represents is the list of volatile organic compounds that have been detected above Fort McClellan's site-specific screening levels. And those are just risk-based screening levels that have been developed over the past four or five years

for Fort McClellan to proceed with their environmental investigations.

But of these compounds exceeding the site-specific screening levels, what we've done is we've highlighted those particular compounds that exceed the EPA's maximum contaminant levels for drinking water. And you can see here the number of compounds is less than -- exceeding MCLs than the actual compounds exceeding the site-specific screening levels.

Just one other view of the VOCs. I want to talk about the cross-sectional view, but I also wanted to mention in map view, what these look like. Residuum, we've got an apparent boomerang-shaped configuration in the vicinity of landfill three.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Can y'all see that?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It's kind of difficult to see. Can folks back in the back see this? It's difficult.

But the outline of the plume is about right in here, where this pointer is showing.

And then in bedrock, the deep bedrock, deep wells, wells a hundred and seventy-five to two hundred and fifty feet deep, the plume configuration is a little bit larger, extending out here on-post, down here to the south.

And here to the west we haven't defined. One thing that really jumps out is these wells here on the Brown property.

We've had no VOCs detected in any of these wells that are associated with landfill three. This well up here, we had one well with the constituent methylene chloride. It's a common drinking water compound. If you sample your drinking water, you'll oftentime see methylene chloride.

So again, what this shows: We've defined the extent of the plume here to the west, to the south, and to the east. There is some unknown area up here to the north where we need to go further to the north, northeast and perhaps northwest. Click on that, Bill.

One other thing I wanted to point out, the Medders' well, as I previously said, and the Lowery well, were sampled in 2001. No VOCs were

detected in those wells. Those wells are not shown on this map, but up in here and over in here, where they would be on this map.

One other important thing I wanted to bring up is that there is evidence that degradation is occurring. What I mean by that is: That a lot of these compounds that we believe are associated with landfill three, they appear to be breaking down naturally. And they are moving from something more complex to something simpler. So, that is a good thing.

If the degradation process would go to completion, the stuff would eventually, the organics would eventually degrade into something that would be relatively harmless.

This is a map or a slide, just wanted to put everything into perspective here. This is landfill three, right here. These are the Weaver water supply wells. And this -- these lines right here are red, and what they are is the outline of the plume in the deep bedrock wells along landfill three here to the west.

What this shows is the relative

position of this plume, as we know it, in relation to landfill three and the City of Weaver water supply wells. Again, we've defined the extent here to the south, to the west, and to the east. But there is -- are some areas up here to the northwest, north and northeast, which are going to require further delineation. Next slide.

So, in summary: The groundwater contaminant plume is defined to the west and to the south of landfill three in fractured mudstone and silt stone. The structural feature, the faulting, which we see right here on the block diagram, over here in the cross section, this appears to influence groundwater and contaminant movement, causing groundwater to move in a preferential flow pattern.

The groundwater in the deep bedrock appears to flow through fractures beneath Highway 21. And that's in this area right here. Next slide.

We have inferred at least three faults between landfill three and the City of Weaver water supply well. We know one -- one fault, the Pell City fault, it's well documented in Alabama geologic survey literature. These other faults are

inferred. They're based are on some brecciation we saw in cores and based on the change in lithology or the change in rock type we're seeing from here moving to the west.

The bedrock contaminant plume trends south, north along Highway 21. Over here on this map, you've got here -- you have the south end of landfill three up along Highway 21. And it appears to be moving with the groundwater flow direction, as I previously mentioned. The groundwater flow direction in the deep bedrock is moving to the northeast, north, northeast.

So, what's next? Well, at this time we are currently compiling additional information. We are formulating a plan to install additional wells to the northwest, north and northeast. What we intend to do is present these to the BCT next month, in September.

In addition, we've come up with a list of approximately nineteen monitoring wells in the vicinity of landfill three, not only these wells around landfill three, but also the two Weaver supply wells. The intent of these wells, the sampling of

these wells, is to maintain our understanding of the orientation or configuration of the plume and also here -- sample these wells on the west and the two Weaver water supply wells to the west to just monitor and maintain our understanding of the extent of contamination to the west of landfill three.

And that's pretty much it. Any questions?

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Does this have any relationship to the recommendation of capping?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No, this is really a separate --

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: It doesn't -- it doesn't support or not support, as far as the recommendation of capping?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No. Ron, you may want to address this. But the Army's really looking at the groundwater and the mediation as -- source mediation as two separate issues.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Okay. That's all.

MR. RON LEVY: That's correct.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I have a

couple of questions.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Sure.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I'm sure you guys told us this at some time in the past. But how much data is this based on? Was the groundwater data collected over a period of a year or something like that, since the monitoring wells were installed? Or was this just one sampling event or how much groundwater data was collected?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The information that went into this plume, to define this plume and in the plume that we're showing right here in the residuum in the bedrock, we collected this data from the wells represented here and here. Basically, there are thirty -- I think close to thirty-nine wells, including the two City of Weaver wells. We did those as quick as possible. We did that in approximately a three week time period, April and May of this year.

So, each time we've put in wells, we've not only sampled the new wells, but we've gone back and sampled the old wells.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: How many sampling events have there been? I guess where I'm

getting at is: Did you take into account seasonality and all that stuff, or is this something you keep looking at as you move into the future?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, the seasonality is -- differences are going to be captured with the quarterly sampling. We sampled, I think, back in May -- May or April we talked about the sampling that was done in January.

Prior to that, we sampled some wells last summer. But as we sampled wells, the Army's continually adding more to the data base. So, not only are you getting seasonality, you're getting a greater extent, both vertically and horizontally, of what you're sampling.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: You mentioned that some of the samples you had MCL exceedances. Now, some people may not know what it means, as far as moving forward, if you have an MCL exceedance. Can you give us a little detail on what that means, as far as moving forward in the process when we have these exceedances at certain wells? I mean, does it mean you move into a -- eventually, at some point, move into a risk assessment phase or what

does that --

MR. RON LEVY: Well, this is an RI. So, we're in an RI phase and there will -- and there's a risk assessment associated with that. Plus, we'll move in after the RI phase into an FS.

So, at some point, we will have to define a remedy. But until we, you know, finish the process and define the northern extent of the plume, you know, we're probably -- we're really not prepared to define exactly what the remedy is, at this point.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Did -- you mentioned you had some information on flow velocities. Do the size of the plumes match up well, given how long the landfill was in use with the velocities? In other words, if the groundwater is moving three feet a year in bedrock or -- I can't remember what you said -- twenty-five feet a year or something like that, in the residuum, do the size of the plumes kind of.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: They match --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: -- match up fairly well with that?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: They --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I know it's

not an exact science --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It's not an exact science. The plume -- the extent of VOCs here in bedrock appears to be a little bit larger than what you would look at at three feet per year. It probably falls more in line with the velocities we're seeing in the residuum. Again, the -- they were averages. We have --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Sure.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We have hydraulic conductivity, or testing that we've preformed, has just given us really, I think, an order of magnitude type understanding.

There is other things going on like dissolution and other physical changes in these contaminants which may be moving them at -- which may make them appear at a farther distance than where just strictly at groundwater velocity speed would tell you where they should be.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And given the groundwater velocities you have and some of the other data you have, are you able to predict how far north you anticipate that they have moved in the

bedrock or is it really just --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No, not at this time. We're continuing to evaluate where we need to go up here to the north. And, at this point, no.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: And my last question is: I seem to remember about a year --

MR. JOE DOYLE: Can everybody speak up just a little bit for the people down here?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I'm sorry. I'm talking this way, and you guys are all that way. Can -- I seem to recall about a year ago there was a theory that perhaps the groundwater was going out and then looping back around and going back under the landfill. I assume that theory isn't panning out?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That theory -- that was just a theory at the time --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Yeah.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: -- based on what we knew. I think we've got a lot more data now. And we've got wells that were put in much deeper than what we -- than what we did in the past.

And the theory is partially -- you know, the theory is that the groundwater structure or

the bedrock structure is influencing it, but it's not influencing it in the way that we had thought of previously. It's just really more -- acting more as a barrier and moving it to the northeast, southwest instead of moving it beneath, back down below the form and fault. Yes, sir?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I have some questions about your model. Could you take that --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Sure --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: On the far left, you're saying that -- at the top left of your model, the yellow, and that's the Blarney well?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes, sir.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: And across the top of that section that's about two, three -- two miles, maybe?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No. This is -- from here, from A to A prime, we're looking at about seventeen hundred feet, which is a little bit less than a half mile.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Could you take your far left -- or the landfill, could you put that to scale on the surface over here? Where is it --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Landfill three is right along here. It shows up -- we have it plotted on this map, but it's difficult for you to see because where it's shown. Landfill three is approximately from right here to here on that cross section.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: How deep is that yellow section, the orange section?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: In the yellow section, this residuum extends, approximately -- it varies, as you can see. We've seen it as shallow as thirty feet and we've seen it as deep as over a hundred feet. It's not consistent. It really depends upon what rock -- what rock you encounter right here along this section, because the rock tends to weather differently.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Okay. My question really is: How far into that -- how far deep into that -- and I can only think of it in terms of archeological stuff -- but an lens, if you've just got a little scoop, how deep does the bottom of the landfill go?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: How deep the landfill? The landfill, we believe, based upon some

trenching and boring activities within the fill material, the bottom of the fill we have looked at is approximately sixteen to seventeen feet below ground surface. So, each of these little tick marks here is twenty feet. It would be less than one of these distances between these tick marks. So, the landfill on this scale would -- might be approximately right along the line here. And I'm -- my hand is shaking so I'm not shining -- but it's about -- we looked about sixteen, seventeen feet.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: But it's pretty shallow, compared to the --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Absolutely, very shallow, compared to the scale we're showing right here.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: If it was just scraped off and bundled up and put in a can and hauled off, how many more wells would we have to put out there to see if it's still leaking if it was gone?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, the work we're doing now is defining the horizontal and vertical extent of the plume, these plumes that I'm showing right here which you can't see, unfortunately.

That's where we're focusing on. We're focusing -- the initial impetus was to determine if there was any impact to the City of Weaver's water supply wells. Now, we're looking to the north to get the vertical and horizontal extent.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: It's moving toward where I live now, up toward Jacksonville.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I think that --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: My question is: No matter how far out you go north to decide what the edges of it are, okay, if it's gone and it rains and the water runs through there, wouldn't it be a whole lot less at the end of it when it gets there if there was nothing for it to flow through?

My question is -- I don't -- I'm confused, because if you've done been doing wells going all the way back to '83, what is drilling another well going to do to the information you've got?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Well, let me -- I think what Josh is trying to show is this is where the contamination already is in the process, and if you remove the landfill tomorrow, it would still be there,

contamination in the --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: It would still move through --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- in the groundwater and still be moving. What we're trying to see is where it's at so we can stop and clean up that piece of it, which is why it's two separate actions.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: And it's my understanding there is technology that can -- you can remove that -- where the plume is gone, there is technology where you can remove that, too; is that correct?

MR. RON LEVY: This is remedial -- there are remedial methods that we can undertake.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I would just think if I was brewing coffee and I poured some water through my grounds, and I wanted to get rid of the color of the coffee, I would just take the grounds out, and then the water would begin to clear up, even all the way up there to Bonny Brook. I don't know, just a thought.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes. We don't disagree with that, either.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Okay.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MS. SARAH CLEMENCE: What's the volume? What's the size of the plume, as far as you know it, now?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We haven't done any formal calculations or even informal calculations to determine what the volume is. We're looking at concentrations which are -- total concentrations which are less than a part per million.

These are -- although some of these concentrations exceed our site-specific screening levels and EPA MCLs, concentrations are on the lower end of what, you know, what you're actually seeing.

But as far as actually calculating a volume of VOCs right here within this plume, we haven't done it, yet. We still haven't defined what's up here to the north.

And until we do get the plume totally defined -- and that's something, as far as the volume is something we probably wouldn't be looking at.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other

questions?

MR. RON LEVY: Okay. Again, I just want to point out, we believe this is a good news story, although we've still got additional work to be done here. The BCT has some additional decisions that will have to be made, in terms of what we're going to do further north. Shaw has to come back to us and tell us what their recommendations are, in terms of that further work. As Josh pointed out, we're looking towards December to be talked to. And we will continue to present that information to the RAB, in terms of where that's going.

The next thing on the list is a video about unexploded ordnance. And the video talks about the difficulties or the impacts associated with cleaning unexploded ordnance. We think it's an opportune time to show it -- to show you this. And I want to point out it's an Army video. It was produced by the Army.

We think it's an opportune time to show you this, because we're getting close to releasing the EE/CA results on the investigations for the Alpha, Bravo, and Charlie areas. You guys point

back out to the UXO map on the back wall, back there. And we do want to show you some of those impacts.

The video was produced by the Army Environmental Center. It actually -- they actually came down here -- a lot of you guys weren't here -- but they came down here and took shots of the RAB -- so, some of you might even see yourself in there, others, just weren't around -- as well as pictures in some of the work that's been ongoing on Fort McClellan.

I think it's an interesting video, and I really think it portrays the problems associated with doing cleanup of UXO. Brenda. You ready?

(Whereupon, there was a video shown off record.)

MR. RON LEVY: You all need to understand this went out nationally and so -- there were a number of folks from this RAB in there, so, if you felt like a star, you were one.

I'd be glad to take any questions. We've got folks from Huntsville and Foster Wheeler here.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I thought it was a good video. I thought it was very informative.

No questions?

Onward and upward. Agency reports. JPA, Miki's not here tonight. Philip told me he had technical challenges or something; is that right? So, he didn't have a report tonight.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yeah, I'll give something. I'm going to let him go ahead and go first.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay. We'll let Doyle jump in there first, then.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Been working here now for about twenty months. When I came, there was a lot of work to be done but -- and we did a lot of work. But a lot of it was in the developed area, small parcels, you know, a half acre here, two acres there, something like this. And we did a lot of work. And I think we have a lot to be proud of from that standpoint.

But we're now to the place that things are slowing down, and we're having to shift gears. We're getting into some of the more complex work that has to be done. So, basically, for the lasts two months, I have been going back through and

just doing research on the data that have been collected in the ranges and also in the landfills, fill areas, and trying to get a handle on that and trying to, in my own mind, chart out a course forward.

Been working with the Army on this. Been working with ADEM on this. And I know that groundwater is a concern, and I understand Mayor Kimbrough's concern over at the City of Weaver.

So, basically, what I have is a hydrogeologist that I've basically given cart blanche to and told him that I want him to sit down with the Army's hydrogeologist. I want every piece of data reviewed. Understand where all the wells are. Why they are there. Do we have enough wells? Are they in the right place? Do we have data gaps? What else do we need?

Ben Bentkowski over here, some you may know him. He's also working over at the Depo. But he is working with us to basically understand what's going on in the groundwater here. We've been working on the -- what the contamination is in the soil. I've been going back, taking a look at that, trying to get a handle on what the data gaps are

there.

And the risk assessments -- and I think most recently we gave comments on the Baines Gap Road ranges and also the ranges over at Iron Mountain Road. Right now, we're wrestling with a couple of -- what we call FOSTs, F-O-S-T-s, finding of suitability to transfer property. And I think one of those, we'll have comments out on within the next week. Then the SuperFOST will take a couple more weeks to get that out.

But I'm not generating a lot of documents right now, but there is a lot of research that is going on, a lot of work, because we're at the place that some hard decisions are going to have to be made. And it's going to be important that EPA and the State and the Army sit down and take a look at this and make those decisions and go forward.

So, that's kind of where I am. This is where I have been spending all of my time for the last couple of months. Philip.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I'm in agreement with Doyle. It's been a -- these last couple of months have been really testing to all of us here.

And especially going back and reviewing the information Doyle's talking about, bringing another hydrogeologist in. It gets our eyes wide open on these things.

And cover a few things -- I don't have my little pass-out sheet because we're really -- we're into reviewing some pretty tough reports right now, and it's a slow-down period. And it's been -- several of the remedial investigation reports are coming in, and these things are very voluminous and very complex and very complicated. And you'll see more of our groups coming in from the groundwater side and Ben Bentkowski coming in.

Also, I've introduced the last time my UXO subcontractor. We've spent an enormous amount of time getting him up to speed, for the very reasons here, this isn't going to be an easy site to clean up. And so like I say, it's been taking a long time to get him up to speed on things.

I have been bringing him here to the site. We've had field visits. He's going through a lot of the UXO presentations and getting up to speed with the UXO safety, etcetera, etcetera.

We've been dealing hard with the landfill EE/CAs, especially landfill number three in this presentation here. And we're also reviewing some of the FOSTs. And we're making sure they're legally correct.

And then, been spending a lot of time, also, with Doyle's subcontractor here for hydrogeology, going on field visits here. So, we've been very busy.

I guess it's getting back up to speed, reviewing old data, to make sure we can answer your questions, appropriately. And that's kind of where we are right now.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Good. Any questions for Philip or Doyle?

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: I know the JPA is, seems like, constantly changing their land-use plan. What effect is that having, as far as the clean-up? I know you were talking about UXO and if you're going to do for construction, if you're going to do for park use and all like that.

And I think -- I know they've changed from the original -- are you -- are you

changing the review and evaluation of those properties with their request or are you still acting on the --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We only have one submission for the economic development conveyance, which concluded their reuse plan. That's the only one we have. There've been some maps of a transportation study and some other things, but there's been no change to the reuse plan.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: They have not submitted --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No --

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: They've talked about it -- so, that wouldn't affect -- would that affect, y'all, if they do --

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: We, by law, are required to clean up to whatever the approved reuse plan is.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Approved by?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: The community. It's the community reuse plan that has to go through and get community approval and finally work --

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: So, if they redirect, then --

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: If they come up and develop a new reuse plan and go through all of the proper procedures to develop it and get it approved by the community and all of the other powers that be and then get it approved by the Army, then we can change directions.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We don't approve their reuse plan. They submitted it to us. And we don't necessarily clean up to a reuse plan. That is something we use to evaluate the clean-up. Doyle said clean up to a reuse plan, which we don't do. We evaluate the clean-up based upon the reuse plan.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: I know when like -- I think at the last JPA meeting -- and I think they submitted or are submitting (phonetic) it, but the proposal of a new road in the northern area. So, at this time, that's not an official request, so y'all are not acting on that; is that correct?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Okay, thank you.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other questions for Philip or Doyle? No.

Technical review committee and update on the TAPP contract hours. As I mentioned earlier -- sorry, I skipped right over the action summary sheet, didn't I?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Let me finish my thing and then we'll jump back to you.

MR. RON LEVY: Just the point of fact the JPA is not here, so we're not able to get that.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Right, the JPA is not -- Miki is not here tonight.

Ron, he's started with five hundred hours available to provide assistance to us. He has four hundred and sixty-two and some change left. I encourage you strongly that if there is any activities out here that you think we -- you'd like to have Ron's assistance on and helping explain to us, let me know.

Don't worry about whether it's within his scope of work or not. I'll get that worked out with Ron. But E-mail me, call me, let me know. And we'll turn that over to Ron to take a look at for us, you know, going through Ron Levy here to get that

done. So, I encourage you to put a little thought into it, and if there is something we want Ron to help us out with, let me know, please.

And with that said, we'll jump to the action summary sheet.

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, I'm not -- I don't intend to do a detailed review of the action summary sheet. I do want to ask right up front: Do y'all find this format helpful in the action summary sheet, since it's all presented early on and gives a snapshot of the activities on the installation? We certainly take comments and -- to improving it, if you see something of interest, in terms of how to present data to you.

It's also a reflection of the work that -- not just the Army is doing, but what EPA and ADEM is doing. And you can get a feel for their reviews as we -- and their dealings with us, if you look at it.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I have a quick question, Ron. And I know we're running late, so I'll try to go quick here. But one thing that I get confused with from time to time is, for example,

Doyle said that he's got a number of RIs that he's -- RI reports that he's beginning to take a look at.

And I was skimming through the action summary sheet. And I see -- the only reference to an RI I see is on landfill three. I know there's lots and lots and lots of documents out there, but is there a way that we can come out and somehow connect that, I guess or --

MR. RON LEVY: Does --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I mean, Philip said he's looking at some RIs. And I have no idea what those RIs are.

MR. RON LEVY: In terms of public review on those documents, until we get to the regulatory review, we really don't -- we don't present them to the public, which is this board. But we can define what -- what the activity is. I don't -- do you see a problem with that?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: All I'm throwing out is that there's a gap there, when I hear Philip saying he's looking at something -- if it's not appropriate or shouldn't -- appropriate's not the right word, but if it's not the right time in the

process for us to know what's in those documents, I don't have a problem with that. But that's --

MR. RON LEVY: Some of the sites that Philip is talking about are still in the early stages of the RI. He's going through drafts of the document.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Okay.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And a lot of them are like Pelham Range, too, so, there is enormous amount of work going on over there, that's not presented here on a regular basis.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Could you remind me what an RI and an FS and a BSA is?

MR. RON LEVY: BS --

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: BSA, it's on the EPA and ADEM, it's got an RI and FS and BSA at all landfill and fill areas is needed. On this summary sheet that --

MR. RON LEVY: Oh, that was the -- the one that Ron Grant put out?

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: Yeah, I just -- I don't -- you know, I'm a slow learner. RI and everything, you know.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, as we've talked about the process, there is a baseline -- excuse me. There is a baseline document. That was the environmental baseline report that we -- the survey that we did, an EBS. We stepped through this.

As you start to define whether or not you got a problem, you do an SI. SI says, yes, there is a problem or no, there isn't a problem, which stands for site investigation.

RI, okay, you said in your SI you've got a problem. You moved into RI. You're now defining what the nature and extent of that problem is. And then part of that RI generally comes an action and a feasibility study, which looks at what's the best way to address that problem. So, an FS stands for feasibility study.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: What's BSA?

MR. RON LEVY: That's a baseline -- that was a baseline --

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Risk assessment.

MR. RON LEVY: Risk assessment is what he's talking about there.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: BRA.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: BRA, not BSA.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: BRA?

MR. RON LEVY: That's confusing. That's generally -- as part of the RI, you're also looking at risk, human health and ecological, so there's a baseline risk assessment.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: But RI was remediation to take place?

MR. RON LEVY: Remedial investigation.

We discussed the landfill three. I won't go into that. That's the first thing on the action summary sheet.

There is discussion again about the Alpha, Bravo, and the Charlie area EE/CA. We're back out in the Alpha area, taking some additional samples after we went out and looked at our data.

This is all part of the process. As we look at data, we go back, and if we think we've got data gaps, then we'll go back and take additional samples. And we're doing that on our own.

Bravo, the same thing. Charlie, we've been discussing with ADEM and their

subcontractor, the work plan. I think we had a very successful meeting recently with ADEM on that. Try to work out some of their concerns. I think it really turned out well.

Then we continue to move forward on the Charlie area investigation. Which again, for those of you who don't remember the map in the back, the big green area on the one that says Fort McClellan UXO EE/CAs is the Charlie area. And you can see the Bravo color and the Alpha color up there, as well.

M-101, we're preparing the final removal report. We've completed all that work. So, that's nearing completion, too. We should be able to share that with you at some point in the future here.

And the eastern bypass, we're continuing with ongoing work out there up in the north central portion, as well as that additional forty acres that ALDOT defined for clearance purposes.

For those of you who are not aware, if you look up off my left-hand shoulder here, that's that the map right against the green display. The red area is the additional forty acres that I was talking about. And it's the area which is that greenish

color -- I don't know what you call that -- that we're still working in, up in the north central portion of that. So, field work is ongoing.

Status of the CWM, of course, we finished on main post. We're putting together an action memorandum on that. Pelham Range, the field work is complete. We are working through regulatory comments. These are both investigations where we looked at chemical warfare material on both main post and Pelham Range.

As you can see, on the landfill EE/CA, the big piece there is as of today the public comment period ended. I will say that we are in receipt of the JPA's comments.

I think Doyle pointed out the finding of suitability. There is two out there. If I could point to the map on the right-hand side, the very right-hand side of that wall, everything in the green has been transferred.

That portion that's defined in the yellow was in the SuperFOST two. And then -- well, I guess you don't see -- the other FOST that he's talking about is tract three. It's this piece of

property up here -- there you go -- that --

MR. JOE DOYLE: This portion right here and this portion right here.

MR. RON LEVY: We're looking to get into ALDOT's hands so they can redirect the entrance into Summerall Gate Road and allow for development down into that area.

We've got about eight-five personnel on post that are contractors or Corps folks. And, of course, we've always got an ongoing concern about UXO safety. And people walking into areas out there while we're investigating, is a major concern to us, so, that was on the action summary sheet. Anybody got any questions about that?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Real quick, Ron, the time frame for responding to those comments on the landfill EE/CA.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We're doing a review. It took a hundred and twenty days to get comments. It will take us awhile to review each one of the comments and address them. I don't have a date.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: No flavor,

month, three months, anything like that?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: No.

MAYOR ED KIMBROUGH: With the JPA, a hundred and thirty-three questions that they submitted?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, that's right, part of it, plus EPA, ADEM. And I don't know if we had any other public comments. Ron, did we have any others?

MR. RON LEVY: We had a letter from the City of Anniston, but he essentially said that he supported EPA and ADEM's and the CDG's comments, which are -- came from the JPA.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Any other questions? Okay. We'll move into audience comments. Any questions or comments from the audience? No.

Before we adjourn, don't forget to pick up your paperwork from the table back here. Encourage anybody that has anyone who wants to be a member to get their applications in.

And there was a third thing -- oh, any ideas for Ron, anything you would like Ron to take a look at for us, let me know.

We'll hear a motion to adjourn for the evening?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Motion to adjourn.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Second?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Second.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: All in favor? Opposed? Motion is carried. Thanks for coming.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)

CALHOUN COUNTY)

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

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

P.O. BOX 544
OHATCHEE, AL 36271
256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 25th of August, 2002.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2005.

P.O. BOX 544
OHATCHEE, AL 36271
256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001