

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, a Court
Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at the
Jacksonville Community Center, Jacksonville, Alabama,
on the 18th day of March, 2002, commencing at
approximately 6:45 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

CAPTION SHEET	1
REPORTER'S INDEX	2
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD	3-79
CERTIFICATE	80-81

1 MR. GLYNN RYAN: All right. It's
2 normally a -- Craig is always here on time, so the
3 fact that he's a few minutes late, we'd still like to
4 go ahead and start. And, Pete, could we get you to
5 stand in for --

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Be delighted. Can
7 I stay here?

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Sure. That will be
9 fine. As long as Sam can hear you, that's the
10 important part.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: In which case,
12 let's call this meeting to order.

13 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We got a --

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Roll call is
15 next.

16 MR. GLYNN RYAN: All right.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay. Scott --
18 first of all, let's find what -- where are we? This
19 is March. Scott Beckett?

20 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Here.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: James Buford?
22 Monty --

23 MR. CLENDENIN: Clendenin, here.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: Clendenin, thank
2 you very much. I apologize. Myself. Barry Cox?
3 Donald Cunningham?

4 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Here.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Jerome Elser.

6 MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Donna Fathke?

8 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

9 MR. PETE CONROY: Curtis Franklin?

10 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Here.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: Lamar Freeman?

12 MR. LAMAR FREEMAN: Here.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: Mary Harrington?

14 Ron Hood? Jerry Hooper? Ed Kimbrough?

15 DWIGHT MITCHELL: I'm here filling
16 in for Mr. Kimbrough, he's out on business.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Gary Stratton?

18 Fern Thomassy?

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Here.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Ron Levy?

21 MR. RON LEVY: Here.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Doyle Brittain?

23 Phil Stroud?

1 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Here.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Introduction of
3 guests. Miki, are you not on this list?

4 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Huh-uh.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Usually what we do
6 is we go around the room and introduce our guests.
7 So, can you, please, introduce yourself, starting with
8 you, Miki.

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Miki Schneider
10 with the JPA.

11 MS. JOAN THOMASSY: I'm just
12 Joan Thomassy, and I'm here with Fern.

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

15 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: I'm
16 Jeannie Yacoub. I'm with the IT group.

17 MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein,
18 Fort McClellan Environmental Office.

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

21 MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson,
22 transition force, environmental office.

23 MR. LEE JAYE: Transition force

1 environmental.

2 MR. BOB DAFFRON: Bob Daffron,

3 National Gard Training Center.

4 MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James,

5 transition force, environmental office.

6 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Art Holcomb,

7 Foster Wheeler.

8 MR. DAN COPELAND: Dan Copeland,

9 Huntsville Corps of Engineers.

10 MR. JIM SHANKS: Jim Shanks,

11 transition force, environmental office.

12 MR. BILL GARLAND: Bill Garland,

13 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

14 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Ken Stockwell,

15 Parsons Corporation.

16 MR. PORTER MORGAN: Porter Morgan,

17 Corps of Engineers, Huntsville.

18 MS. LINDA WINSTON: Linda Winston,

19 Corps, Huntsville.

20 MS. BETINA JOHNSON: Betina Johnson,

21 Corps, Huntsville.

22 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda

23 Cunningham, environmental office, transition force.

FAX 256-892-3001

1 MR. PETE CONROY: And --

2 THE COURT REPORTER: Oh, Sam.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Everybody knows
4 Sam.

5 Approval of the minutes. Does
6 everybody have copies of the minutes?

7 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Pete, you'll note
8 that we have January and February minutes to approve.
9 Didn't have a quorum at our last meeting.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Everybody had an
11 opportunity to look them over?

12 MR. DON CUNNINGHAM: Make a motion
13 we accept them.

14 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Second.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: All in favor?
16 Opposed? Abstentions? Minutes are approved.

17 Old business. Revised RAB member
18 roster. Ron?

19 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, you should have
20 in front of you, in your packets, a revised RAB member
21 roster. We're constantly seeking changes to this
22 document. Brenda maintains that, and of course, gets
23 it out to folks. So, if you would, take a minute to

1 look at it and provide us any changes or input to it.
2 Brenda, you got anything else about that roster that
3 you want to say?

4 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: No.

5 MR. RON LEVY: Pete, you got it
6 there?

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Yeah, it took me a
8 minute, but I found it. Okay. Next on the list is
9 the approval of the tentative dates for the next set
10 of RAB meetings also in the packet.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Right. We're looking
12 for a vote on those -- or approval on those minutes,
13 at this point -- approval on those dates, at this
14 point. I'll point out that we do our quarterly
15 off-site, and the next one is scheduled for
16 Covenant Presbyterian Church on the 20th of May. We
17 will take input from folks, but we're proposing to --
18 this schedule, as it stands now. If there's any
19 changes, we'll take it up, as well.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: How do they look?

21 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Fine with me.
22 Recommend we approve them.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Got a motion to

1 approve.

2 MR. JERRY ELSE: Second.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: All in favor? So,
4 moved.

5 Next on the list. New member of the
6 TRC. Where is this? There was a -- do you want to
7 talk on this one, Glynn?

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: The proposal was
9 made that we request new members for the TRC.
10 Jerry Hopper, did he call in? He was going to
11 confirm.

12 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: He had a
13 death in the family --

14 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Right.

15 MR. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: -- but he
16 didn't leave a message as to whether --

17 MR. GLYNN RYAN: He had -- it had
18 been recommended that he be placed on the technical
19 review committee. And he then has not responded back
20 to us. So, I think that's still up in the air, Pete.
21 Can we just leave that until the next meeting?

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay. And for
23 the record, we're glad to have Mr. Buford join us.

FAX 256-892-3001

1 And so, we'll --

2 MR. RON LEVY: We'll try to contact
3 him again and see if he's interested --

4 MR. PETE CONROY: And now it's the
5 TAPP committee volunteers and start-up meeting. Ron,
6 Glynn.

7 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Well, as you know,
8 we've tried to get some dates together to get everyone
9 together and have not succeeded in that. And I would
10 propose that we again seek some dates that maybe we
11 can get Craig and --

12 MR. PETE CONROY: We'll need Craig
13 for that one.

14 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, exactly.
15 And we'll give him a call. Try to call him next week
16 and try to set up another scheduled meeting.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Well, this portion
18 of the meeting is moving right along. We'll move
19 right over to programs. And first on is landfill, the
20 fill area, the EE/CA presentation by IT.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, let me just
22 start out a little bit. First of all, let me
23 introduce Jeannie Yacoub. Most of you know Jeannie.

1 Jeannie is the project manager from IT Corporation.
2 She's going to give us a briefing of what's in the
3 landfill EE/CA, engineering evaluation cost analysis.

4 As I mentioned in the past, we've
5 been working this investigation. We now have it to a
6 point where we're putting it out to the public. Right
7 now we're in the public comment period, started on the
8 21st of March and will run 'till the 19th of April.

9 We do have a public meeting for this
10 document and our proposed intent, which Jeannie is
11 going to talk about here in just a minute, on the
12 1st of April.

13 And if you've been reading the
14 newspaper, you will have seen that there in the legal
15 section there is a notice of intent out. Plus, we'll
16 prepare a separate ad to go in the paper, just prior
17 to that.

18 I guess with that, I'll let Jeannie
19 go ahead and do her briefing. And we'll allow for
20 questions after Jeannie has finished. Jeannie.

21 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Thanks, Ron.
22 Thank you for inviting me, everybody. I know a few of
23 you know me, but not everybody. I'm the project

1 manager for IT. And through a contract with the Corps
2 of Engineers, IT has basically investigated the
3 landfills of Fort McClellan and developed an EE/CA
4 that provides the compilation of the data that we've
5 collected, along with the historical data base of
6 Fort McClellan. And there was a pretty significant
7 data base on some of the landfills there.

8 So, we've compiled all that data,
9 evaluated some alternatives that the Army can take
10 with respect to the landfills and fill areas. And
11 basically those are presented in the EE/CA.

12 So, the EE/CA is a compilation of
13 product documents of the investigation and the
14 evaluation of alternatives that the Army looked at for
15 the landfills, and it provides some recommendations
16 for Army actions of the fill areas.

17 Next slide, Brenda, please.
18 Basically, the EE/CA provides a comprehensive landfill
19 strategy for Fort McClellan. It provides
20 recommendations for all the ten known fill areas on
21 the installation. We recommend NFA under CERCLA for
22 eight of the fill areas, CERCLA actions for two of the
23 fill areas. And then to facilitate reuse of the

1 property and minimize safety concerns, the Army is
2 also recommending some non-CERCLA actions for six fill
3 areas. Next slide.

4 The first landfill is landfill one.
5 I've got a little map up here. Landfill one is right
6 there. (Demonstrating.) It's the former post
7 sanitary landfill from 1945 to 1947. So, it's located
8 on the west central portion of the main post. It's
9 about six point three acres in area and estimated
10 volume is eighty-two thousand cubic yards.

11 After evaluating landfill one, we
12 found no human health risk as defined by CERCLA, no
13 ecological risk as defined by CERCLA. So, the Army is
14 recommending no further action at this landfill under
15 CERCLA.

16 Now, in your slide presentation, in
17 your hand-out materials, you have -- your next slide
18 is a sheet that provides some recommended non-CERCLA
19 actions. And there are actions, as I said, for six
20 fill areas that the Army is going to recommend.
21 You've got them in your materials.

22 But I'm going to talk about that.
23 At the end of the presentation, I'll address all of

1 them, so, we're just going to -- that slide is there
2 for your information.

3 Landfill two is that little --
4 (demonstrating) -- U-shaped area right there. This
5 fill area operated potentially as early as 1927 and as
6 late as 1969, based on aerial photographs. It's
7 located in the north central portion of the main post,
8 about five point six acres and estimated volume
9 fifty-four thousand cubic yards.

10 In looking at landfill two, we found
11 that there are some human health risks for a potential
12 resident from lead and polynuclear aromatic
13 hydrocarbons -- we call them PAHs -- and arsenic in
14 surface soils for potential residential site use.
15 There are no risks if you use a recreational site
16 scenario for this fill area.

17 With regard to ecological risk, we
18 did find a potential risk for metals and other
19 compounds in the surface soils. Based on that, the
20 Army is recommending a land use control to restrict
21 future residential reuse of this property.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: What are PAHs?

23 MS. JEANNIE YACOUR: PAHs are

1 compounds that are commonly associated with asphalt,
2 tar. They're what we call anthropogenic contaminants,
3 wide spread. So, it's not uncommon to find them.

4 MR. RON LEVY: You would get PAHs in
5 prescribed burning.

6 MS. DONNA FATHKE: What was that,
7 Ron?

8 MR. RON LEVY: You could get PAHs
9 even from prescribed burning. In other words, we can
10 see in our results, because of the fires that are
11 caused, PAH results or some level of PAH. So, that's
12 what she means by anthropogenic.

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: You talking
14 about soots and things like that?

15 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: Anthropogenic
16 is man-made --

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Not just carbon,
18 but heavy materials as a result of petroleum burns and
19 partial burns?

20 MR. RON LEVY: The breakdown of it.

21 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: And aromatic
22 means you can smell it most of the time.

23 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: Okay. Landfill

1 three is probably the most complex landfill on
2 Fort McClellan is right there. It's up in the
3 northwest portion of the main post, approximately
4 twenty-two point eight acres, volume of about three
5 hundred and seventy-five thousand cubic yards.
6 Investigations have shown, as you've been briefed on
7 this actually chlorinated VOCs, volatile organic
8 compounds, in the ground water. Thallium in surface
9 soil for the residential site user. We didn't find
10 any risks for recreational site user and no risk under
11 CERCLA for ecological risk.

12 So, the recommended action here is a
13 low permeability soil cover for the land use control
14 and limited long-term ground water monitoring. And
15 the Army has remedial investigations underway to
16 address ground water issues at landfill three.

17 Landfill number four and the
18 industrial landfill right there, are adjoining fill
19 areas. Located in the northwest portion of the main
20 post. Landfill number four, which is this L shaped
21 area, served as a sanitary landfill from 1967 to about
22 1994. It's about forty-three acres, volume of a
23 million and a half cubic yards. And it's closed.

1 The industrial landfill, which is
2 the smaller corner portion right there --
3 (demonstrating) -- has been active under the current
4 permit since October 1995. That area is about sixteen
5 acres, estimated volume approximately thirty-one
6 thousand cubic yards.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Could you go back
8 down? I had something on the last one.

9 MS. DONNA FATHKE: On landfill
10 number three, you mentioned limited long-term ground
11 water monitoring as opposed to unlimited. What's the
12 --

13 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Limited means
14 for a certain amount of time that the Army will
15 negotiate with the regulators. Probably be, I would
16 say would start out being five or ten years and then
17 there will be reviews by the regulatory agencies and
18 the Army to monitor those ground water results.

19 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Is that usually
20 based on what the results of the monitoring is? I
21 mean, if they're showing great movement, they'll
22 monitor it longer than if they're showing almost no
23 movement?

1 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: That's correct.

2 MR. ELLIS POPE: It will depend on
3 the results of the ongoing remedial investigation that
4 we have.

5 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: With that
6 landfill three, the ground water monitoring, will
7 there be any dye-trace studies? You'll have to excuse
8 me, this is the first time I've sat in on this. So,
9 are there going to be any dye-trace studies done to
10 see which way it's migrating, or is it just monitoring
11 each well that's been dug or drilled?

12 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: We're not
13 contemplating dye-trace studies at this time, but we
14 are putting in some wells right now, off-site, to
15 determine if there is movement of the plume and where
16 it's moved to. So, there are wells in place and we're
17 also adding more.

18 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: The reason I
19 ask is, Mayor Kimbrough asked me to sit in tonight,
20 and we're about to do a source water well head
21 protection, and we've got our geologists coming in.
22 They will be doing some dye trace for our wells. And
23 then, of course, they'll have the delineation around

1 it. And I was just wondering, he -- the Mayor
2 indicated that it was possible that we could possibly
3 use some of the wells that were drilled -- our
4 geologists would have access to.

5 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: That would be
6 the Army's call.

7 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Yes, ma'am.

8 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: I think that's
9 who would have to coordinate.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Glynn, what do you
11 think?

12 MR. GLYNN RYAN: I don't know what
13 we're talking about here. I would have to ask Ron to
14 take a look at it and see if it was feasible. First I
15 had heard of it, actually.

16 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Be careful not
17 to turn your water green for years and years and years
18 to come. It happens.

19 MR. GLYNN RYAN: It's important to
20 note that this is a landfill EE/CA, and we're doing
21 another study outside of it on ground water
22 contamination, so it's two different studies.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Right.

FAX 256-892-3001

1 MR. GLYNN RYAN: What you're talking
2 about is wells being drilled for ground water flow?

3 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Well, the
4 wells that you already have drilled, will our
5 geologists have access to them in order to do the
6 delineation?

7 MR. RON LEVY: You talking about the
8 data, the data from those wells, so, you could look at
9 ground water flow?

10 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: The data and
11 perhaps maybe monitor or measure the depth of the
12 wells.

13 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. In fact, we'll
14 be able to give that to you, because we'll already
15 have it. We'll be doing ongoing monitoring.

16 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: That will be
17 public -- in fact that will be public record. I mean,
18 that will be out there for the public to use, as well
19 as yourselves. So, it will be there for everybody.

20 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Okay.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: For the record,
22 glad to have Dr. Cox join us.

23 DR. BARRY COX: Well, I need to

1 (inaudible), I didn't read my notes right so, I --

2 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Anymore
3 questions?

4 MR. RON LEVY: You do realize a lot
5 of those wells we're putting in now on private
6 property, the private property issues may be a
7 different story. I don't know that -- you know, we
8 can tell you what we've done during the time we've
9 sampled it. But if you're talking about wanting
10 additional data in there, that may be an issue with
11 the private land owners.

12 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Yeah.

13 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Back to
14 landfill four and the industrial landfill. Again,
15 we're talking about those fill areas right there. We
16 found no human health risk or ecological risk under
17 CERCLA, so the Army is recommending no further action
18 under CERCLA. The Army will continue compliance with
19 all ADEM permit requirements.

20 The fill area north of landfill two
21 is right there. (Demonstrating.) Little sliver of
22 property. Time of use is unknown on that fill area.
23 We don't have any documentation about it that can tell

1 us how long it had been used.

2 Basically, it was identified as a
3 ground scar on a 1961 aerial photograph. It's located
4 in the north central portion of the main post, two
5 point four acres, estimated volume twenty-nine
6 thousand cubic yards.

7 We found no human health risk under
8 CERCLA. We did find a potential risk for metals,
9 pesticides, and semi-vos in surface soil, sediment,
10 and surface water. The Army's recommending no further
11 action under CERCLA at this fill area.

12 Fill area east of Reilly Air Field
13 and the former post garbage dump are those areas right
14 there. They're adjoining fill areas. They're located
15 in the north central portion of the main post.

16 The fill area east of Reilly was
17 identified from 1949 and 1961 aerial photos. It's
18 about four point five acres, twenty-nine thousand
19 cubic yards in volume.

20 The former post garbage dump. We
21 don't know the times of use. It's about two acres,
22 ninety-seven hundred cubic yards in volume.

23 We found no -- next slide, Brenda,

1 please. We found no human health risk under CERCLA at
2 these two fill areas. We did identify a potential
3 risk for metals and pesticides in the surface soil,
4 metals and semi-vos in surface water. So, the Army's
5 recommending no further action under CERCLA at this
6 fill area.

7 Fill area northwest of Reilly
8 Air Field is this area right there. Again, you don't
9 know the dates of operation, how long it was used. It
10 was identified from an aerial photograph, 1954, as a
11 potential disposal area. It's located in the
12 northwest corner of the main post, five point nine
13 acres, approximately, fifty-three thousand cubic
14 yards.

15 We found no human health risk under
16 CERCLA at this fill area. We did find a potential
17 risk for mercury in surface water. The recommended
18 action for this fill area is also no further action
19 under CERCLA.

20 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Question.

21 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Sure.

22 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Mercury, is that
23 not a human health risk?

1 MS. JEANNIE YACOUB: Not at the
2 levels that we found it at. The ecological values, we
3 bench marked the values. We have agreed to values,
4 that the Army and the regulators has agreed to that we
5 screen the contaminants against. And the ecological
6 values tend to be very much lower than human health
7 values, actually.

8 DR. BARRY COX: What are the values?

9 MS. JEANNIE YACOUB: They're bench
10 mark values from EPA Region Four.

11 DR. BARRY COX: What are the
12 concentrations in the landfill there?

13 MS. JEANNIE YACOUB: I don't know
14 the numbers offhand. I would have to look at the
15 data. There's a lot of them. But for mercury, I
16 think it's about five.

17 DR. BARRY COX: Five what?

18 MS. JEANNIE YACOUB: PPB.

19 THE COURT REPORTER: One more time.
20 I'm sorry.

21 MS. JEANNIE YACOUB: Pardon me?

22 THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear
23 you the -- last thing. Five --

1 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: Five PPB.

2 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

3 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: But I'm not
4 sure. I mean, I think that's a bench mark value, but
5 I'm not sure.

6 MR. JOE DOYLE: (Inaudible.)

7 THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear
8 you, Joe. Everybody's --

9 MR. JOE DOYLE: That data is all
10 available in the actual EE/CA that's available to you
11 to --

12 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: It's a
13 tremendous amount of data. So, I don't have it
14 committed to memory.

15 MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, if there is
16 determined to be a problem in the future -- I mean,
17 I'm not supposing that there will be -- but there is a
18 slight, at least, ecological risk there, but there's
19 no further action taken, what does that mean? Does
20 that mean --

21 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: Well, what we
22 did, when we evaluated the risk, we look not only at
23 the numbers, but we look at for example how many

1 samples we took and what samples showed a value in
2 excess of that bench mark we looked at.

3 Maybe there was only one out of
4 eight or nine samples. So, we might say -- and if the
5 exceedance was just marginally over the bench mark
6 value, we would make the -- the Army would make a risk
7 management decision in consultation with the
8 regulators that would say, there's really not a
9 significant risk here to warrant an action.

10 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Will there be
11 land-use controls restrictions put on this area?

12 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: Not on this
13 one. The Army is recommending that there be no
14 further action under CERCLA.

15 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Will this land
16 eventually transfer to the JPA and then to the City,
17 or will it always stay under Army control?

18 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: No, this land
19 is being transferred.

20 MR. RON LEVY: All of these fill
21 areas will transfer. In fact, I think only one of
22 them is in an area that was assigned for the refuge
23 area. The rest of them, in one way or another, will

1 go -- transfer to the JPA, which doesn't necessarily
2 mean the City.

3 I don't think any of it's on the
4 property we're going to transfer to the City of
5 Anniston.

6 MR. GLYNN RYAN: I'm not sure. I
7 think it is.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I actually
9 stand corrected. I stand corrected. One is up the --

10 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: One north
11 Reilly --

12 MR. RON LEVY: One's up in the north
13 -- part of Parks and Recreations will transfer to the
14 City.

15 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Question.
16 Remind me what CERCLA stands for.

17 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: It's the
18 Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation
19 Liability Act. It is the Super Fund Act. It provides
20 for us a series of protocol under which we can
21 evaluate sites, either through RIFS, in this case, an
22 EE/CA, site investigations. And the risk assessments
23 we conduct under CERCLA comply with EPA and State

1 approved risk assessment protocols and models. That
2 would include exposure scenarios, reference those
3 concentrations.

4 MR. RON LEVY: Simply put, it's the
5 law that governs us from an investigative and
6 restoration standpoint. We follow CERCLA. And most
7 everybody does when they're doing restoration and
8 cleanup activities. It's not just the federal
9 government doing its on cleanup, but it's private
10 entities, private industries, as well.

11 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Is that where
12 the benches marks come from? Is it part of the law or
13 are those periodically monitored?

14 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: The ecological
15 bench marks come from EPA Region Four. Yes, they are
16 values that EPA Region Four promulgates. We didn't
17 make those up.

18 For substances where EPA Region Four
19 did not have bench marks established, we did research
20 into literature and other EPA regions. We proposed
21 those values to EPA Region Four and ADEM, and they
22 approved them. And those are the bench mark values
23 that we use.

1 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Could you be a
2 little bit more descriptive for me, in terms of what
3 the difference between a human health risk and an
4 ecological risk is?

5 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: Yes. Super
6 Fund or CERCLA says that the Army is obligated to
7 protect human health and the environment. A human
8 health risk assessment will evaluate the risks, cancer
9 and non-cancer, that contaminants, potential
10 contaminants would pose to a human, under various
11 exposure scenarios. For example, a resident, somebody
12 who lives in an area, might have more exposure and
13 opportunity for, you know, damage let's say, than
14 somebody who is just walking through the area once a
15 year.

16 So, we evaluate under various
17 scenarios we call them. And we always evaluate under
18 a residential scenario, in this case, because it is
19 the most conservative scenario.

20 Ecological risk evaluates the risk
21 to critters, the bugs and the bunnies and the
22 environment. And as I said before, some of those
23 values are much lower than what you would even find

FAX 256-892-3001

1 for a human health risk, because animals and small
2 critters tend to be more sensitive to a lot of these
3 substances; they're closer to the ground, they eat
4 them, they breathe them. So, those values tend to be
5 much, much less. So, we look at all of those
6 considerations when we do risk assessments.

7 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: In coming up
8 with those values, what sort of thought goes into the
9 idea of the ecology as a (inaudible)?

10 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: I'm sorry, I
11 didn't --

12 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: The ecology as a
13 web and the health of those little critters is
14 eventually tied into human health through the food
15 chain.

16 MS. JEANNIE YACOUN: There is some
17 food chain analysis, depending on, you know, how
18 extensive the risk assessment is. This is basically a
19 SLERA risk assessment. We have the bench mark values,
20 which is the first phase that you would go through on
21 a full blown ecological risk assessment.

22 And at this point we're finding
23 very, very little that poses a risk. As I said, if

1 you look in the EE/CA, we have -- it's documented how
2 we address these risks.

3 Yes, we find some potential risks
4 for mercury in surface water. It might have occurred
5 in one out of five samples. The exceedance of the
6 risk, the value of what we found, which is what the
7 bench mark value is, is small. So, the Army's saying,
8 it's not really a risk here. That's --

9 MR. PHILLIP STROUD: Can you tell
10 them what the SLERA is?

11 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: The SLERA is
12 called the screening level ecological risk assessment.
13 And it is the first phase, the first steps of a full
14 blown ecological risk assessment, according to EPA
15 protocol. They have an eight step process. The SLERA
16 takes you to about step three.

17 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: You're saying
18 the Army is saying that there's no risk, but that
19 decision that the Army is making is based on input
20 from ADEM and EPA and you as the scientists --

21 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: That's correct
22 --

23 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: -- and the Army

1 is agreeing with your recommendations, correct?

2 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Right.

3 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: So, even though
4 the word "risk" is used, there's no risk?

5 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: There's never
6 no risk, you know. You're getting into the -- what's
7 a risk and what's not a risk. I mean --

8 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Well, I'm just
9 --

10 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: We try to
11 quantify it and balance it with what's -- we can
12 expect just in the normal course of living, what we're
13 going to find out there. And that's what these bench
14 mark values are for. Does that answer your question?

15 When we say, "no risk," we're saying
16 as defined by CERCLA. Okay? The way CERCLA defines
17 risk assessment.

18 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Okay. CERCLA is
19 saying no human health risk, but there is an
20 ecological risk. And the Army is saying that the
21 ecological risk --

22 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: The Army is
23 looking at that risk --

1 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: -- does not pose
2 a risk to the people who will be living on the
3 property?

4 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: Well, they're
5 saying that it doesn't pose a significant risk to the
6 critters who are occupying that property, under
7 ecological risk.

8 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Significant is
9 the key word there.

10 MR. RON LEVY: We've already
11 eliminated the health risk to humans here, and now
12 we're just looking strictly at ecological risks.

13 MR. ELLIS POPE: But the human
14 health risk takes into account the food chain issue
15 that you brought up before, venison or the different
16 foods that would be consumed by humans if these
17 animals are on this site. So, that's taken into
18 consideration in the human health risk assessment.

19 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Okay. Thank
20 you.

21 MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, if any of
22 these landfills for instance are transferred to the
23 City, if there's no further action taken and no land

1 use controls, that means the City can do whatever they
2 want, they can build on them, they could dig them up,
3 they could pipe the methane off of them; is that
4 correct?

5 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: I'm not sure
6 what exactly that means. I'd like to let the Army
7 handle that question.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Yes, that is correct.
9 In other words, there are some things, if you'll
10 notice in the non-CERCLA actions, there will be a
11 notice that there is a fill area in the deed. But we
12 are not restricting the deed holder by putting
13 something, a covenant so to speak, in the deed that
14 says, no, you cannot dig here. And, Joe, you might
15 want to expand on that.

16 MR. JOE DOYLE: We're saying that
17 we're in compliance with the law, that it's
18 essentially a clean piece of property. We're putting
19 people on notice, obviously, from an engineering and
20 construction standpoint, you start digging here, like
21 foundations, you may come across rubble, fill, trash,
22 whatever.

23 But it does not pose a risk beyond

FAX 256-892-3001

1 additional cost associated if you care to build there.
2 Whether it be from a settling standpoint, you know,
3 you're not on bedrock and you're not on hard soil.

4 But it's perfectly okay. There's
5 not a risk to human health and the environment but if
6 you want to go there, dig it up, build on it,
7 whatever, we're not putting that type of restriction
8 on it. As opposed to landfill -- correct me if I'm
9 wrong here -- two and three. They're going to have
10 some land use control restrictions on them. But with
11 regard to this one, for example, that's up here, no,
12 there will not be a restriction.

13 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Thank you.

14 MR. JOE DOYLE: Keeping in mind,
15 also, that in the case of the City, they're bound by
16 -- in making their application for the economic or for
17 the conveyance of that property, they have made
18 certain representations to them as to the proposed use
19 which is recreational. It's not like they're going to
20 turn around and build a housing development or
21 anything else. They have self-imposed restrictions
22 upon themselves in the application process.

23 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: Ready to move

1 on to the next one? The fill area at range thirty
2 right there. In the north central portion of the main
3 post. And we identified that fill area basically
4 from aerial photographs, dating from 1949 to 1982. The
5 area is about four acres, approximately eleven
6 thousand, three hundred cubic yards in volume.

7 Next slide, please, Brenda.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Where was it
9 again, please?

10 MS. JEANNIE YACOB: I'm sorry. It
11 was right there.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

13 MS. JEANNIE YACOB. Again, no human
14 health risk identified here under CERCLA nor
15 ecological risk under CERCLA. The Army's
16 recommendation is no further action at this site.

17 The fill area west of Iron Mountain
18 Road and range nineteen is right there.

19 (Demonstrating.) That, too, was identified as a
20 potential fill area by ground scars on a 1949 aerial
21 photograph. It's located on the west central main
22 post, about one acre, estimated volume eight hundred
23 cubic yards.

1 Another site where we found really
2 no human health risk, no ecological risk under CERCLA.
3 Recommended action is NFA.

4 Finally, the last fill area, my
5 favorite, stump dump. It's a disposal site from
6 before 1985 to 1988. Documentation is not clear as to
7 exactly how long before 1985 they were using this to
8 put stumps and limbs and construction in.

9 The Army placed soil cover and
10 drainage control over this fill area in 1995. It's
11 about ten acres. Estimated volume a hundred and
12 sixteen thousand cubic yards. No human health risk
13 under CERCLA, no ecological risk, therefore the Army's
14 recommended action is no further action under CERCLA.

15 I mentioned before that six of the
16 fill areas, as you've seen in your presentation, have
17 some -- what we're calling recommended non-CERCLA
18 actions. These are actions that the Army is going to
19 take to promote reuse of the property and minimize
20 some safety considerations. And they range from
21 actions such as grading and backfilling to eliminate
22 ponding on landfill one, with demolition of some
23 existing structures there.

1 There is a few houses that are close
2 to the fill area. I think one of them overlays the
3 fill area a little bit, so that's going to be
4 demolished.

5 All of the fill areas are going to
6 have landfill notice in the property transfer
7 documentation. We'll clean up surface debris where
8 it's appropriate, decommission all the monitoring
9 wells that have been installed around the properties.
10 And we will install -- or the Army is proposing to
11 install concrete monuments to better define the
12 boundaries of these fill areas.

13 Two of the fill areas, landfill two
14 and the fill area north of landfill two, these two
15 areas right here, we're proposing to stabilize a
16 couple of the slopes. That would mean put -- placing
17 ricrac on the slopes to keep them stable, keep them
18 from eroding in the event of floods or anything like
19 that. And then soil cover over the Reilly Air Field
20 fill areas up here.

21 That concludes my little talk.
22 Point of contact for this project is Lee Jaye, sitting
23 over here next to the wall, if you have questions.

1 Thanks.

2 MR. RON LEVY: I want to point out
3 that the TRC will get a chance to review this
4 document. I know you're looking to take more work
5 home with you. So, before the TRC members leave, we
6 have a document to give you, with a letter stating
7 what we're looking for, so --

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Got wheels on
9 it, right?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Right. Pretty thick
11 document there. Break out your backpack.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: Are we ready for
13 the chemical warfare material EE/CA?

14 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Can I just add
15 one thing, Mr. Chairman?

16 MR. PETE CONROY: Please.

17 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I know I
18 reported the last time I was at RAB that the Joint
19 Powers Authority has hired an independent engineering
20 firm that is reviewing this landfill, all the landfill
21 EE/CAs. The City is also -- we're looking at the
22 property that's proposed to be transferred to the City
23 so that we can get a better handle on the long term

1 impacts of these landfills and remaining in the -- on
2 the property to transfer for future development. The
3 board was just wanting another opinion on if the
4 recommendations that Jeannie presented at the end were
5 the best recommendations for the long term
6 marketability of the property.

7 MR. PETE CONROY: Did you say who
8 you hired?

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER:
10 CDG Engineering.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: And when would
12 that be available? When will the review be completed?

13 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I'm supposed to
14 have a draft on the 20th for me to review. And I
15 would hope something would be available by next month.

16 The landfills -- ultimately, all
17 this property will come to the JPA. We have the
18 challenge of selling the property to the developers.
19 If you think about trying to convince a developer to
20 buy a piece of property that was once a landfill, it
21 does bring on certain challenges. The City, and
22 rightly so, I think, has a concern that long term,
23 when the JPA goes away -- because we are a temporary

1 agency -- that they will find themselves inheriting
2 whatever property we no longer -- or are no longer
3 able to sell or not able to sell, I should say.

4 So, they are taking a careful look
5 at this landfill issue, and I think pollution concerns
6 are obviously an issue to the City of Anniston. So,
7 they're just taking a second look at it with us.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: You'll share those
9 result with this group?

10 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: We will do
11 that.

12 MR. PETE CONROY: And now the CWM
13 EE/CA by Parsons.

14 MR. RON LEVY: CWM EE/CA. As I
15 pointed out with the landfill EE/CA, we also have a
16 notice of intent out on review of the document. The
17 thirty day public review period started on the
18 13th of March and will end on the 11th of April. And
19 the public meeting for this is tomorrow, over at the
20 Anniston City Meeting Center from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
21 So, love to have you all come and ask questions.

22 Let me introduce to you
23 Ken Stockwell, who is the project manager from

1 Parsons. Ken, take us through your briefing.

2 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Thank you. Let
3 me stand up here.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: I apologize.
5 Before you get started, can you reiterate to us, Ron,
6 what's happening tomorrow night?

7 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, there is a
8 public meeting for this EE/CA so that the public, at
9 large, can have an opportunity to see -- it will be a
10 poster presentation -- well, there will be posters
11 there, there will be people from the Army and from the
12 contractor and the Corps there to answer questions.
13 We'll have copies of the documents. And anybody who
14 wants to come and talk to us, we'll be glad to
15 entertain their questions about it.

16 We'll also take written comments,
17 too, if they want to fill out a form. And we'll
18 address those, as well, during the public comment
19 period.

20 If nobody -- just a quick question,
21 if nobody has anymore questions about the landfill
22 EE/CA, Jeannie, who has got a daughter at home,
23 Jeannie Yacoub would like to leave, so before she gets

1 up and leaves, I want to see if anybody's got any
2 questions.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Go home.

4 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: She has to
5 drive to Atlanta.

6 MS. JEANNIE YACoub: Thanks a lot
7 everybody.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Go home.

9 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: My presentation
10 is to talk about the final chemical warfare material
11 EE/CA and the recommendations for those sites that
12 were covered by that study. Many of you, I believe,
13 in the past at the RAB meetings have seen the results
14 of the study. This will summarize those results and
15 put forth the recommendations that are going forward
16 on the sites.

17 Brief summary, we had thirty-three
18 sites to look at that were defined by archive written
19 reports and various records from the past that
20 potentially could have contained chemical warfare
21 materials or chemical agents from training in the past
22 history of Fort McClellan.

23 We were able to look at some

FAX 256-892-3001

1 information on -- other information on a number of
2 these sites to basically draw conclusions and
3 decisions on fourteen of those sites without further
4 investigation.

5 Nineteen of the remaining sites did
6 require additional field study that was conducted as
7 part of this CPS (phonetic) and formed part of the
8 conclusions that we're presenting tonight.

9 The objectives of this particular
10 EE/CA were to focus on the chemical warfare aspects of
11 these sites. And some of these sites may have
12 overlapping issues and concerns. But this EE/CA was
13 to resolve these sites because of the chemical warfare
14 material or chemical agents that may remain in the
15 environment from the training activities only, and
16 conclusions that are drawn are related to those
17 materials and chemical agents only. This would allow
18 those sites that have other issues to be addressed
19 further once the chemical agent issues have been
20 addressed.

21 Generally speaking, where these sites
22 are located, would be in the center of the
23 Fort McClellan, any of them were up here towards

1 what's called reservoir ridge area, up in the
2 northeast and where the old ammunition supply point
3 used to be. And then they're bunched around this
4 training area down here near, I guess it's called
5 Sunset Hill area and Howitzer Hill area down here.
6 And there is one site I'll mention, which is way out
7 here, 24 Alpha, which was used for training and
8 (inaudible) --

9 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry? I'm
10 sorry.

11 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Am I going too
12 fast?

13 THE COURT REPORTER: 24 -- a little
14 bit and then Ron coughed and I lost you. 24 Alpha
15 what?

16 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Howitzer Hill,
17 Sunset Hill, 24 Alpha down to the southeast --

18 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

19 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: -- where
20 extensive training like the technical escort training
21 was conducted.

22 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.

23 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: I'll talk

1 briefly about the fourteen sites that we looked at
2 initially out of the thirty-three that didn't require
3 further studies. And the reason they didn't is four
4 of them were already assessed by the government in
5 previous studies. We deemed the sampling analysis
6 connected with those sites to be adequate to
7 characterize the sites. And the results of those
8 studies indicated that there were no chemical agents
9 and materials found on those sites. So, they didn't
10 require further studies.

11 Ten of the sites, when upon further
12 evaluation were determined to really not be likely
13 chemical warfare training areas. Some of these were
14 things like flame thrower, which historically were
15 called chemical, but are not deemed to be chemical
16 agents, they are flame thrower training.

17 Or some of the sites weren't used,
18 at all, or some of those sites were duplicates of
19 other sites that were studied or were contained on
20 those other sites. So, these fourteen went away for
21 further study. And the conclusion could be drawn that
22 no further action was required for those sites, based
23 on this historical information.

1 Now, the other nineteen we
2 investigated using geophysical surveys and intrusive
3 investigations, soil sampling, and this type of
4 activity. In 2001, from about March through July --
5 and I will summarize those sites that we investigated
6 and what we found, but the bottom line conclusion is
7 going to be no further action on any of these other
8 sites, as well. So, all thirty-three sites are going
9 to be recommended for no further action.

10 Here is one of the first sites that
11 I'll talk about. Briefly, in what's called smoke
12 ranges R&S, this was studied because it was located in
13 the vicinity of another site that was heavily used for
14 chemical warfare training called T-38.

15 This was an area around
16 Reservoir Ridge. Here is T-38 here. There were smoke
17 ranges around and there were some concerns about
18 burial of chemical agents possibly in those land
19 areas, and the fact that we found were some
20 indications of ordnance training, small items were
21 found, but fundamentally, nothing much was found, at
22 all, within the smoke ranges R&S. This is not a
23 chemical site. This was not a concern for chemical

1 agent issues.

2 Next, the old burn pit is another
3 site that was found during the archive search report
4 during the site visit which was conducted years ago.
5 The area back in the woods behind the motor pool that
6 looked suspect. It was also in the general vicinity
7 of the chemical training. So, it was investigated.
8 It showed up on historical photos as a bare area in
9 the woods.

10 When we got into the investigation,
11 we found not only the original pit, but two other pits
12 nearby. And the materials that were found in those
13 pits turned out to be expended or training rounds of
14 an ordnance nature. So, this was not a chemical site.
15 This was determined to be an EO related site, which
16 will be addressed elsewhere.

17 Next slide. T-38 I mentioned was in
18 the center of the Reservoir Ridge area. This
19 particular site was used for both storage of chemical
20 agent during the active training periods. And parts
21 of it were used for disposal.

22 Some of the concerns here was that
23 the disposal pit, which I'll focus on in just a

1 second, and some miscellaneous potential burial of
2 mustard drums on the sight.

3 We looked at all the locations that
4 potentially could have had burial, dug them all up.
5 There was previous studies done on the site, as well,
6 we have that data. And then we got into the sump.
7 And nothing was found in all these different anomalies
8 around. There were no buried drums. It was mainly
9 railroad tracks, that kind of thing, but nothing
10 buried there. And all the soil samplings that were
11 taken were also non-detectables.

12 This is the sump that was used for
13 disposal of remnant training agents. What we did find
14 and confirm in this sump was in fact what was
15 expected. There were various items related to the
16 training that were found in the sump. These were
17 removed. Chemical mortars are used as containers for
18 chemical agents in the training.

19 But nothing that we found contained
20 any remnant chemical agent. None of the soil samples
21 that were sent off-site for lab analysis showed
22 chemical agent. And the on-site monitoring that was
23 done with what's called minicams had zero detections

FAX 256-892-3001

1 of vapors during the excavation and removal and
2 intrusive.

3 These are areas where trenches were
4 dug into this pit all the way to the bottom and
5 various things that were found. Basically, they were
6 all -- they were all there, the were all
7 decontaminated, and that's the expectation for that
8 sump.

9 The cleaning area 24 Alpha was the
10 other big site down here to the southeast I mentioned.
11 This site was used extensively by technical escort
12 unit for responding to accidents or whatnot with
13 chemical agents, and how to dispose of these items.
14 So, they had historically records of two burn pits and
15 potentially disposal.

16 Within the area of 24 Alpha when we
17 investigated we found both burn pits, and we did find
18 two disposal areas. And we found quite a variety of
19 training items within those pits. And once again,
20 they were tested, they were cleared as not containing
21 chemical agent, and the soils and materials that were
22 in and around the pits with those items, were sampled
23 and analyzed and were clean, in terms of chemical

1 warfare agents. So, there was essentially nothing
2 found for the (inaudible) the site.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: What is a concrete
4 bomb?

5 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Literally,
6 that's what it is. It's a bomb-shaped item that's
7 made out of concrete. It has some listing -- lifting
8 loads on it.

9 MR. RON LEVY: What they did, Pete,
10 they poured a piece of concrete in the shape of a bomb
11 so they could use it for training purposes. They
12 might contaminate it, they might, you know, use it to
13 transport around so they could train soldiers on, you
14 know, what a bomb is, without actually having a real
15 one.

16 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

17 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: You can actually
18 find them in various places at Fort McClellan used for
19 erosion control and back in the woods and --

20 MR. RON LEVY: They did make fences,
21 too. When you put (inaudible).

22 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Driveways, they
23 have those things.

FAX 256-892-3001

1 MR. PETE CONROY: How quaint.

2 MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Excuse me.

3 When did the technical escort stop training at this
4 site and start using another site, do you know?

5 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: Most all the
6 training out in the open of Fort McClellan stopped in
7 the early '70s, I believe. If my recollection is
8 correct.

9 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's correct.

10 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: And the whole
11 site was decontaminated. Then they built the CDTF
12 facility when they reinstated this to the chemical --

13 MR. RON LEVY: The chemical school
14 left Fort McClellan in the early '70s, and was
15 transferred in '73, was transferred up to Aberdeen.
16 And then it came back here when they opened
17 Fort McClellan up in the '80s for the chemical school.

18 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: But then they
19 had the specific school area, and they didn't do the
20 outside opening training, at that point.

21 There were also five locations
22 identified through various historical documents as
23 potential areas where mustard had been spilled.

256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001

1 And when we talk about "mustard," I
2 think, hopefully, most of y'all know, mustard really
3 isn't a gas, it's kind of molasses-type liquid. And
4 it apparently was believed to have leaked out of
5 containers at different locations around the facility,
6 the five locations.

7 These sites were sampled by
8 basically, soil samples. Some of them are under
9 parking lots, that type of thing. But nothing was
10 found within the soils remaining.

11 Then there is a whole bunch of the
12 rest of the sites of the nineteen that had virtually
13 nothing found there. Many of them were just soil
14 sampled. This is a black top training area, as an
15 example, that would have been in that general area of
16 chemical training, but no one knew exactly what it was
17 for. So, all kinds of soil samples have been taken
18 around here. There was nothing exposed here, there's
19 nothing detected in the soil samples.

20 Likewise for these other sites.
21 They were just suspect because of where they're
22 located and because somebody looked at them and said,
23 you know, maybe something was stored on this according

1 to (inaudible). So, that's the only record there
2 would be. And nothing was found on these sites.

3 And then the final sites, training
4 area 31 was the technical escort training area before
5 T-38 was used up at the top of Reservoir Ridge. There
6 were two or more studies done at this site, and
7 nothing was found, previously. Nothing was found by
8 us, not even a remnant of training materials were
9 actually uncovered like barb wire and stuff like that.

10 And the rest of the sites, likewise,
11 has historical training or indications that they could
12 have had training, but again, we found nothing there.
13 We found a little bit of trash in Naylor Field and a
14 disposal pit, but that was it. Did quite a number of
15 soil borings and samples in and around that site.

16 So, in conclusion, basically, we've
17 looked at all these sites that were suspected to be
18 chemical training sites. We're confident that we
19 found the sites that were in the records as being
20 training sites by the indications that we saw were the
21 accurate maps that we had.

22 And we have found nothing to
23 indicate that chemical agents remain either in

1 containers or in the environment, itself, in the soil
2 or in the water on the site. So, no further action is
3 going to be the recommended response action for all of
4 the sites.

5 MR. PETE CONROY: Any questions?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Let me just point out
7 that Paul James is the point of contact. Paul, raise
8 your hand.

9 MR. KEN STOCKWELL: I'm sorry, Paul.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Eastern bypass
11 discussion.

12 MR. RON LEVY: That's mine. I think
13 we've told you before on the eastern bypass -- Brenda,
14 would you flip to the last slide. I think we've
15 mentioned before that
16 Alabama Department of Transportation has defined
17 additional acreage that was needed in their
18 right-of-way to construct the bypass based on
19 engineering they have done to date. They found out
20 that there wasn't adequate property that they defined.
21 And they had identified what you see here.

22 The areas in yellow are the areas
23 that were identified for clearance, for additional --

1 clearance under the eastern bypass EE/CA that we're
2 doing now. The areas in green down below were already
3 defined for no further action, and the area up there
4 in the light blue is being covered in the M101 EE/CA,
5 which we briefed you on in the past.

6 If you can go back to the first
7 slide. Because we are cleaning up the eastern bypass
8 under CERCLA, there are certain requirements we also
9 have to follow when we make a change to an action or a
10 decision document, which is essentially what we're
11 doing. And we're doing it under -- since we're doing
12 it under CERCLA, we have followed this format.

13 The original action memorandum for
14 CERCLA was published the 2nd of August. It involved
15 the -- everything outside -- everything inside of that
16 yellow area that I just showed you.

17 And we began our actual cleanup on
18 the eastern bypass on the right-of-way that was
19 defined, the 27th of November. We officially got,
20 from the State, from ALDOT, a notice of those forty
21 additional acres, which you saw in the yellow, as
22 needing -- as something they needed on the
23 7th of February.

P.O. BOX 544

OHATCHEE, AL 36271
256-892-0591

FAX 256-892-3001

1 And we expect to publish, in
2 accordance with the law, what's known as an
3 explanation of significant differences.

4 We also hope to start the clearance
5 on these additional acres the 22nd of April. As you
6 all know, we're still in the process of working the
7 eastern bypass now. So, this is just moving into
8 another area as part of the eastern bypass clearance.

9 Next slide. These are the
10 requirements under CERCLA. We in fact did prepare an
11 explanation of significant differences. The scope of
12 the action pretty much is the acreage that you saw.
13 Performance is going to be the same as what we're
14 doing under the eastern bypass, the same technologies
15 we're using.

16 And, of course, there is an
17 additional cost which we define. Personally, that's
18 still being worked out between the contractor and the
19 Corps, so, I don't have any cost there. But we do
20 talk about the fact that there is additional cost.

21 We have sent the document on to the
22 regulatory agencies for review. And we will publish,
23 as I said, on the 12th of April, the notice of

1 availability on the ESD and put it in the
2 administrative record.

3 So, for the RAB's purposes, we're
4 just telling you what we're doing. We're moving
5 forward. We're doing it in accordance with the law.
6 We're allowing the regulatory agencies to comment on
7 it.

8 But essentially, it's no different
9 than the clearance we're doing for the other acreage
10 within the eastern bypass. It doesn't change anything
11 from a clearance standpoint that we're doing.

12 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Ron, could you
13 explain -- I'm sorry. Explain the color code again on
14 here that was -- I didn't --

15 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. There's about
16 forty plus acres that consists of these yellow areas
17 in here that we're actually doing clearance on for the
18 eastern bypass. Down here is part of -- everything
19 you see that's colored is what the
20 Alabama Department of Transportation requested for
21 additional acreage. However, only what's in the
22 yellow are we handling under this particular action
23 memorandum or decision document.

1 This down here has already been
2 cleared or it did not require any clearance because
3 there's no history of ordnance use down there, and we
4 FOSTed the property. This up here is part of the M101
5 EE/CA, which is ongoing now, which you've heard about.

6 So, this is the change or the
7 difference. This happens to fall inside of the area
8 M101, so it's really not a new clearance. It's part
9 of a clearance that we've already considered.

10 All I'm showing you is the acreage
11 that's outside of the --

12 MR. CLENDENIN: Is the yellow area
13 outside the present fence, have to move the fence
14 back, or is it still inside the fenced area?

15 MR. RON LEVY: Within this area
16 there is no fence. Down here, what we've already
17 transferred to ALDOT, there is a fence. And, yes,
18 that would be outside of the fenced area.

19 MR. Barry COX: Just out of
20 curiosity, why do they need that extra --

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Good question.

22 DR. BARRY COX: It looks like a very
23 irregular shape to me, that's why I was curious.

1 MR. GLYNN RYAN: It follows the
2 terrain.

3 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Slope stability.

4 DR. BARRY COX: Slope stability is
5 basically what it is?

6 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Right.

7 MR. BARRY COX: Okay.

8 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Ron, I was with
9 the Chamber of Commerce two weeks ago, and we went
10 down to Montgomery. And one of the briefings we had
11 was from ALDOT. Not a very good briefing, either,
12 I'll tell you, so that's why some of this question
13 comes up. They implied, a pretty strong statement,
14 that there was something holding them up until the
15 Army accomplished its clearance.

16 Now, what I've understood up to this
17 date is that all of the Army actions were in place and
18 were not holding ALDOT up. So, is it likely this was
19 what he was referring to without any explanation? Are
20 we holding them up with anything else in their process
21 because we haven't accomplished the clearance that's
22 necessary for them to get to work?

23 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We've accomplished

1 what's -- where that green is --

2 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Right.

3 MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- and below.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Uh-huh.

5 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Where we're still
6 clearing is above the green. So, there is some areas
7 that we're still clearing that we have not given to
8 ALDOT to start work on. So, I think that's what they
9 may be referring to.

10 MR. FERN THOMASSY: That's holding
11 up their work?

12 MR. GLYNN RYAN: I don't know if
13 it's holding up their work or not.

14 MR. JOE DOYLE: Let's put it this
15 way: We have presented voluminous time lines to ALDOT
16 from day one. So, they have been completely in the
17 information loop with regard to our expectations of
18 what we're going to find and how long it's going to
19 take doing the EE/CAs. So, I mean, from that
20 standpoint, you know, there's been no significant
21 changes in the time lines or anything else as we
22 progressed with the UXO cleanup. So, beyond that --

23 MR. RON LEVY: This will change our

1 time lines.

2 MR. JOE DOYLE: Yes, this will
3 change it, but I mean, this is --

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Oh, sure --

5 MR. JOE DOYLE: -- this is ALDOT
6 driven.

7 MR. FERN THOMASSY: It's driven by
8 them. And the implication was, you know, that they
9 were being slowed down in their work because of the
10 Army necessity to clear those areas of UXO or sort of
11 go through and do the work that was necessary to
12 certify they were cleared. And I've not heard that,
13 up until that time.

14 Certainly with a group from the
15 Chamber of Commerce, that was a pretty significant
16 statement for them to make.

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Were they
18 challenged?

19 MR. FERN THOMASSY: The guy that was
20 there couldn't answer the question anyhow, because he
21 was a substitute, and he started off the briefing and
22 he couldn't answer any questions. All he was doing
23 was talking to us with a few notes he had.

1 MR. PETE CONROY: I was going to ask
2 why it was a substandard briefing, but I think you've
3 -- done that.

4 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah.

5 MR. RON LEVY: I would just say that
6 we've always been straight forward with ALDOT and the
7 RAB and the community about what we're doing and how
8 long it's going to take that's all I can tell you.
9 And we're trying the best we can to move through this
10 process with a cleanup that's consistent with CERCLA.
11 So, I don't know what ALDOT may have said or not, but
12 --

13 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Unfortunately, I
14 was there and I'm not too sure, either.

15 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We will discuss
16 with them what the holdup is.

17 MR. FERN THOMASSY: Yeah. That will
18 make it worth it.

19 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Sure.

20 MR. FERN THOMASSY: And maybe that
21 -- maybe you can clarify that with us at a later date.

22 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Oh, I will. We'll
23 try to.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Pete, that's all
2 we've got on the program.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: My favorite part.
4 Agency reports.

5 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Well, I've just
6 gotten -- come back to work today, late. My dad
7 passed away, and I buried him this last weekend.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: I'm sorry.

9 MR. PHILIP STROUD: And so I've been
10 out of commission for the last two weeks. And they
11 buried him in Camden, Alabama. So, I'm kind of under
12 the weather.

13 I don't have much to add, except for
14 before that I was moving full steam ahead, you know,
15 with all these going on now. I fully intend to get
16 these reviewed.

17 Talking off and on with EPA.
18 Obviously, they can't be here for the same reasons for
19 the last several months. So, anyhow, just bear with
20 me as I get back up to speed. I kind of feel like I'm
21 in drum right now, and that's all I have to say.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: Not to sound like
23 protocol, but on behalf of everybody, I am sorry.

1 MR. PHILIP STROUD: There is one
2 thing we are moving on. I can say this, the UXO
3 contractor, it is in motion. There has been a small
4 delay because of my father's sickness and death. But
5 it's looking real good. We got five subcontractors to
6 send it in, and three of them are looking real good
7 right now.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Miki?

9 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Well, the JPA
10 has been busy with the independent review on the
11 landfills and underground storage tanks. And we are
12 preparing to try and meet with the Army in April on
13 both of those documents and talk through the issues we
14 have with those.

15 We're supposed to take another
16 transfer of property coming soon from the Army. The
17 housing has been moving along nicely. Numerous --
18 sold two, three houses last weekend during the -- what
19 was the --

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Archery.

21 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Archery, thank
22 you. Lost it there for a minute. During the archery
23 contest that we had. And that was very successful.

1 The merchants along Lenlock were very pleased with
2 that event and the number of people that we had in the
3 community for the weekend. So, that's about all.

4 DR. BARRY COX: I wonder what it was
5 the issue with the EPA not being able to attend?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Philip -- Doyle's had
7 -- his wife's also been sick --

8 MR. BARRY COX: Okay. So, it's just
9 personal, not the EPA?

10 MR. RON LEVY: Well, there is a
11 money issue with him, too. He's been restricted on
12 travel because of money, in-house money, which they're
13 trying to work through. And I don't know when that
14 will be solved, but he has very little money. Their
15 whole federal facilities office has very little money.
16 But we're trying to work through it with them.

17 In fact just to get through some of
18 the reviews, we've been trying to go into Atlanta so
19 we can get him as part of the team and help us through
20 the process without, you know, having to have them
21 spend money for travel to come out here.

22 MR. BARRY COX: I recall that there
23 was a commitment that they would attend at least every

1 other meeting.

2 MR. RON LEVY: I -- you know, I
3 can't tell you what --

4 MR. PETE CONROY: Does that funding
5 issue need to be addressed?

6 MR. RON LEVY: I can tell you within
7 the Army, we're trying to address it.

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yes, it needs to be
9 addressed. And we think the RAB --

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Is that something
11 that this RAB could take action with regards to?

12 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We think the RAB
13 could make a difference by contacting Region Four.

14 MR. PETE CONROY: Do you think we
15 need to write a letter to Jimmy Palmer?

16 MR. GLYNN RYAN: It certainly
17 wouldn't hurt. This is an important project.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: Anybody want to
19 talk about this for a minute?

20 DR. BARRY COX: Commission you two
21 to draft a letter up.

22 MR. RON LEVY: Give him the last one
23 you wrote.

1 MR. LAMAR FREEMAN: If travel
2 funding is an issue, could they not attend through
3 teleconference?

4 MR. PETE CONROY: I'm not sure they
5 could, just based upon the equipment that I've seen
6 over there. I'm talking about phones. But why don't
7 we -- I'd be delighted to put that in the letter.

8 MR. PHILIP STROUD: There are a
9 couple more issues -- it's out now. EPA has also
10 pulled out of the UXO totally. They've left it in the
11 State's hands completely. And that's why I'm in a
12 rush to get this UXO subcontractor in.

13 And that also goes for HTRW, too.
14 They are no longer going to concur with anymore
15 reports. We're looking into that right now from ADEM.
16 The Army's looking into it, too.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Let me further define
18 what their intent is. They're saying that primacy
19 belongs to ADEM, and therefore, their comments are not
20 going to come directly to the Army. They are going to
21 send their comments on documents to ADEM, through ADEM
22 -- or to ADEM which, you know, should take those
23 comments and use those for purposes of addressing our

1 cleanup.

2 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: For HTRW but
3 not for UXO?

4 MR. RON LEVY: For UXO they're
5 completely out of the loop, according to the letter.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: And when did that
7 happen?

8 MR. RON LEVY: Do you remember the
9 dates?

10 MR. JOE DOYLE: About two weeks ago.

11 MR. RON LEVY: Two weeks ago we
12 received the letter.

13 MS. DONNA FATHKE: What was the
14 reason for it?

15 MR. RON LEVY: The reason was, is
16 that they're saying that they had no authority and no
17 -- they had no regulatory authority for ordnance and
18 that it was really a State issue, as opposed to an EPA
19 issue.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Sounds like
21 Jimmy Palmer.

22 MR. RON LEVY: But as far as the
23 HTRW, we're still receiving comments -- well, ADEM is

1 receiving comments, and it's coming through ADEM. It
2 puts a greater work load on ADEM, obviously.

3 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Uh-huh.

4 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: And ADEM's only
5 one person.

6 MR. PETE CONROY: Hi, ADEM.

7 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That's an
8 issue.

9 MR. PHILIP STROUD: That's an issue.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Needs to be part
11 of the letter?

12 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: That should be
13 a separate letter.

14 DR. BARRY COX: Send two letters.

15 MR. PETE CONROY: Could you get us a
16 copy of the letter that you all received from EPA?

17 MR. RON LEVY: Sure.

18 MR. PETE CONROY: I mean, maybe you
19 all don't want to -- would that be useful?

20 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Yes.

21 MR. PETE CONROY: Would that be
22 something you would like to look at, if it triggered
23 the decision?

1 MR. PHILIP STROUD: Thank you.

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Anything else?

3 Next on the list is action summary sheet.

4 MR. RON LEVY: We're going to do
5 things a little differently, instead of me just going
6 through something I've already handed out, I'll take
7 questions on the action summary sheet.

8 Most of what we've got there is a
9 change in dates, a little bit of an update. But if
10 you've got specific questions, I'll be glad to take
11 them, instead of me taking thirty minutes of your time
12 going through it.

13 MR. PETE CONROY: How about we just
14 take a minute and look through it.

15 Been any punitive action relative to
16 the breach of, you know, pedestrians entering into
17 these safety zones?

18 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We've turned it
19 over to -- each time we've had an incident, we turned
20 it over to --

21 MR. JOE DOYLE: APD.

22 MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- Anniston to
23 handle it, whether they --

1 MR. JOE DOYLE: Keeping in mind,
2 the Anniston Police Department and
3 Sheriff's Department controls Fort McClellan. Our
4 security force are not armed. So, if they can detain
5 them, fine, if not, you know, if they call immediately
6 for assistance from the local law enforcement
7 officials, we handle it as a trespassing.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Has it been kind
9 of a spotty problem or is it consistent in --

10 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Let me ask our
11 contractor, he has had the most problem.

12 MR. ART HOLCOMB: It's spotty. It's
13 not real consistent, it's just infrequent.

14 MR. RON LEVY: One time is enough,
15 though. I mean, it just shuts us --

16 MR. GLYNN RYAN: It costs big
17 dollars every time we have to shut down. So, it's --
18 besides the danger and expense.

19 MR. ART HOLCOMB: It's not every
20 day.

21 MR. GLYNN RYAN: But it's not every
22 day, as Art points out.

23 MR. PETE CONROY: Maybe half a dozen

FAX 256-892-3001

1 instances, something along those lines?

2 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Since the first of
3 the year, I think we've had three.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: I won't say that's
5 not serious. Of course, every instance is serious,
6 but okay. Upon our cursorial review of this document,
7 Ron, has anybody got any questions? And Miki --

8 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: Can I ask an
9 administrative question? The fill area EE/CAs, you
10 said the public comment period is closed in
11 April 19th, I think was Jeannie's comment. Will the
12 RAB -- the technical review committee is reviewing
13 that. Will they bring their comments back to this
14 body, Ron?

15 MR. RON LEVY: The way the TRC was,
16 I think, put together was for them to send -- they
17 represented the RAB and for them to send the comments
18 in to the Army. But if the TRC wants to bring it back
19 to the body, as well, they're certainly welcome to do
20 that. But we've been accepting comments from the TRC.
21 In fact, we've been accepting individual comments from
22 each TRC member directly. So, we take singly or we'll
23 take in whole, if that's what they want to do. I

1 don't know -- again, it's the TRC's choice, not ours.

2 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Right.

3 MR. RON LEVY: In addition, we're
4 obligated to take anybody's comments that wishes to
5 comment on the document, and the documents are
6 available, publicly, in the repositories. But as we
7 had agreed, since we didn't want to reproduce, you
8 know, documents for everybody, it's an expensive
9 proposition, and we just try to focus it to the TRC
10 members.

11 MR. PETE CONROY: Miki, what are
12 your thoughts?

13 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: I was just
14 wondering if the RAB wanted to hear the results of the
15 TRC's work as a kind of a report before it -- that
16 EE/CA was closed out?

17 MR. PETE CONROY: From a procedural
18 point of view, it sure makes sense for us to collect
19 that and consider those comments.

20 MR. SCOTT BECKETT: I'd be
21 interested in hearing what they --

22 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Me, too.

23 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Will the TRC be

1 ready to present it at the next meeting? We'll put it
2 on the agenda.

3 MR. PETE CONROY: Let's put it on
4 the agenda. And most importantly, let's focus in on
5 setting up a meeting of the TRC.

6 MR. RON LEVY: If we can get the
7 comments in enough time, we can respond to the
8 comments and be able to answer your questions at the
9 time of the next meeting, too.

10 MR. JOE DOYLE: When is the next
11 meeting scheduled for? Make sure it's within your
12 meeting time limits.

13 MS. MIKI SCHNEIDER: The 15th.

14 MR. GLYNN RYAN: We'd like to have
15 your comments before that. We can respond -- we can
16 provide responses at the meeting.

17 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Seems to me that
18 the TRC members did send you some comments in the
19 beginning when they first started up --

20 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Certainly.

21 MS. DONNA FATHKE: -- sent an
22 E-mail, and I believe they copied all of us on it.

23 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Sure.

1 MS. DONNA FATHKE: But I haven't
2 seen anything recently. Are they still sending you
3 E-mails?

4 MR. RON LEVY: The ones from the
5 previous document we responded to and sent those
6 responses back to the TRC members. And again, it was
7 up to the TRC to do what they wanted to do as far as
8 the RAB was concerned.

9 MS. DONNA FATHKE: I would like to
10 be copied on all those E-mails, if we can get that
11 message to the TRC members. But as I remember, it has
12 to be a little more explicit. If I remember
13 correctly, one of the E-mails for instance referred to
14 certain paragraphs on certain pages, and we don't have
15 this information in front of us, so, it really didn't
16 mean anything.

17 MR. RON LEVY: It's tough to try to
18 reference back to something that you hadn't seen.

19 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Yeah. Well, of
20 course, I guess we could take the E-mail over to the
21 library with us and look it up.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: But that ain't
23 going to happen.

1 MS. DONNA FATHKE: It ain't going to
2 happen, yeah.

3 MR. RON LEVY: We're willing to do
4 whatever the RAB wants us to do, just tell us.

5 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Well, we could
6 pass on to the TRC members to copy us on all their
7 correspondence and try to write them in mind -- keep
8 it in mind that we're reading them without the
9 document sitting in front of us. You know, so we can
10 understand what it is that they're questioning or
11 commenting on.

12 MR. RON LEVY: My recommendation is
13 that if there's a discussion between the RAB members
14 and the TRC in terms of how they want to do that --

15 MS. DONNA FATHKE: Who is the TRC
16 again? I know it's Craig and --

17 MR. PETE CONROY: Barry and myself
18 --

19 MR. RON LEVY: Barry, Fern and --

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Fern --

21 MR. RON LEVY: Pete.

22 MR. PETE CONROY: And --

23 MR. GLYNN RYAN: Probably -- we

FAX 256-892-3001

1 expect Jerry Hopper, but that's --

2 MR. PETE CONROY: Both Craig and

3 Jerry are busy.

4 MR. GLYNN RYAN: And that's not

5 conferring --

6 MR. PETE CONROY: And that's not an

7 excuse.

8 MR. GLYNN RYAN: -- Jerry's going to

9 take this on.

10 MR. PETE CONROY: Did we hear from

11 Craig tonight?

12 MR. GLYNN RYAN: (Shakes head.)

13 MR. PETE CONROY: Okay.

14 MR. PHILIP STROUD: My thinking is

15 he's probably connected up with the lawsuits that's

16 going on there, Because my two bosses are directly

17 involved with that right now.

18 DR. BARRY COX: I was having trouble

19 getting in contact with him, too.

20 MR. PETE CONROY: Anyone here in the

21 audience have any comments, questions, concerns,

22 commentary, issues, personal problems, comments with

23 regard to our food?

1 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, this is -- I do
2 want to thank Brenda. That was her first time putting
3 this together, and she did a great job.

4 MR. PETE CONROY: Yeah, you did. In
5 which case, is there a motion to adjourn?

6 MS. DONNA FATHKE: So moved.

7 MR. JERRY ELSER: Second.

8 MR. PETE CONROY: Good night. Thank
9 you for coming.
10 (WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF ALABAMA)

3 CALHOUN COUNTY)

4

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

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama,
on this the 26th of March, 2002.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2005.