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 18th day of November, 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

FAX 256-892-3001

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Good afternoon, or should I say good evening. We want to officially call this meeting to order. And let me proudly say, before I do anything else, thank you; we have already established a quorum. Give yourselves a hand. I missed all of you guys and girls who were not here before.

We will take the roll. Harrington is here. Mr. Ryan is here. Mr. Beckett is excused. Mr. Buford?

MR. JAMES BUFORD: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Clendenin?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Conroy? Dr. Cox? Mr. Cunningham is excused, his wife is ill. Mr. Elser?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Ms. Fathke?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Franklin? Mr. Freeman?

MR. FREEMAN: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON:

FAX 256-892-3001

Mr. Branchfield?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Hood?

MR. RON HOOD: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON:

Mayor Kimbrough?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Grant is here.

MR. GRANT: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Levy?

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Brittain?

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We need to look at our agenda, since we didn't do any business last time, and we do have a program down. The discussion has come up that we should get our business taken care of once we get our minutes approved. And I need to know now from the body if that meets your consensus. You voting members, I need to hear

something from you.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I couldn't hear the question, Mary.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We're concerned that we didn't get any business done on last time.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Yeah --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We want to approach the agenda a little bit out of order, putting the program part back, since it's a little lengthy, until we get our new business taken care of, since some of that does require action from the board.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Sure.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Do we need to move on that?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'd like --

MS. DONNA FATHKE: I so move to rearrange the agenda to take care of new business first. Is that what you wanted?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Is there a second?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Second.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It has been

properly motioned and seconded that we will address our business before we do our program. All in favor of the said motion, let it be known by I. Opposes, same opportunity. There being none, we will approach the agenda from that angle.

Our first item of business will be, as we customarily do, an introduction of our guests. We'll go around the wall first and then come up.

MR. STEVE MORAN: Steve Moran from the Shaw Group.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Josh Jenkins from Shaw Group.

MR. TROY MINTON: Troy Minton, Shaw Group.

THE COURT REPORTER: What was your last name? I'm sorry.

MR. TROY MINTON: Minton.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Y'all speak up for me, please.

MR. LEE JAYE: Lee Jaye, Transition Environmental.

MR. ART HOLCOMB: Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler.

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

MR. ROB LEATH (phonetic): Rob Leath (phonetic) with the Corps of Engineers, Mobile.

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

(INAUDIBLE): Corps of Engineers.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, Transition Force, Environmental.

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

MR. JIM MANTHEY: Jim Manthey, Corps or Engineers, Ordnance and Explosive Center of Expertise.

DR. ROBERT MARNICIO: Robert Marnicio, Foster Wheeler.

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

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

MR. VINCE COPELAND: Vince Copeland, Corp of Engineers, Huntsville.

MR. SPENCER NELSON: Spencer Nelson,

URS Corporation.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James, Transition Force, Environmental office.

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

MR. STEVE NEAL: Steve Neal, Foster Wheeler.

MR. TODD BIGGS: Todd Biggs, Foster Wheeler.

MR. BETTY VICK: Betty Vick.

MR. HUGH VICK: Hugh Vick, Gannett-Fleming.

MS. ANNIE GODFREY: Annie Godfrey, EPA.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. Well, let me highlight that Ms. Godfrey with the EPA is Mr. Doyle's boss, I think.

Our first -- our next item of business will be to approve these minutes from September. There is none for October, since we didn't have it. Refresh your memory if you don't remember what we went over.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Make a

FAX 256-892-3001

motion for approval.

MR. JAMES BUFORD: Second.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It has been properly motioned and seconded that we approve the minutes. Are you ready for the question? All in favor of said motion, let it be known by I. Opposes, same opportunity? There being none, the minutes will stand approved as printed.

The only business under old business would be no quorum for October. Again, let me say thank you for putting forth this extra effort and let's ask that we be a little bit more responsive to Brenda's needs if we know we can't make it, because there are some times I know we won't be able to, and she will know and we will know.

Now, we want to move down to our new business. We have been trying to get us some RAB members now for a few months. The first item would be to vote on the members. Everybody, each of you have a ballot in your packet, and you did have or should have the applications. I think we talked about it last time. I have to find my little notes.

People have put in a little plug for

people. I hope you still remember those. But I'll ask, if you will, at this time, that you'll vote. And for those of us who made the little presentations or told about anything, if you want to reiterate that, this is the time.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Are you saying we do have a ballot in our packet?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It looks like this. (Demonstrating.) And it's got something on the back just like this.

MR. RON LEVY: Monty, it's on the back of that one page. You passed it. You passed it.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I'll find it.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It's got some little bitty names on it, and that's all the voting members names. That's it.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: I would like to make a comment on Dwight Mitchell. He's director of Public Works for The City of Weaver, and he formerly served on Fort McClellan when he was with the Calhoun County Water. And since our water system is the closest to the post, as far as our source of water, I would encourage you to consider him.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. For three, yes, vote for three.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Please, remember you're voting for three members. We have three vacancies.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Let the record reflect that Mr. Conroy is here in time to vote.

MR. RON LEVY: Pete, there's a ballot in your packet.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Vote for three members.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: You know, we tried getting our RAB members replaced --

MR. PETE CONROY: We'll try again.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: -- in October. Oh, we're ready tonight. You make number ten.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: It's on the back of one of those pages.

MR. PETE CONROY: There's just been ballot problems all over the place.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: But one thing about it, we're going to count these before this meeting is over and know the results. And it won't be

but ten ballots.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Look over in Dr. Cox's and get one, and then we'll put his back, should he come in.

MR. PETE CONROY: Got it.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: If your ballots are ready, you can pass them out and over.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: Tell him who to vote for, Mayor.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: He mentioned -- I think he mentioned her last time. Maybe --

MR. PETE CONROY: Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: There should be ten.

MR. RON LEVY: We need another ballot.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Franklin has come in. Mr. Franklin, we're in the process of electing members to the board. If you can compose yourself, you still have time to look through your

FAX 256-892-3001

packet and vote for three people on the ballot.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Now that we've got the voting out of the way, in your packets, we have consideration of amendments to the bylaws. Now, those are in your packet, and I won't go through discussing them, and we won't deal with them, but I'm asking that we will read them and when we come back together, be able to vote them up or down.

And the primary purpose of these is to facilitate the business to go on. We were just left standing in October when we came. And we had people here, and we couldn't conduct our business because of our quorum. If you read it and like it and think well of it, we'll put it in place, and if you think not, we'll bypass it. But it's all for the purpose for allowing us, as members of the RAB Board, to conduct business. It's almost like going to feed the chickens, and you take fifty pounds of feed, and you get there and you only have one chicken; you don't make the chicken do the whole fifty pounds, but you certainly don't take the fifty pounds back without taking care of the one chicken.

Our next item would be our agency reports. And we'll take them as listed, ADEM, EPA -- Micki isn't here for JPA -- and our technical review, and then our action summary sheet. And then we'll flip back to our program.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Okay. Sorry, I wasn't here last month. I've been real committed to finishing up a lot of reports. And I have been swamped. And we're making tremendous progress. We're getting into some real tough issues. I've just received also the super FOST number three. I think that's various areas in the cantonment area, I'll be looking at that directly.

But we're looking at a lot of FOSTs now and we're looking at a lot of RIFSs. I know we're still dealing with some SIs. We're dealing with a large amount of UXO issues. And HTRW seems to be moving along. So, I just want to let y'all know that instead of supplying y'all with a lot of reports, we're in the midst of quite a few right now.

So, I've been committed to it and will remain committed to finishing it up, several of them, getting up to speed and caught up. So, if y'all

256-892-0591
FAX 256-892-3001

have any specific issues, I'll be glad to go over some with y'all. So, feel free.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Philip, have there any standards been set for the UXO yet or are all y'all setting your own standards?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Standards --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: UXO, the range -- you know, there are lots of questions about the standards of clean-up. Are y'all just establishing your -- am I incorrect on that one, the range that -- we discussed the range issue, and that they couldn't come to an agreement on the clean-up? Ron, is that right?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I'm not sure which range --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: What is that?

MR. RON LEVY: Your question is -- your question is one more time, is there --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Is there a standard set for clean-up of ranges with the UXO?

MR. RON LEVY: There isn't what you'd normally think of as a standard. And we're doing risk based clean-up. In fact --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: So, y'all are setting your own according to the plan, right?

MR. RON LEVY: Well, you're going to see some discussion about that in the risk assessment coming up. Maybe it'll better help you address more questions to us.

And at this point, I know that EPA has got a document they're reviewing, but, you know, we really haven't sat down and discussed the -- whether what we've defined as clean-up is adequate or not. So, we're really not there, yet.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: I know there was some discussion from the JPA at one time about the plan that had been submitted for reuse. And there was some question by the Army that they had never received any revised. So, you're operating under one, I think, from several years ago; is that correct? Is that what you're basing your clean-up on?

MR. RON LEVY: We're operating under the plan that was submitted to the Army under the economic development conveyance. It's a '98 plan. And the map was updated in 2000. It was submitted to the Army. That's the approved plan that we're aware

of. Glynn, do you have anything further that you want to add?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: I'm sorry, I was talking to --

MR. RON LEVY: He was asking about the reuse plan.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: The reuse plan. We have the one that was submitted with the EDC application.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: In 1997 or something like that?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: '98, it was updated in 2000.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: It was actually in 2000 when they made their EDC application.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: But they haven't changed it since then, submitted anything to you?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: (Shakes head.)

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Thank you.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. Are you finished, Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Yes.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: As Philip said, there is a lot of work going on at this base. And I'm passing out a list of the reports that we have reviewed and submitted comments on. Since the last RAB meeting, the thirteen reports, and we have a few that we have received that we are in the process of reviewing right now. But we've only had those a week or so. This is basically where our time has gone for the -- over the last month.

So, if you have any questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them. Otherwise, that's our report.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. A large number.

MR. DOYLE BRITTAIN: There is a lot of work going on at this base.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Did Micki send us anything?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: I have a question real quick.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Yes.

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Number

thirteen here, maybe Ron or somebody could just briefly tell me what that investigation is or have we talked about it in here before?

MR. RON LEVY: It's just a -- you asking me the question?

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: Well, whoever can answer it.

MR. RON LEVY: It's a sampling plan for 24 Alpha, which is an area out in the Fish & Wildlife area. We have some groundwater contamination out there. We're looking at, in this case, the horizontal extent. So, they did a supplement to that. It's not been released to the public because essentially, we're still in the sampling side of the house. There's been no data generated to show the public so --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: So, we really --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: But that was mostly just like -- what are you looking for in the groundwater?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: So, do we know what it is?

MR. RON LEVY: Steve, can you help me out on this one?

MR. STEVE MORAN: Well, was the question, what is in the groundwater?

MR. RON LEVY: We're at T --

MR. CRAIG BRANCHFIELD: What are we looking for?

MR. STEVE MORAN: 24-Alpha. It's Benzine, carbon tetrachloride, (inaudible) benzine and carbon tet.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I missed that.

MR. RON LEVY: That was Steve Moran from Shaw Group. He was showing us --

MR. STEVE MORAN: It's benzine and carbon tetrachloride.

THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay.

MR. RON LEVY: To add further to that, Craig, is that this is the site that was previously used by the chemical school for training -- live-agent training, what we're looking at. We

essentially have eliminated the site based on investigation, CWM-wise. So, we're looking at groundwater contamination associated with the deconning. That's what we believe.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Additional questions?

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: I have one on -- to the Army. Where are you on the questions that have been submitted by ADEM and EPA and JPA?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: On the landfill EE/CA?

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: No, no, the questions that were submitted --

MR. GLYNN RYAN: On the landfill EE/CAs?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Yeah, that's what he asked.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: March is our expected date --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Of response?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Response, yes, sir. We, hopefully, can beat that.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: And we have nothing from JPA?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: (Shakes head.)

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Technical review committee. I have received nothing. I think -- and Scott isn't here, but he's going to send me something.

MR. RON LEVY: I hadn't heard anything, either.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. We're down to our action summary sheet.

MR. RON LEVY: I hate going through this piece by piece, but I'll just give you a broad overview of each one of the sections. We've been talking about landfill number three and the ongoing groundwater monitoring work. There's been briefings in the past to the RAB about it.

I think the good news to this point, based on that is that the BCT has looked at and approved an addition of ten additional wells to try to bound the groundwater contamination to the north. There are some other wells in there that we're going to look at from a supplemental data standpoint. But

FAX 256-892-3001

we're moving on in this process.

Now, it's not -- the actual work schedules and the plans still need to be presented to the BCT, finalized in the finalized version. As soon as we get that, we will attempt to show it to the RAB, as well, in terms of where we're going with that. But we're just not there, yet.

On the UXO work that's ongoing, I can tell you that the Alfa area EE/CA has been submitted to ADEM for review. It went out on the 4th of November. This is still internal reviews between the regulatory agencies and the Army. Since ADEM just got it, I'm not sure that they've been able to move very quickly on that.

We're still working internally, the Bravo and the Charlie document. Hopefully, we'll have something out -- and actually, I don't have a -- I don't have a set date for that. But we're shooting some time in the summer for actually getting it out to the public. So, it's a way off.

Alfa is actually -- you know, we're shooting some time February, March timeframe to get it to the public. So, that is also a way off.

FAX 256-892-3001

The M101, which is the area -- I don't know if I can point it out -- Bill Shanks over there is pointing to it. It's the brownish area. That's been completed. We're working to get some comments back on that, as well.

And then the eastern bypass work, we're still working the additional forty acres on the eastern bypass, plus, we've got a mechanical removal that we've been talking about that will occur on part of the -- part of that acreage so that the eastern bypass -- so the eastern bypass is still ongoing work.

CWM investigations, those are essentially all complete. We've briefed those to the RAB in the past.

What we really moved into next is the investigation associated with the groundwater, with the actions that came out of CWO, the groundwater issue, the groundwater contamination. For the most part, we're done with the CWM. We did not find anything. And we've briefed that in the past.

Glynn pointed out on the landfill EE/CA, we're still working the comments and expect to get that all completed by March. And there just is a --

FAX 256-892-3001

just as Phillip pointed out, there is two FOSTs out there, super FOST number two, which is in ADEM's hands, and there is one for the eastern bypass tract two and tract three. Bill, can you point those out on the map, tract two and tract three?

MR. BILL SHANKS: (Pointing.)

MR. RON LEVY: That is in a FOST stage two at ADEM going through a review. And you can see from the sheet how many folks we've got on board. Does anybody have any specific questions they want to ask about what's going on in the clean-up?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: No questions? Okay. At this time, we'll get the update of our TAPP hours. And I seriously doubt we have anything, since I have received no information.

MR. RON LEVY: I received today --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Oh, you did?

MR. RON LEVY: -- an expenditure for two and a half hours. So, of the original five hundred hours we started with, we're now still -- we still have four hundred and fifty-one hours -- four hundred and fifty-one point seven five hours still left under the contract.

So, most of the -- what's happening now with Ron's billing again is really his participation at the RAB and his write-ups of summaries of that event. Ron, do you have anything that --

MR. RON GRANT: No. That's about it. I can't add any more to that.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. If there is nothing -- and I ask you members to, again, that if there are things that you are concerned about -- and I suspect now that some of the stuff is coming out to us, there may be some questions -- that you get them in if it's specific.

Let me take this time to tell you who the new RAB members are. They are Jim Miller, who is the general manager of Anniston Water Works Board; Cheryl Bragg, the director of Anniston Museum; Dwight Mitchell, director of Public Works, City of Weaver. And I am certain that Ms. Cunningham will notify these people ASAP. Thank you all in that respect.

We will now go back and do our program part. And when we finish that, we will take

FAX 256-892-3001

input or comments from the audience.

MR. RON LEVY: I mentioned to you before about the EE/CAs that are coming out related to the UXO work. And in the past we've briefed to you risk assessment process associated with hazardous, toxic, radiological waste, the HTRW program. That was done by Shaw and folks from the Corps.

Tonight, we want to give you a presentation on the OE, the ordnance and explosive side, talk about the risk assessment process and the particular process we used here at McClellan. I'm going to let Dan introduce the folks that are going to do the speaking, Dan Copeland from the Corps.

MR. DAN COPELAND: First out, Jim Manthey from the Huntsville Ordnance and Explosive Center of Expertise is going to give a brief introduction into OERIA, which is the ordnance -- well, he can give you the definition for it. But then following that, after a brief introduction, Dr. Ron Marnicio, with Foster Wheeler, performed the (inaudible) for the EE/CAs.

MR. RON LEVY: I think he's going to use the slide presentation, if y'all want to turn

around.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: I'm not having a good day.

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: My name is Jim Manthey. I'm with the Ordnance Explosive Center of Expertise for the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. One of my jobs is to handle the development of guidance of the risk assessment, among others. We are a relatively small group, so, I've got several jobs in the Center of Expertise. One of them which is the development of guidance for use in risk assessment (inaudible.)

I'm just going to give you a brief introduction. Ron Marnicio is going to do a relatively detailed discussion of how they applied the tool that the Center of Expertise developed to assess risk. The tool they developed is called the ordnance and explosive risk impact assessment. As soon as the slides come up --

If I start talking either too fast or too softly, let me know. I have a habit of doing that, both.

MR. PETE CONROY: How many in your

office?

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: We have a total of eleven people, including two administrative people. We're a relatively small group, cross-function quite a bit. I also handle a national initiatives and work on DOD guidance and policy, and also in addition, I am the project manager for the Corps of Engineers site characterization manual (inaudible)--

THE COURT REPORTER: The site characterization --

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: The site characterization manual.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: You know who I am, I've already introduced myself. So, I guess we can go to the next slide.

What is risk assessment? Risk assessment for ordnance and explosive projects or OE projects, as I'll use later in the presentation, is the assessment of the current site conditions for potential of injury or death from the OE. This is called the baseline risk assessment. And then there's

FAX 256-892-3001

also the assessment of risk for how our response action will impact that risk. That's risk reduction. Next slide, please.

Why do a risk assessment? In the EE/CA, we're tasked to evaluate and assess several response alternatives, to recommend a preferred response alternative. One factor that's involved in that is to assess the response alternatives for how protective of human health and the -- excuse me, how protective of human health each response action is, relative to each other.

The risk assessment is the primary tool for this assessment. And that's what we're going to be talking about tonight. Next slide, please.

As I said, the tool that the Center of Expertise is currently recommending is the OE risk impact assessment or the OERIA. The tools used to communicate baseline risk and risk reduction creates response alternative.

I say communicate, since we don't really try to calculate risk. We're just communicating the factors involved with risk and what those factors -- the characteristics for those factors

are.

We assess the factors involved in risk on OE sites. These include OE factors, type, depth, sensitivity of the ordnance items. We also assess site or accessibility factors such as, how stable is the site, is there erosion, is there a lot of flooding, what have you. And these include -- and also includes, what type of access is there to the site. Is there restricted access to the site? Is there terrain that inhibits access to the site, etcetera?

We also assess human behavior factors; what type of activities are conducted on the site, what type of in intrusiveness are involved in that site -- excuse me -- that activity.

OERIA has some detailed guidance on the web. The website is listed at the bottom of the page. If you want to look at the detailed web -- the detailed guidance, please, do so.

Ron's going to go into a relatively detailed explanation of how they apply to the OERIA model, and I will be available afterwards, if you want to ask me any specific questions. Thank you.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: Brenda wanted me to wear the microphone, and I told her that I would rather not, but the main point is that -- make sure you can hear me. If I fade out, throw something soft at me.

As Jim said, what I'm going to preview for you here is the process that we used to go from that general guidance on how to do an OERIA risk assessment and the factors and steps that we took as part of generating the risk assessment that's a section of each EE/CA document.

THE COURT REPORTER: Of the -- each document? I'm sorry.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: Of each EE/CA document.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: It's engineering evaluation, cost analysis.

What we'll see here is a little bit about the OERIA model, itself, but I'm going to be talking about the information that goes into the analysis, as well, and what we do to collect it, and process it to use in the OERIA.

One of the first things is to do an OERIA or any risk assessment, you have to define the area that you're going to do it for. What's the boundary of the physical area that you're going to do the assessment on. I'll hit on those.

Earlier on there was some question asked about the future use projection. We'll talk briefly about how that factors into this assessment because it is an important part.

I'll introduce the idea of a conceptual site model to you. A conceptual site model is how we start to think about the area, how the people use the area, and then how people can come into contact with where -- places where ordnance might be.

That website that Jim mentioned on the -- his last slide presents the guidance and the general approach to doing an OERIA assessment. A part of that approach is that you have the opportunity to tailor or tweak the factors or add factors to the assessment to make sure that you're assessing all the right things about the site. You want to make sure that you're capturing all the important site characteristic -- or factors that actually are

FAX 256-892-3001

indicated to affect the risk at your particular area. So, I'll talk about what we did to tailor the general model, to try to make it a little bit more Fort McClellan specific.

Once we get to that part, I'll review the range of information and data that you need to collect to put into this assessment, both from a field investigation and some other general site information. Jim talked about the baseline assessment. And I'll rehit on that in a little different spin. And again, the baseline assessment is the relative level of risk, assuming the conditions stay as they are right now.

And then, as Jim mentioned, the idea of where we're going with this is that there is, in terms of cleaning up an area or remediating an area, there is always different alternatives proposed to remediate. And we have a set of response alternatives. And what we try to do then after the baseline is to reassess the risk, assuming that those alternatives are put into place. And those alternatives tend to change the conditions in the area, and they change it in a way that affects the

level of risk.

So, I'll briefly go through that idea. And then I'll wrap it up by just reiterating, once we get through the OERIA process and get some answers and some results, what happens to that information, how does it get factored back in to the rest of the EE/CA process.

Okay. That was sort of the preview. I'll hit on those topics and get into a little bit more detail.

The assessment boundaries, when you see the EE/CA reports later on, you'll see that we talked about these areas in which we're doing assessment. We call those areas sectors. And we have two kind of sectors; one is called a site characterization sector and one is called a risk assessment sector.

Site characterization sectors are identified first. And what's done is we look at the records and all the past -- the records of the past activities in different areas of the facility, to get an idea of what was done there, and therefore, what kind of ordnance might be in that area. And so, the

site characterization sectors are sort of our best guess as to what the area may look like, based on the past records.

The field -- the characterization work that goes on, the surveying and the investigation, which I'll talk about later, are done in reference to these areas. Once the information comes back, we have a much better idea of what those areas are like. We know what kind of ordnance was actually found there, if any, and we know the depths that it was found and a lot of other details.

That's when we build the risk assessment sectors, which instead of relying on just documentation, we rely on where the actual data came back and showed us where different types of ordnance were. So, that's one difference between the two sectors.

The other difference goes back to what Jim said with regard to the risk factors. He said there was ordnance risk factors, there were site risk factors, and then there was behavior or human activity risk factors.

So, if we want to assess an area

that's more or less the same from the standpoint of risk, we have to choose those boundaries so that those factors important to risk are sort of the same within it. So, in addition to having the same kind of ordnance, we also look for areas that have a similar topography and accessibility. And we also look for areas that have a similar projected land use. And that way, the accessibility to that area being assessed, the ordnance in that area being assessed, and the types of activities in the future will all be as similar as we can get.

The importance of land use. Land use comes into this in two very important ways: As I just said on the previous slide, we choose the boundaries of the risk assessment sector so that the activities that we think are going to happen within those boundaries are the same. And we get that from the projections of the land use.

And then once we have a land use, that defines the range of actual activities that we expect to happen, whether we're going to have activities that involve digging into and disturbing the soil or more likely just activities that happen on

top of the surface. And then we can make estimates of what the frequency of use are, how intense people's interaction with the ground are, whether they're digging into the ground a lot or not, whether they're driving vehicles on the ground or they're just walking, and then the depth of intrusion, you know, are people going to dig in the top six inches only or are they going to be digging holes four feet, are they going to be putting new building foundations in, much deeper depths. That all comes out of what the projection of the land use is.

The earlier mentioned land use report identified a number of different types of land use for Fort McClellan. And there you see the names of them; mixed business use, retail, cultural, etcetera, the eastern bypass corridor and transportation use. And then there was there was two other categories, one called active recreation, and the other called passive recreation.

What I have in the -- written out here is what active recreation was defined to be in that report. Off-road motorized vehicles, golf and tennis, regrading of land and including installing

fence posts and things.

We didn't want to go through the risk assessment individually for each one of these different land uses, because we thought that these things were more similar than they were different with regard to the activities that were involved and how people doing those activities would interact with the ground. So, what we did is we grouped all these things together under the header of development and then had passive recreation as the other.

So, some future uses are termed development and some are termed passive recreation. And we think that in terms of the activities that we assume under development, we assume the more intrusive -- intrusive to deeper depths -- and the more intensely interactive of people with the ground for this. So, we think that a lot of these are being handled very conservatively.

MR. PETE CONROY: Going back to passive recreation, I think I get the idea, and I think we all get the idea, but I've never actually seen the definition --

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: Of what is

passive?

MR. PETE CONROY: Would you do that for us? Can you give us a definition in writing and mail it to us later, just so we can have that?

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: Yes, we can. In general, it's things like hiking, walking, relatively light or insignificant intrusion to the ground. Though we do have such a definition in a report.

I mentioned in the preview a conceptual site model. And I said it was how we -- what we put together to start thinking about how to evaluate the risk. What the conceptual site model is is a description of the potential exposure pathways associated with ordnance. Exposure pathways is kind of a jargon term in risk assessment. But what it is is simply a connection between the source of something, whether -- you may have heard it before, chemical source -- but here we're talking about a source of ordnance or explosives. The connection between that and the people that could be in contact with it. Which the other jargon word is called the receptor.

So, it's the linkage between the sources and the receptor. And here, what I have are all the little links that need to be there for a complete pathway, and some examples. So, let's look at the -- the examples are in the parentheses.

A primary source, based on an activity could have been some training activities at Fort McClellan. You need then a mechanism of release or deployment. They could have fired some ordnance. That was how the ordnance got in -- from a controlled situation to being let out into the environment.

That creates what's called a secondary source. Now that ordnance is out in the soil, rather than being in the controlled environment that it was before. As was mentioned, that soil and that ordnance may stay in that same spot where it was released to or deployed for a very long time.

Or if you have something like the potential for erosion, freezing and thawing, that could make items move closer to the surface or a number of natural mechanisms and man-made mechanisms, maybe people took soil from one area and moved it and used it as fill in another area. So, there are

migration or transport mechanisms that caused that ordnance potentially to move from where it started to some place else.

Once it's in that some place else, that's what's called the exposure medium, because that's where somebody could get exposed to it today. And then with ordnance, we're almost always talking about direct contact as the route of exposure and that jargon word receptor is the person that's exposed.

So, this complete exposure pathway looks at the whole history of where that ordnance started, how it got away, how it might move, and then how does it get to where some people may come into contact with it, potentially.

As I mentioned, a standard step in the OERIA process as it's generally written, is to look at the factors that are identified and evaluate those to make sure they address the issues that are of concern at your particular site. And again, I call that the tailoring. And it's to make sure these factors address the important features. And what we'll do is real quickly step through the three groupings of risk factors, the ordnance is one, the

site is one, and the human behavior is one. And I'll tell you what we did regarding each one of those.

This is the ordnance factors. The ordnance factors relate to what kind of ordnance items you find, how sensitive are they, how hazardous are they, are there some that with a larger, potentially larger releases of energy or smaller.

A part -- there's one called OE type, which addresses the hazard level of items. A subset of OE type is a family of ordnance called high explosives. You may have heard the term HE.

Because people think about HE sometimes differently than others, even though it's captured in that other factor, we chose to break that out, just so that if somebody was looking for that piece of information, it's right there without having to dig around for it.

Some of the other tailoring we did is the standard OERIA approach for OE type and OE sensitivity calls for identifying the most hazardous OE type and the most sensitive OE type that is found within that area.

What we did to just provide a little

more information for the assessment is, there are four categories that the OERIA guidance identifies. Since we have the information, we just identified what the percentage of the found items were, if there were found items that were in each of the hazard categories and each of the sensitivity categories. So, it's just making the analysis a little bit more fine tuned.

This is the second slide, the last slide on the tailoring of the ordnance again. What we have here is the average density of the energetic items is a part of the standard OERIA process. What we did is break that down into three particular soil layers within each of those areas. How many and what percentage and what average density of any items found were found on or at the surface, how many were in the depth range of zero to one foot, and how many were found at greater than one foot depth. And again, it's just giving a little more fine tuning of that characterization data, you're looking at right in front of you.

We picked these particular depth intervals for two reasons; one, is they are -- the primary reason is they're associated with -- we'll see

in a minute -- the different response alternatives.

There's going to be alternatives about digging up ordnance to different levels. One of those is clearing the surface, only, one is clearing the surface and down to a foot, one is clearing down to the depth that you can detect. And so, these characteristics of the site are tabulated in exactly the same layers that match up with those layers.

We also looked at ordnance and explosive debris. Debris here means the remnants of ordnance items that have gone off before, the metal shell casing and things. By looking at that, that also helps you get an understanding of what the distribution of things may have been in that area before.

We're switching gears now to the second set of factors which was the factors about the site. And as Jim mentioned, factors are site accessibility -- and actually that was supposed to be -- I'm sorry -- that's site stability -- a typo there.

It turns out, given the nature of Fort McClellan, we didn't change this, at all.

Because of the projection for reuse on the facility, we didn't want to have any restrictions to the site as part of the final state. And we didn't, in terms of going over the site, find evidence of very large erosion or very large effects of freezing and thawing or those other processes that could make the site unstable, which means here, make the site in a way that the ordnance could be moving around. Okay?

So, based on that, we left the -- we left those factors exactly the way they were, because they didn't enter into it very much.

The last set of factors was the human risk factors. And human factors mean here, people's behavior. And that -- the OERIA, risk factors related to that are the activities, the probability of contact with the ordnance and explosives, and the exposed population.

Again, these seem to match pretty well with what we were seeing, in terms of being able to explain or describe conditions at McClellan, so, we didn't tailor them, but we did -- we applied these factors twice. We applied them for current conditions, as we -- current activities that we see --

or really what was going on before the clean-up started, and then secondly, what the future projected activities were, in line with that land use document.

Okay. So, just to catch you back up on where I am on my slide, we've talked about how we've tinkered, we've tailored with the standard OERIA risk factors to try to make it more applicable to Fort McClellan and fit in with the EE/CA evaluation process.

This slide talks about the information that you need to put into the overall analysis. One is: The total sector area. Now, this is the risk assessment sectors. How many acres is it? Second is -- gets into some of the characteristics of the results of the field work or that site characterization work that was done. And that typically involved two processes, geophysically surveying the area. And that involves using various types of detectors, metal detectors, electro magnetic detectors, a suite of things to see what might be there.

And that work is typically done with two kinds of approaches. It's a series of grids where

square plots of land are marked out and surveyed or transects where basically, the person with the detector walks along in some sort of path or corridor and they evaluate that strip in front of them. They go back and forth and cover area in that way.

Much of what's geophysically surveyed is then what's called intrusively investigated, which just means they go back and dig up what the survey indicates to be potentially there. And the digging up is all done with the purpose of identifying what caused that signal. Sometimes it is ordnance, sometimes it's a beer can, a nail, some other item that creates the same response in the detector, like a piece of ordnance item.

But once those are identified, we can count them, we can see what kind they are, whether it's a mortar, whether it's a projectile. We can count it. We can determine whether it's energetic or not and we can characterize the depth at which it was found. Because all these things affect the risk factors that we're going to do.

This slide hits the other two kinds of risk factors, the site access factor and the site

stability. Often while we're out there doing the other work of surveying and digging, people are out there looking around and observing other things about the area. And that's generally called reconnaissance.

And there's two things that we also want to get a handle on. One is, are there potential barriers to people going into that area, and secondly, are there things that potentially are going to draw people to that area. Because that affects how many people might be in an area and consequently sort of the level of risk that may be posed by anything that's out there.

These barriers could be, as Jim mentioned earlier, natural or man-made, could be ravines or something that make it very unlikely for people to get across, but also things like water bodies or recreational facilities that are going to draw more people to them.

And again, relative to site stability, we look for things like erosion, places where there were slides, look for things that could have caused ordnance items that were deposited in one place to end up somewhere else.

FAX 256-892-3001

All righty. So, going through all of that, here are the risk factors that we ended up with for Fort McClellan. That high explosive sort of check mark -- or not check mark I mentioned earlier. These were the OE type, the OE sensitivity, and the count or average density of OE items in the area, the two factors about the site, access and stability, and then the factors about people's activities and behavior.

The way -- when you see an OERIA analysis, it looks like a big table. And all of these factors are across the top. And then down the columns you see one of these things filled in. And this is just -- we're not going to talk about them all -- but basically, this describes what the options are for going into each of those columns, how to represent those risk factors. Some are percentages, some are one of three particular choices.

For example, for site access, you can either put in there no restriction, limited restriction, or complete restriction. And then the report would explain in a little more detail as to what those mean.

Again, what's the purpose of the baseline? The baseline is simply, as you may think, it's the baseline or reference point for comparing the risk reduction achieved by the different alternatives that are proposed to do in that area. These are the general response action alternatives or the alternatives that are being looked at and evaluated for each area at Fort McClellan.

Again, alternative one is no further action, that's the baseline case that I just talked about. And alternatives two, three, four, five, and six, all add some additional type of response, either in terms of controls or restrictions on use.

Alternative three, construction support means that you limit that construction cannot happen without qualified ordnance folks being there when the construction happens to make sure that it's done safely.

Alternatives four, five, and six are the clearance or removal options. And as I mentioned earlier, when we were talking about those depth intervals, alternative four is clearing the ordnance items that may be there off the surface only. And

FAX 256-892-3001

then alternative five is clearing those surface items and anything in the top foot. And then alternative six is clearing anything that you can detect down as far as you can detect it. These -- this set of alternatives was used in each of the evaluations that were done.

So, again, as I mentioned, the OERIA analysis is documented in this table with all the risk factors across the top. Down to the side there is a row for each alternative. So, each alternative is evaluated with respect to each risk factor. And what you do is look at the alternative and how it's defined, and then you say, if that alternative is implemented, how is it going to change conditions in that area, and how will that risk factor change?

Is that going to create more accessibility, less accessibility, or not affect the accessibility? Is that going to remove some amount of the ordnance?

So, you do the what-if analysis of apply -- assuming that the alternative is implemented and see what changes. And then what's used is an aid -- a letter score, the things that -- the

alternative that creates the greatest risk reduction for that factor will get an A score. That's the best one relative to that risk factor.

The second best one will get a B, a C, and etcetera. If alternatives have the same effect, they get the same score. So, you can have an alternative -- two or three alternatives get an A for a certain risk factor if they have the same effect.

Once you've scored all of the alternatives for each risk factor, the final question is: Which alternative creates the most risk reduction? What's the best one, overall? What we did here is used a -- the guidance leaves it open to define this however you want to do it on a site-specific basis.

What we set up was a -- basically, a three level scheme, high, moderate, and low. And we save the baseline for the baseline case. That's the standard against the bench mark that we compare them all to.

If an alternative -- in looking at all of the risk factors, leads to the greatest risk reduction, that got a high. The alternative that was

next best in a relative sense, gets a moderate. And then if there is some observable reduction in risk, but probably not too much, that gets the low.

It's not rocket science. It's a relative scale of which one is better, how do they compare to the baseline case.

And again, if the alternative -- in these high, medium, and low, it's in looking at the scores for the individual risk factors and professional judgment of how to put those multiple scores together to get an overall score.

In the actual -- hang in there, we're getting close to the end -- in the actual EE/CA documents, this is all done very specific to a particular area. So, you'll be able to see in those reports this table with letters and how -- which ones are high, moderate, and low.

We've done quite a few sectors so far. And what I've tried to do was just pull out some of the general results of how these things are looking.

The first thing is that the ordnance factors are the most important. These are -- this is

how much ordnance may be there, what depth is it there, how hazardous is it, how sensitive is it to potentially detonate. Those factors rank the highest, in terms of affecting the overall scoring alternative. And obviously, the most effective -- or only effective in clearance can't change those things if those items are still out there. So, the way to affect that is some amount of clearance or removal.

The second set of risk factors was the site factors. And as I kind of mentioned earlier, because part of the assumption is we didn't want to have access controls, we didn't want to have to keep people out of certain areas after the remediation, and that the site was fairly stable with regard to the movement of these items. These factors scored pretty much the same for any place on Fort McClellan. So, those factors really don't help us very much for differentiating.

Lastly, the human factors are very influential because as we saw, the human factors, things like the activities and the number of people and all, start with that land use projection. It defines those activities and those activities impact

FAX 256-892-3001

the intrusion depth and how people are going to be interacting with the soil. And that's a very important parameter in these -- in these assessments.

And lastly, as Jim said, why do we do these risk assessments? Well, we do these because the EE/CA requires that a variety of criteria are evaluated for each of the alternatives being considered. One of those criteria is the effectiveness of the response and reducing risk. And the -- this OERIA analysis is the principle factor that's used to determine whether at all -- whether and to what degree an alternative reduces risk in an area.

Okay, thank you all for your attention. I guess we're -- I and Jim can take any questions you may have.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I don't have a question, but I do have a comment. Apparently, I've been here too long, I actually followed that one. I don't mean that bad, I mean I understood the terminology from beginning to end, and I didn't have to go through all of these long terms that lost me in the middle.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: I've got a

FAX 256-892-3001

question on the landfills, in the fill areas. Have EE/CAs for UXO been done on those?

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: I do not believe so.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, the -- if I can answer the question this way: Where landfills fell in areas where we had known ordnance activity, they're evaluated in these EE/CAs, they're being evaluated under these EE/CAs.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: They're not defined as a specific risk assessment sector just because of the boundary.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Well, let me ask a specific question, and then you might not want to answer it tonight, but I'd like the information. The fill area on the northwest of Reilly, there's a fill area there --

MR. RON LEVY: You can point it out on that map right behind you. See the map right there? Which fill area are you talking about?

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: It's this northwest of Reilly Air Field, parcel two two nine seven.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Mayor, what was the number?

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Parcel two twenty-nine seven.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Sorry.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: According to information, there were eighteen practice hand grenades and an inert practice armor piercing round found in that area. According to this EE/CA, it recommends no further action.

I'd like to -- for somebody to explain that to me. You might not be prepared to do it tonight, but I -- to -- I understand the presentation, I understand you're going through the process and everything, but I'd like to know in understandable language -- this is -- I understand is an active recreational area, that has been designated as active recreation, and so, you know, when you read that, I have a concern about, you know, if they found that, why no further action was necessary and what that was based on?

So, if just at the next RAB, if somebody

could update us on that -- on that particular -- there was several sites, I understand, that there was found some ordnance on them and no other action was the recommendation for the EE/CA.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: We can certainly do that. Again, that particular site you're talking about was not a part of any of the UXO EE/CAs, so it's separate. If those were found and found within the landfill EE/CA, we'll -- I'll just have to -- we'll get you an update on it, Mayor. I can't answer it tonight.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And ADEM has posed questions related to what you're asking there, as far as --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: That was the one that had the most of them. Some of them just had several. You know, but this one had eighteen hand grenades and then the other round.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, let's be clear about it; a practice grenade is really different from a grenade.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Well, I understand that, but it still had an explosive item on

it. And, you know, my question -- like I say, I don't want to -- tonight, but active recreation and that was I think what Pete asked was about active recreation, what is that. And then, you know, if there's not any danger, then fine, but that just -- you know, red flag comes out at me any time I see anything like that, Ron. Maybe I don't understand. I admit that I don't understand a lots of things. You know, but if somebody could just explain that to us, then I would appreciate it.

MR. RON LEVY: We'll take your question back.

MR. PETE CONROY: Does a practice grenade blow up?

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Where is our UXO people down there?

MR. PETE CONROY: I heard yes and no.

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: A lot of them don't. Just baseball (inaudible) --

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: That's what we used in our test, when we practiced trying to get a handle with the grenade, and it didn't go off. But

are there not some that have explosive devices in them?

MR. JAMES MANTHEY: There are certain types.

MR. HUGH VICK: Some of the older ones had a cork in the bottom, it had black powder, and when it went off, it blew the cork out.

MAYOR WAYNE KIMBROUGH: Well, they might not be anything, but I would like to know.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: So hopefully, somebody will have an answer for Mayor Kimbrough at our next meeting.

MR. GLYNN RYAN: Yeah, we'll have an answer. And we probably can give it to you before then, Mayor.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay.

MR. PETE CONROY: You had mentioned site stability. And did I understand you to say that really it's not an issue and the freezing and the thawing doesn't move ordnance in our environment?

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: Not to an appreciable extent it doesn't seem. Regarding freeze thaw, it's a combination of temperature extremes and

FAX 256-892-3001

soil types --

MR. PETE CONROY: Sure.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: -- and a variety of things, and it doesn't appear that that's -- the right combinations are happening.

MR. PETE CONROY: So, when you assess risk, you don't weigh that in?

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: We look, as a matter of running through the process, with a particular boundary drawn on the map, we look to see whether there's evidence of -- evidence of that or evidence of, you know, sort of severe gullies, where there's run-off and erosion --

MR. PETE CONROY: Sure.

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: -- anything that may give you some visual evidence that things are moving around, either naturally or, you know, we -- you know, we know that in a certain year people filled this area. Well, where did the fill come from?

MR. PETE CONROY: But generally speaking, the freeze thaw movement is not an issue around here?

DR. RONALD MARNICIO: No, I don't

FAX 256-892-3001

believe so.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Additional questions? Thank you for the presentation, and they should all be so.

Okay. We're down to comments from our audience. If the audience has any comments or questions, we will entertain them now.

I would be remiss, first of all, if I closed this meeting without giving Ms. Godfrey a chance to make some comments. And also, Sam has asked that we make sure we sign in, the persons that are present, so she can be sure that she has an accurate spelling of your name.

MS. ANNIE GODFREY: I'm not really prepared to say anything. I'm just here, I'm taking a tour of all the facilities that our section works on. I'm relatively new to this program at EPA. I've been EPA for twenty-three years, but in the Federal Facilities Program, I've only been here since April. And I'm just trying to get around to see how the RABs work and the base closure teams work and the other teams working on the non-BRAC sites. And everyone here has been very gracious about showing me around

256-892-0591

FAX 256-892-3001

and giving me information, and I thank you for letting me come.

MR. RON LEVY: Can I just point out one thing before we leave? I didn't mention it during the action summary, but it's in the notes. I think it's important because it will ultimately impact on the community, and that's that we're going to conduct a private well survey where we're going to be looking at wells and springs in the vicinity of landfill three.

We're looking at a two mile arc. We've already started looking at the private property records across that area up there. This -- we had done one a long time back -- I can't remember the actual year -- but it's not going to be -- it wasn't as extensive as what we're looking at now.

We expect to do a mailing associated with this after we identify residents within that area and ask them the question, you know, do you have a well, is there a spring on your property, what are the uses of that. And it'll all become part of the information we use in determining final actions resulting from landfill three. And I think it's

important that everybody knows that, because we will be asking the community questions.

Josh, do you have anything further about that particular --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Additional comments?

MR. PETE CONROY: In this slow and incremental process establishing a National Wildlife Refuge, tomorrow is another important day because President Bush is scheduled to sign the Defense Authorization Bill tomorrow about 10:00 o'clock. And that's a piece of legislation that will create our National Wildlife Refuge. So, one hundred and eighty days after tomorrow, if he signs it, it will be up and running.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. Very good.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Congratulations, Pete, and thank you for all your hard work in doing that.

MR. PETE CONROY: There was a lot of other people involved in that.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Anything else for the good or not for the good of the RAB? Let me thank you all for being so gracious to be in attendance tonight and remind you that we don't have a meeting in December. We'll be back together in January. And the meeting is --

GLYNN RYAN: Here, I believe.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: -- here. We are officially adjourned, unless y'all just want to hang out.

(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 3rd of December, 2001.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2005.