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 August, 2003, commencing at approximately 6:30 p.m.

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

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

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

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Good evening. We'd like to bring our meeting to order. At this time, we'll now have our roll call. Harrington is here. Mr. Doyle is here. Beckett? Buford? Mr. Clendenin?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Conroy?

MR. PETE CONROY: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Dr. Cox?

DR. BARRY COX: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Steffy? Am I pronouncing that correctly?

DR. STEFFY: Yes. Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Elser?

MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Fathke?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Franklin is excused. McCary. Branchfield? Hood? Mayor Kimbrough?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Ms. Bragg?

MS. CHERYL BRAGG: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mitchell?

MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Miller is excused. Mr. Grant's here.

MR. RON GRANT: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Levy?

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Mr. Brittain is excused. Mr. Stroud?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Here.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: At this time, we will have an introduction of our guests. We'll go around the room. And save the comments that you wish to make, if they are people in the audience, until the end.

MS. KAREN PINSON: I'm Karen Pinson, Transition Force.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, Transition Force.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda Cunningham, Transition Force.

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

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

MR. ART HOLCOMB: Art Holcomb, Foster Wheeler.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Josh Jenkins, Shaw E&I.

MR. JOHN RAGSHDAL: John Ragshdal, Shaw E&I.

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James, Transition Force.

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

MR. BILL SHANKS: Bill Shanks, Transition Force.

MR. BOB SCHMITTER: Bob Schmitter, with the TOSC Program.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Now, if we may, we'll get into the approval of our July minutes.

I think we had -- I counted nine, ten, with myself; is that correct?

MS. DONNA FATHKE: I think that's good.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Is that

correct?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: You need a motion? I'll make a motion for approval.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Thank you.

MR. PETE CONROY: Second.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It has been properly motioned and seconded that the July 21st, 2003 minutes be approved as printed.

Ready for the vote? All in favor of said motion let it be known by I. Opposes, the same opportunity. Thank you.

Now, we want to move into our program for tonight, which is to begin with the landfill three groundwater monitoring for first and second quarters and ten newly installed wells. Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Okay. What I want to do today is just to brief everybody on the work done to date, completed to date at landfill three. Basically, since 2002, about this time period last year, we talked about some of the geology and hydrogeology investigations.

And since that time period, there

has been some additional work done and that's what we're going to talk about tonight. Next slide.

Just to update you, refresh your memory on what we know. Groundwater, the groundwater contaminant plume is defined in fractured mudstone and siltstone. The contaminant plume consists primarily of chlorinated volatile organic compounds or chlorinated VOCs.

There are structural geologic features trending along Highway 21 just to the west and northwest of landfill three and they appear to influence groundwater and contaminant movement.

The City of Weaver potable water supply wells, the two wells, have not been impacted by VOCs from landfill number three. Next slide.

And there are at least three faults that the Army has inferred between landfill number three and the City of Weaver wells, which may impact the groundwater and contaminant movement.

The bedrock contaminant plume, which is deep, trends north-south along Highway 21. It appears to be moving with the groundwater flow direction in a northeasterly direction.

Just to refresh you on the history of landfill number three, it was used as a post sanitary landfill from 1946 until 1967. It was constructed as a series of trenches that were filled with sanitary waste. It's approximately twenty-three acres in size.

This is landfill three, main post, map of the main post. Landfill three is up here in the northwest corner. The structural features I mentioned, we've inferred along Highway 21, that was done with some previous boring and geologic investigations that were completed in 2000, 2001. Next slide.

Okay, the VOC distribution in groundwater. Now, this time last year we discussed the VOC distribution in groundwater. At that time, the City of Weaver had been sampled three times by the Army. There had been no detectable concentrations of VOCs.

The chlorinated VOC distribution associated with landfill three appears to trend along the major fracture orientation in the bedrock. And the analytical results from the groundwater indicate

that the VOCs extend along Highway 21 to the northeast and they appear to be seen at increasing depths as you go away from the landfill.

The horizontal extent of the contaminant plume was defined to the west. The Medders and Lowery wells, which are two domestic wells that had been previously sampled, they were sampled in 2001 and no VOCs were detected in either of those wells.

By the way, those wells, even though they're domestic wells, they're no longer being used. Both of those folks are on potable water supply.

And the last thing, there's evidence that degradation is occurring. By that I mean there are well-known published pathways, if you want to call it that, that where you've got a compound, a chlorinated compound that will, under certain conditions, break down into other compounds over time. And we are seeing evidence of those degradation pathways. Next slide.

Again, here is landfill three, northwest corner of Fort McClellan right here. City of Weaver's water supply wells number two and

number three. Number one is no longer in service.

This is the Medders well location, which is just across Highway 21 from the northern part of landfill number three, and the Lowery well, which is just across from the northwest corner of the main post.

Data from 2002. This was our VOC plume, as we looked at it in the shallow or residuum/transition wells. Kind of a boomerang shape. Next slide.

And this is the distribution of the VOC plume in the bedrock wells, the deeper wells. These wells are -- at the time, were in excess of a hundred and fifty to two hundred feet deep.

I've got some dash lines up here. We inferred the horizontal extent to the north, to the east, and to the south. Next slide.

MR. RON GRANT: What are the concentration units on those two charts?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The concentrations are -- back up one slide, please. The concentrations, these units are in parts per million. And the concentrations range from -- this outside line

is the one part per billion or the point zero zero one ppm concentration. And right here, this concentration is up to two hundred and fifty parts per billion or .25 parts per million concentration line.

Any other questions?

MR. DWIGHT MITCHELL: Can you contribute the degradation to perhaps the heavy amount of rainfall on the groundwater or no?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Up to this point in 2002, no, because we were right in the middle of a drought during that time period. We were seeing degradation compounds -- there is a compound that we have associated with landfill number three, trichloroethene, and it breaks down into -- goes through a long pathway.

Vinyl chloride is a compound that you see near the end of that degradation pathway. We saw vinyl chloride last year at this time. So, it really has nothing to do with rainfall.

Next slide. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: How do those concentrations relate to impact on human health?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I tend to get to that in a minute --

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Okay.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: -- right near the end, because what I want to do is I want to give you the most recent data and then discuss it within that context.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Sure.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: So, if you'll just hold off on that, I can talk to that question.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: That's fine.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: So, the remedial investigation activities. Based on the data that I just summarized, the BCT, in 2002, agreed that further delineation was required to the north, south, and east. And in doing so, they decided that quarterly groundwater sampling would be a good idea, just to monitor what was going on over a relatively short period of time and also install some additional wells to the north, south, and east, and sample those wells to see if the horizontal extent could be further defined -- horizontal and vertical extent -- excuse me -- could be further defined.

So, talk about the quarterly groundwater sampling. The BCT came up with a list of twenty-one wells to sample in September and October 2002 and again in March of 2003. And I believe Ron presented the September and October results back in January or February of this year.

But of those twenty-one wells, nineteen were monitoring wells that were installed by the Army associated with landfill number three. And then also, the two City of Weaver potable water supply wells were also sampled just to sample these wells because they are a public concern issue. Next slide.

Again, wells were selected interactively by the Fort McClellan BCT, the Army, ADEM, and EPA. Here is the list -- or here is the map, showing the wells highlighted that were included in the groundwater sampling event, the quarterly groundwater sampling event in the fall of 2002 and the spring of 2003.

These are the nineteen monitoring wells. And, of course, The City of Weaver potable water supply wells are approximately one point seven and two miles respectively to the west, northwest.

Next slide.

Now, what we've seen in sampling these wells on a quarter -- in two quarters, we've seen concentrations within the wells fluctuate over time with increased precipitation. Next slide.

DR. BARRY COX: What's your interpretation of that?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, what I want to do is I want to speak to that -- I got another slide coming up that I can actually show you and talk to that. I think it will be a little bit clearer.

The groundwater flow directions in the residuum and bedrock, they appear consistent with previous interpretations. And those interpretations are that the groundwater flow in the residuum is to the west-northwest and the groundwater flow in the bedrock is to the northeast, along in the general direction of Highway 21.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: What's that big word, "residuum"?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Residuum simply means -- it's a short term for weathered bedrock. Down here you've got -- at least that's how we use it.

Down here you've got the rock that was on the ground and it has weathered over millions and thousands of years. And you end up seeing what looks like rock on the ground and you dig in it and it's like -- almost like consistency of soil in a lot of cases. So, we have classified that as residuum.

And depending on a geologist or an earth scientist, whoever you talk to, that interpretation can vary somewhat. But in our case, we're using it as soils and highly weathered bedrock.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, that's a higher level than the bedrock? I mean, above the bedrock?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, 'cause it is near the surface. You're going to have your residuum near the surface and your bedrock is deeper, because your weathering processes take place at the surface, creating this residuum from the bedrock, which is the parent material.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, the flows are going in the directions. Is that what that means? The residuum is going to the west-northwest and the bedrock is going to the northeast, so --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: -- depending on what level, they're going in two different directions?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Depending on the elevation of the well, yes.

Getting back to how the precipitation has affected what we're seeing out here. First of all, I want to show you what the precipitation has been in the Anniston area and this is from -- took the year 1998 over here and then we also looked at a continuous -- January 2001 through June of 2003, which is right here.

The blue bars represent the actual rainfall recorded at the Anniston Airport, whereas this line, dotted line here, represents the averages from 19 -- excuse me -- from 1949 through 2000. And as you can see, looking at June of this year, we had over nine inches of rainfall, where the average is only -- less than four. And then again in May, we had over eleven inches of rainfall recorded at the airport, where the average, again, is right about four inches.

So, the last couple of months, there

has been an increased amount of rainfall over average. The period leading up between September and March of -- September 2002 and March 2003, is about right in here. Again, you can see above average rainfall events. And then right here you've got four months that are below normal.

Prior to this time period -- and this is about October 2002 right here -- prior to this time period, you have a long stretch where you only have a couple of months where, you know, dating back to 2001, where you've actually had above normal rainfall.

So, the net rainfall from 2000 -- January 2001 and actually beyond that, earlier, up until October of 2002, has been below normal. Next slide.

Now, what this has done -- and I've taken an example here -- this is OLF-G12 -- this is a residuum well in the median of Highway 21. This well has historically been one of the most contaminated wells associated with landfill number three.

We plotted the water levels in this well and compared them to the total VOC concentrations

that we observed when we sampled the wells. And this date represents September of '02. And this was right before we actually started seeing a lot of rainfall.

What you can see is the total VOC concentration is point five five seven parts per million or milligrams per liter. But after a period of some heavy rain that we saw in October and November and then again in -- I think it was February and March, what we are looking at is we're seeing that that rainfall has pushed a slug of water into the groundwater system and that water has some higher concentrations of VOCs. So, it's -- we're seeing some infiltration into the landfill and some in effect pushing some of this higher concentrations or higher VOCs out into OLF-G12. So, we go from point five six milligrams per liter up to a total of over one milligram per liter. And the makeup of that was primarily TCEs. That was the one single chlorinated VOC that we attributed that to.

Next slide.

DR. STEFFY: I'm sorry. Is G12 at the landfill, itself? Where is that located?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: G12 is on

the -- can you back up, Brenda, to slide I believe it's --

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Brenda isn't here.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Slide eleven. Sorry. Just hit eleven enter.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Eleven enter.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Eleven and enter. There you go. OLF-G12 is right here.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Slide twenty-seven is a better representation.

DR. STEFFY: So, it's pretty close to the landfill.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I'm sorry?

DR. STEFFY: So, that's pretty close. That's what, five hundred feet or less.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This scale, one unit is five hundred feet. So, we're looking at approximately three hundred feet maybe.

DR. STEFFY: And the reason the water table that's in the residuum is domed over the landfill?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, I got a slide that will show that, based on the most recent data.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Thirteen enter?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Go to fifteen enter. That brings us up to the monitoring well installation. Now, the same time period, 2002, the BCT also agreed that additional wells were needed to further define the vertical and horizontal extent of VOCs. So, these locations were arranged primarily in the northern, northwest, north, northeast, and then there is also a couple of wells to the east and south. These ten wells range in depth of eighty-five to over four hundred feet deep.

And the Army performed discrete groundwater sampling during the drilling activities of these wells. And this just lists the wells where the discrete groundwater sampling was done.

The scope of work was agreed on by the BCT. And we went forward with that.

The discrete sampling was done as the wells were being drilled. Water samples were actually being collected. They were sent off to a

laboratory on a quick analysis. And we were getting results back for VOC analysis.

And what we did was we used that data to optimize the selection of our screens for those particular wells or in some cases, for a well pick.

Next slide. These are the wells in blue up here that were put in. Got a well cluster up here, a well pair, a well pair right here, a well pair right here. And in each one of these well pairs, one well was discrete sampled as it was drilled. We've got one well right here, here, here, and down here.

Next slide. Okay, groundwater elevations. What we've seen with the heavy rainfall since October is overall from October up until June of this year, there has been an eleven feet rise in the elevation of the groundwater. And since March, we've actually seen a foot rise from just -- from June to March, dating back.

And again, if you recall, I mentioned that we had nine inches of rainfall in May and eleven inches of rainfall in June. So, the heavy amount of rainfall, the unusual -- the high amount of

rainfall that we're seeing here is a -- is contributing to this overall rise in groundwater elevation of landfill number three.

Next slide. But in saying that, the groundwater flow direction still appeared consistent with previous interpretations.

Next slide. And that being residuum. We've got groundwater flow here to the northwest. As Dr. Steffy mentioned, we've got some mounding that we have interpreted right here on the southern half of landfill three. And there is also some mounding that we've interpreted up here to the northeast of landfill number three.

Groundwater flows from high elevation right here to low elevation in a northwesterly direction. Next slide.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Josh?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Is that a stream -- does that stream that goes by Reilly Lake there, does that come down to the --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This right here?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Yes.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: This drainage path goes to the north. This drainage right here coming from the northern part -- the northeast part, it flows to the north. This, if you look at some maps, it flows under State Alabama 21, it's called Dothard Creek. And as you get further north, it's called the Talla --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Tallaseehatchee.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Which one?

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Which one?

MR. JOE DOYLE: Can you spell that, Mayor Kimbrough for --

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Y'all probably won't know the difference, will you, if it is --

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Josh, it's not working.

(Whereupon, there was discussion off the record.)

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Josh, have you done any type of calculation to calculate the actual volume of contamination here?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Do a mass

balance?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: No, no mass balance has been done. We don't know what the actual volume of it was going in. Nothing's been attempted to date.

MR. PETE CONROY: Philip, what would that do? What would that show?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Just a -- well, they know the concentration of -- basically, of the --

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: VOCs.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: VOCs. And right now, if they know the boundary of the plume, you can get a rough calculation of that. And it will give you -- you can actually work it out in poundage or a liquid volume to try to understand what that means. You can almost reference like how many gallons of gasoline or gallons of this.

MR. PETE CONROY: Yeah.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And you can almost kind of relate it to what kind of spill it may have been. So, it may be a little premature. I'm sure they'll do that in the future to calculate what they may need to either clean it up.

MR. PETE CONROY: Is that the intention?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: A lot of times that work is done in the feasibility stage of an RI. And we're not even there, yet.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: What do you mean by "mounding"?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Can you go back to slide fifteen -- excuse me.

MR. RON LEVY: Eighteen.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Go back up one slide, Lisa. There we go. What I'm referring to is, see this contour right here where you've got a close circle, you see that, this represents one elevation, whereas these lines, these curved lines or -- yeah, these curved lines represent also one elevation. So, when we've got a closed loop, it's what we call a mound effect, because you've got groundwater at least from this mound -- you've got groundwater from this mound can theoretically flow in -- you know, coming off this mound it can flow a little bit this way, it can actually flow reverse somewhat, it could flow up here a little bit. But overall, the general trend

continues to the northeast.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: So, it's a natural rise in elevation at that point in the ground?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Relative -- you know, this well relative to this one, yeah, there is a rise in elevation from this well to that well. And because we've got, you know, one here and here and up here, we've closed our contour right in here.

And it -- when you think about it, it actually makes sense because this landfill appears to be serving as what's called a groundwater recharge area locally, in that the fill material, it's not capped, it's basically, you know, exposed at the surface under soil, but there is no cap that's preventing rainfall from flowing down in there.

And what this is -- we also call this a bathtub effect in that this fill area is locally acting as a water bathtub or sink and water is collecting in here and then flowing away.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Uh-huh.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Does anyone have any other questions on that? Does that make sense?

Okay, next. This is just what I

mentioned previously. Groundwater flow directions to the northeast. Again, these contours represent a single elevation, but again, what we're seeing, generally, is an overall northeasterly groundwater flow direction.

Okay, groundwater sampling results. Now, in the second quarter of 2003, which would have been at the end of June of this year, the Army completed sampling forty-nine wells. And the wells that were sampled were the forty-six monitoring wells associated with landfill three. These were thirty-six pre-existing wells.

The ten new wells, which I just discussed, the Army installed, the two City of Weaver potable water supply wells, and one domestic well, which was the Lowery well, which I mentioned was sampled previously.

Next. And the BCT agreed to sample the wells for VOCs only. And the results indicate that again, there was no VOC detections in the two City of Weaver wells. There were no detections in the domestic well, the Lowery well. And what we saw -- TCE, trichloroethene at point zero zero two five (sic)

milligrams per liter -- and that J means that it was so low, the concentration was so low, that it's estimated. Whenever you see a J, that's what that means -- was detected in OLF-G29. And I'll show that location in just a second.

We did not see 1,1,2,2-TCA, or Tetrachloroethane in that well. I bring that up because in -- during the March sampling event, we actually saw both those compounds in OLF-G29, but we saw TCE at point zero zero zero eight. And that was estimated. And 1,1,2 (sic)-TCA was at point zero zero zero nine nine J. So, you can see that there has been an overall decrease that we saw in that well. Next slide.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: Josh, at those low quantities, is that a significant difference? I mean, all those were estimates.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: They're all estimates. What that means is that -- I would say, no, they're not significant, they are not. They're well below any of the Army's established risk levels. And the Army has its own set of risk criteria. But then they're also lower than the EPA's established

MCLs or maximum contaminant levels for drinking water.

So, what these levels are is that, yeah, we had some positive identifications in that well, but they are extremely low and they're so low that they had to estimate the concentrations or they had to estimate the results. And the positive thing is that they are well below any established risk screening level.

Of the ten new wells that were installed, we detected VOCs in nine of the new wells. What we saw was a decrease in total VOCs in the wells in the median of the Jacksonville Highway and the church property. And I'll show you those locations in a second. And we saw a large decrease observed in OLF-G12 from the March sampling event.

Next slide. And then there was one well, OLF-G47, I'll show you that in a second. It's in the northernmost well cluster. It has a total chlorinated VOC concentration of point zero one zero eight milligrams per liter. Again, this concentration was estimated.

Now, you remember the slide I showed you a few back, OLF-G12, same well on the western side

of landfill number three. I showed you information up to this date right here. We have already had over a part per million of total VOCs.

This last round in June, we're seeing a much lower total VOC concentration and whereas the initial heavy rainfall in the fall of 2002, we believe, pushed a slug of higher concentrated material out toward this well, the continued heavy rainfall that we've seen since this spring, primarily, again in May and June, is actually diluting water locally in that well.

So, we're actually seeing the heavy rainfall over time do something. And then as it keeps -- as we see the above-normal rainfall, it's actually decreasing the concentrations or diluting the concentrations we're seeing in this well.

Again, this is a residuum well. It's shallower, it's exposed, it's closer to the surface, so it's going to respond quicker to surface events such as rainfall flowing into the ground than say a deep well would. And I'm not showing any deep wells here, but in fact we see very little response and change in total VOC concentrations in the bedrock

wells, when you compare them to the residuum wells.

From a risk standpoint, these are the wells -- of the forty-six sampled, I believe there is nine wells up here where we actually have constituents that exceed our site-specific screening levels and EPA MCLs. And there are really only three compounds that exceed both the site-specific screening levels and the EPA's MCLs. These are trichloroethene and 1,1,2,2-TCA and there is TCE in this well. And then we're also seeing vinyl chloride in a couple of wells down here and over here.

Now, I think the TCE MCL, maximum contaminant level, is about point zero zero five milligrams per liter. So, we are seeing some concentrations exceed that.

1,1,2,2-TCA actually does not have an MCL, but it has an EPA drinking water advisory. And I believe that's about twenty parts per billion or point zero two milligrams per liter, so we're seeing a couple of exceedences there.

And then the vinyl chloride I think is two parts per billion or point zero milligrams per liter. And we only see a couple of locations here and

here.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Josh, according to that one, OLF-7 you show no vinyl chloride and OLF-20 you show that there is some. Is that because of the depth of the well?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Twenty --

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: They're right together.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, twenty is the deeper of the two wells. We are seeing -- we have sampled OLF-G20, we have sampled it before. And we have seen vinyl chloride. And our explanation, what we believe is going on there, is as you get deeper into the groundwater bearing zone, you've got other things going on that are affecting this -- the TCE naturally, it is migrating, it is going from -- it's moving downward in the groundwater zone. And it is degrading over time.

And I'm no chemist to really go in and explain much more than that, the degradation process, other than these pathways are well established and published. And we have done no formal research, as far as determining, you know, what the

rate of this degradation or anything like that is occurring.

If you recall, I showed you what the plume -- what the total VOC plume looked like in May of 2002 in the residuum.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Can I ask a question? Right now would be a good time to ask this question. How fast is this -- what's the rate of flow here in residuum and/or bedrock? How fast is this flowing to the north and northwest, northeast?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I don't have that information available at this time. I know it's slow. It's on the order of about three feet per year is what we've calculated, based on the limited amount of data that we've collected.

That's not been a major focus to this point in time of the investigation. You do some testing, but it's not real heavily quantified what we've done to date.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: And one more thing along -- do you know what the porosity of the residuum is right now on average?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We have not done

any testing on the porosity. We've used published values. When we have calculated our groundwater flow velocities, we have used only published data for clays and silts and fractured bedrock.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Do you know what that is?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I don't have that available, but I can get that to you.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Josh, not just that, it would be the bedrock. And I guess one other question is: What kind of porosity are y'all seeing in the different formations? Anyway, that's just a -- we were discussing that the other day and I didn't bring up that question and --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: VOC distribution in residuum, if you recall, it appeared as a boomerang in the May 2002 data. We have some additional data points out here. This is a new well at OLF-G40, which was installed to a depth of a little -- around a hundred feet below ground surface. This well down here was installed to a depth of about eighty-five feet or so below ground surface.

So, we've got some additional data

points. That's extended our plume down here a little. You can see the concentrations are extremely low. They're in the point zero zero one part per million range for total concentrations, total VOC concentrations.

Next slide. Bedrock, again, we revised the horizontal extent of the plume map. We've got -- this line right here represents one part per billion and this line right here represents ten parts per billion. Concentrations overall are less than what we saw in 2002, again, for the reasons I previously explained, with the continued heavy rainfall that we've experienced out here.

But up here, this is OLF-G47, as I mentioned, this was the one that had the total VOC concentration of point zero one parts per million, milligrams per liter. So, that's why we got this line running right through there.

Based upon this information, it appears that we've got a real good handle -- we've defined the horizontal extent of the plume.

Next slide. Looking at the big picture where landfill three is, the context of the

Weaver supply wells, number two and number three, this is the plume map that you all just saw. Just blowing it up so you've got a larger perspective. This shows you its relationship to the Weaver supply wells. This distance is well over a mile, closer in the order of a mile and a half.

Next slide. So, y'all may wonder, what's next? Well, this information, we presented this to the BCT. What we have generally agreed upon the vertical and the horizontal extent of the total VOCs in the residuum and bedrock has been defined and that no further well installation is required on the outsides of the plume.

Also, we agreed that the list of wells to sample for the third quarter of 2003, the Army will be sampling that by the end of September, have all these wells sampled. We're going to increase that number from twenty-one -- the list that was sampled in the fall of 2002 and the spring of 2003, that will include that list, plus the ten new wells that were installed earlier this year.

And that's it. That's it for this. Are there any questions on this data? Yes?

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: When you sample a well, do you take multiple samples from the same well to get some sort of idea of statistical significance for the numbers?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: We generally just take a -- we will purge the well, generally, three well volumes, and take one grab sample. We run what we call an internal quality assurance, quality control program, where 10 percent of the samples are -- we will split -- like if we sample forty-six wells, 10 percent, four point six or five wells, we'll round up, we'll take duplicate samples from those wells, we'll send them off, we'll call them something completely different, try to fool the laboratory, see if we get the results. We have not really done anything statistically with that data.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: So, you're running a check to make sure --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: But we run a check, a laboratory check. We also send blanks that we hide ID numbers on of just the equipment rents blanks and also trip blanks, we just throw one in there, just because it's going along for the ride.

And we will run those for the same analysis that we run for the wells, just to see if there is anything that we're doing or that the laboratory is doing that could influence the results.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: And is that pretty much the standard procedure for people sampling wells, just to make sure that the numbers you're getting --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: -- you can trust, basically?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes. Any other questions?

The only other thing I wanted to discuss, bring up -- and this is just kind of tagging it on here at the tail end -- if you all recall, at the last RAB, EPA, Doyle Brittain requested that some of the geologists and hydrogeologists get together and discuss some of the data. Dwight, you had mentioned that there was some difference in interpretation, and so we just wanted to make sure that these differences of interpretations, if they were significant, insignificant, what they were.

And I just basically talked about the data with some of the technical people. So, we met last week, the City of Weaver's contractor, geologists representing the Army, ADEM, and the JPA were present.

EPA, unfortunately, could not be there. But they have been kept in the loop prior to and subsequent to this meeting. And we've got their buy-in -- we've got their technical person's buy-in, as far as what the results of those discussions were.

Again, this was just a discussion. It was really a data transmittal. It provided -- I forgot, Mayor Kimbrough was there, too, and Dr. Steffy was there. But it really just provided an advanced look-see of what the data was, this data that I presented tonight -- what the data shows, and it also gave Dr. Steffy an opportunity to see some of the background work that brought us up to the point where we are now, as far as our geologic and hydrogeologic interpretations.

And that's pretty much it. The geology and the hydrogeology were discussed. The sampling results were presented. And I think some of

the differences that were discussed, there are some differences in the geologic interpretation, particularly west of landfill three and what the Army has done versus what the City of Weaver has done.

It's our understanding, now talking with your consultant, with the City of Weaver's consultant, they are using a different source of published information and unpublished information than the Army is using. And often, when you get three geologists in a room, you're going to get three different interpretations. That's just the way we are. We often agree to disagree. And if the data makes sense, it's like, okay, move on.

And basically, what we discussed were that the data that the Army has, it fits the model that we've presented to you all in the past. And as far as influencing the -- as far as the geology differences influencing which way the groundwater flow directions are or the contaminant movement -- contaminant location is at this point in time, the differences really aren't significant. And that was pretty much it.

And that's all I have.

DR. BARRY COX: I just wondered if Dr. Steffy would like to comment on the meeting.

DR. STEFFY: Just two points that I gathered from the meeting that we had.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

DR. STEFFY: With the deep aquifer, that you showed the plume going to the north-northeast --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: North-northeast.

DR. STEFFY: -- we agreed that it looks like it was structurally controlled. There was some sort of faulting or something that's forcing the groundwater to go that direction.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Correct.

DR. STEFFY: It's contrary to the regional flow of groundwater for the basin; that is, its regional groundwater flow toward the basin should be to the Coosa River, should be westward.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

DR. STEFFY: So, that north-northeast trend is a deeper (inaudible) than the regional flow?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, it's a

local flow.

DR. STEFFY: An event -- yeah, it's a local flow.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It's a local flow. So, it would be very -- when you start talking regional versus local, I think you need to be careful, because we only have right here in the vicinity of landfill three and we really don't have -- we haven't considered how the City of Weaver's wells fit into the picture or other deep wells fit into the picture.

DR. STEFFY: It's anybody's guess where it's really going to go. I mean, whether it's going to continue north or change to the west.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: The Army's data --

DR. STEFFY: I think we also agreed that no one really knows.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Right.

DR. STEFFY: It's an unknown, right?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Right. And the Army's data is really only as good as the northernmost well, you know, as far as groundwater flow direction, we can really only use that data, because the Army

hasn't looked any further out. And at this point in time, it doesn't appear that there is -- based on the extent of the contamination, it doesn't appear that --

DR. STEFFY: Well, the extent of contamination -- the word is interesting, because in that last plume, figure that you showed, you had at the outermost contours one part per billion.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yes.

DR. STEFFY: But you don't have any wells beyond that.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: That's correct.

DR. STEFFY: So, it's actually -- could be even further than that, we don't know.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Theoretically, yes.

DR. STEFFY: So, the plume could actually be bigger than what you're actually showing?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Correct. And it could be smaller.

DR. STEFFY: It could be smaller. I mean, you do have wells --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Smaller.

DR. STEFFY: -- defining the --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, the one part per billion line could be closer.

DR. STEFFY: Yeah, it could, the way you've drawn it on this figure, yes, it could.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: It's an interpretation, based on the data we have and based upon what we've seen -- how we've seen the behavior to date.

And what we have done, the BCT as a group, we have generally defined to approximately ten parts per billion, because extending it farther out that extra level of effort, at this point in time, is going to be a -- would be a -- you know --

DR. STEFFY: Too much?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Well, I don't know if it's too much or not, but it would be a bigger effort. And then the question comes to the BCT, what -- you know, what do you define to at ten parts per billion has been the general agreement with the work we've done in the past. And that's how we've carried over to landfill number three.

DR. STEFFY: So, is it part of your job then to look at the future, forty years from now?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Not to date, no. Right now we've just been tasked to define the nature and extent.

DR. STEFFY: That's going to be some other consultant coming up.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: I think the -- you know, as far as the --

MR. RON LEVY: I'll speak to that, Josh, in just a moment. Does anybody got anymore technical questions?

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Let me say that -- are you through?

DR. STEFFY: No, I'm not done, but go ahead.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: Our hydrogeologist was satisfied with the information that he saw -- and we had a discussion, but with the stipulation, because of what you've already mentioned, we will be requesting a continuation of monitoring of both groundwater and surface water.

And the discussion, the reason for that is there is some concern about the northward movement, is because we have been advised we are in

the process of identifying a third water source and we have been -- it has been identified that we should go north of our city limits towards Jacksonville. And so there is some concern with that, but there is no concern with the data that they have provided at this time.

We've got the -- we're looking -- because of the monitoring, the continuous monitoring, then that's looking into the future. So, that would -- so, that's our standpoint, as far as the meeting that we -- he was satisfied even though theirs was conflicting, as far as some of the materials that were used, he is very satisfied with what they've identified, at this point. And this was his recommendation to us, that we request --

DR. STEFFY: I think somebody needs to address where is it going to be fifty years from now? If you're not going to fix the landfill --

MR. RON LEVY: And I'll talk to that in just a moment, Dr. Steffy. If you've got another question on a technical nature --

DR. STEFFY: Yeah. Just one other comment about degradation. Even though contaminants

are degrading, it doesn't mean the toxicity is being reduced, because the toxicity of vinyl chloride is much higher than TCE. And you may be misleading people by saying, no, it's degrading.

Well, yes, it's degrading, but the toxicity is actually getting higher for the contaminants. So, you've got to be careful presenting that to the public, I think, in my view, you got to be a little bit careful; that is, the metabolife of vinyl chloride that has a higher toxicity than TCE.

MR. RON LEVY: The vinyl chloride is not the final form. It will continue to degrade itself, am I correct?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah. The degradation pathway is complete, it will degrade itself, making, I want to say, innocuous -- it goes from vinyl chloride to something that is like ethane or ethene or something like that.

DR. STEFFY: The other thing --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Yeah, I agree.

DR. STEFFY: The other thing I think that came out rather important at our meeting was the shallow water -- the shallow water table, the

residuum; that is, more information is needed about the -- what's happening to the water table at the landfill, itself, that came out at the meeting. I think that's rather important.

We don't know enough -- it looks like the landfill is releasing at a point. That's kind of interesting. So, you need to know more about the water table at the landfill, itself, to kind of get a handle on that source of -- that point source of pollution coming out of the landfill.

That was brought up at the meeting. I thought it was rather important.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Are we done?

DR. STEFFY: Yeah. Sorry.

MR. RON LEVY: Let me just -- your point about the long-term impact of all this is a good point. And the Army obviously has a commitment to that long-term requirement. But as most of you know, this particular site is part of a phase one privatization effort with the JPA, which includes a component for a remediation. In this case I think they're looking at some sort of in-situ (phonetic) remediation and a long-term monitoring.

And I think EPA defines long-term monitoring in excess of thirty years. So, there is funding in there to do that, as well.

I can't tell you the specifics, because I don't know really the specifics on how Matrix plans on addressing it, other than to know that they're funded for a remedial action there, as well as the long-term monitoring. And with the wells that the Army has got in, they'll use that.

There is also some additional funding for if they need to do some additional wells, but the Army's plan is to turn this piece, as well as several other sites, over to the JPA and to complete the action. We will finalize a document, a report of finding I believe we will call it, and hand that data over to the JPA and their contractors to complete the remedial effort.

And as we talked about at the previous RAB meetings, that is also going to be something that's open to the RAB, as well. So, they will have -- they will, through this RAB, be coming to the RAB, addressing what they're doing out there and showing their effort.

MR. PETE CONROY: Who represented the JPA at this meeting?

MR. RON LEVY: Linda Baucom, I think would --

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Linda Baucom and Steve Young.

MR. RON LEVY: She's their geologist. Good folks.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Additional questions?

MR. RON LEVY: I did want to mention one other thing. This will be the last time we'll probably see Josh. Josh has been recognized by another company for his superior work and he's going to go to work for another company. What's the name of this company now, Josh, again?

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Mac Tech.

MR. RON LEVY: Say again.

MR. JOSH JENKINS: Mac Tech.

MR. RON LEVY: Mac Tech. All the work he's done at McClellan obviously went noticed. But there are other folks like Don and whatnot from Shaw that I'm sure will be here to address technical

issues for us in the future. Thank you, Josh.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Thank you for the report. We'll move on into our new business. And at this time, we'll get agency reports from those that are present. In the order presented.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: ADEM's entire computer system shut down today. We couldn't print, we couldn't get in, so, I don't have it with me. However, I did have it last Friday.

MR. PETE CONROY: You guys got the worm?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: No, I don't know what it is.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: It's the worm.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: Whatever it is, I mean, completely internet and everything is down.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: That's the worm, you just don't know about it.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: They may have shut it down for that reason, to make sure we're not getting it. I don't know what the deal is, but we were paralyzed today.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: They got to

put the patch on it. We went through it all of last week.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: So, apparently, something is going on. I don't know, it's -- anyway, it was very, extremely frustrating today.

But I can tell you generally what's going on. We're just reviewing several reports between Mark Harrison and Brandi Little, I know they're reviewing somewhere in the order of maybe ten to fifteen reports. And they are at completion and under senior review.

I've completed the review of the SLERA. That's the screening level ecological risk assessment. And it's pending EPA review. I'm waiting on their comments to come in. And so we're looking at that right now. That's been an extremely extensive review. It's about a four thousand page document. So, I'm kind of glad to get that --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: How many pages?

MR. PHILIP STROUD: About four thousand pages. -- I'm glad to get that over with.

And so, also, I've completed the

review of the Super FOST Number Three, the GS (phonetic) Warehouse FOST. These are the finals. And they're under -- we're now talking -- to get that -- to make that final, a final letter.

The FOSET, the final FOSET, I've completed my review on that. I'm looking at the last-minute details on that. And I've got to get with my senior reviewers on that. So, this is -- we're in really good shape on all of those.

And, of course, there has been numerous phone calls on the privatization. That's a constant and a given.

And then I finished up with the eastern bypass removal report. It's in the Army's hands and they're making resolution on those comments right now.

And then there is several other reports I'm going through and I'll be working with Lisa real soon to get my new set of priorities probably within about a week or so.

So, I don't know when this virus is going to -- whatever it is that's hitting our computers, I don't know when we're going to be back

up. I'm hoping tomorrow. So, I'll get back the agency report as a follow-up to this.

I have talked with EPA. I'm not speaking for him, but I do know that they're in hot pursuit of the SLERA and they're working on that. I think they have a couple more weeks on that left.

And Doyle and I have been kind of off and on, talking about the Super FOST GSL (phonetic) Warehouse, the FOSET, and a variety of other things. But I don't know exactly where he is with all that right now.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: No one is here from JPA?

MR. RON LEVY: Miki said she couldn't -- she -- her daughter or son -- school, something to do with school.

MR. PETE CONROY: I guess Ed and I could talk just a little bit about early transfer. And the process has been moving rapidly and it's been a Herculean effort on behalf of the Army and the JPA and the contractors. And everything seems to be on schedule.

And September 15th has been set

aside as a date to have a ceremony to announce the details. Mark it on your calendar. And, Ed, anything to add to that?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: Meeting today, there are two deeds that have been transferred, I think, this week; one is deed ten and eleven (inaudible) is the golf course and I'm not sure of the other one, but they will be transferring that property.

MR. PETE CONROY: Next JPA meeting is Tuesday morning. All are invited.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I may want to make it to that one. Tuesday, what time?

MR. PETE CONROY: 7:00.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: 7:30.

MR. PHILIP STROUD: I'm sorry, tomorrow?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: No. Next week. Next Tuesday.

MR. PETE CONROY: Next Tuesday.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Hopefully, the air-conditioning will be running by then.

MR. PETE CONROY: Well, we've been

meeting in (inaudible), so, still, hopefully, the air-conditioning is running.

MR. RON LEVY: They're meeting at (inaudible)?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: The air-conditioner went out.

MR. JOE DOYLE: The air-conditioning is out.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay, there is nothing for technical review, anything, we didn't connect.

MR. PETE CONROY: We had just mentioned that we're going to get together just as soon as we have some time to coordinate with the TOSC project.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Okay. Action summary.

MR. RON LEVY: I don't really -- I'm not going to do what I normally do. I'd really rather just take questions, as it relates to the action summary. This does go out early, so everybody has a chance to see it. And you've heard people mention things that have already been talked about, the

eastern bypass Philip talked about, the deeds that Mayor Kimbrough mentioned.

We, the Army, are really working hard, as Pete said, at trying to make all this happen by the September 15th deadline on both the deed transfer and the privatization piece. The signing of the ESCA, which is the environmental services cooperative agreement, lots and lots of effort is going into that and making sure that everybody's got it straight, the language is correct, that all interests are taken care of, and that the funding is there.

And I do want to mention something to you, because of the funding that's going into it -- it's a significant number -- I did need to tell you, the majority of work that's occurring next year from the Army's perspective is minimal. We don't have -- I don't have a whole lot of funding coming to me because it was all earmarked for the privatization phase one.

So, from the Army's side of the house, you're definitely going to see a decrease in the amounts of work that comes through us from an investigative -- at least new work, specifically, I

should say. We will try to close out as much of the characterization pieces for those that are not in the phase one as possible, you know, working with Philip and Doyle from EPA and get to those issues. But there is not -- very little money in there for the Army to do continued work on the parcels that are still remaining.

And also, so you understand, there is a phase two to this. And so those parcels will eventually or those sites will eventually become part of this amendment to this ESCA so that they get picked up as part of the privatization. So, they're trying to withhold as much of the funding available to us -- us being the Army -- so that it can be provided to the community or to the JPA from a clean-up standpoint.

MR. PETE CONROY: But it would be safe to say there would be no net loss of service?

MR. RON LEVY: Certainly not. And certainly, you know, the amount of money that's being put in this is a lot more than we would have ever seen from the Army's side of the house.

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: What is your budget this year?

MR. JOE DOYLE: Pardon?

MAYOR KIMBROUGH: What is the budget this year for y'all?

MR. JOE DOYLE: That has not been determined.

MAYOR WILLIAM KIMBROUGH: I'm talking about this past year.

MR. JOE DOYLE: Oh, I'm going to have to get back to you on that. I'll tell you what, I've been more concerned about next year's budget and working that than concerned about this year's, other than obligating as much as can be obligated, so I don't lose it. But it's being swept up and it's being swept up at all BRAC installations to fund this privatization piece. So, it's going to be a very lien year next year, with the thought that '05 and the next round of BRAC at '05 should be a much better year, in terms of money being available, at least from the transition force's perspective on those areas where we will continue to have the cleanup responsibility, whether it be the bypass, the Charlie area EE/CA or whatever.

Which leads me to a -- I wanted to

make a comment here. Mayor, you asked a question I believe at the last meeting and I wasn't present, but one of the staff told me that you had asked a question about the status of the Charlie area EE/CA. And I'm prepared now to tell you what's going on.

The Charlie area EE/CA is essentially complete. It's not out on the street for public comment. And the reason being is that as part of the letter of transfer from Department of the Army over to Department of Interior, we have a piece in there that essentially says that we need the concurrence from Fish & Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, relative to clean-up levels and clean-up processes that are occurring in the Fish and Wildlife area.

As you all recall, the Army retains the responsibility for all the environmental remediation, not withstanding that the transfer has already occurred.

To that end, I had a sit-down last week, a very productive sit-down, with Fish & Wildlife Service. From my perspective, I want to get a buy-in with regard to clean-up levels with

Fish & Wildlife Service before we take it to the public.

And so, we're just -- it's a learning curve. And the first one out of the shoot is literally the Charlie area EE/CA. That's the first big one that's got to be addressed. So, I'm working with the Fish & Wildlife staff, not just here locally, but also on their regional level.

And basically, the first meeting was information sharing. I need to know exactly what Department of -- or Fish & Wildlife Service needs to do, whether they need a clean-up level, a surface clearance, a clearance to a foot, whatever it might be, as well as I guess from a status standpoint, I believe we've previously briefed this, we're -- we should be next couple of months, prepared to start doing a clean-up to depth with regard to the high-intensive-use areas within the Fish & Wildlife area, as well as the firebreaks and roads associated, so that they can get moved forward on their fire plans and actually doing their controlled burns.

Although, some areas right now are -- there is no restrictions with regard to that. And

some of those areas they're free to utilize.

But approximately a third of the land is still under some type of a land-use control until remediation, both HTRW and UXO is complete. So, to give you a definitive time frame, I cannot at this time. I'm shooting for approximately the first of the year, getting a consensus or concurrence, whatever you want to call it, from Fish & Wildlife Service with regard to UXO clean-up levels so I can get that document out on the street.

But like I said, this is a -- it's a big document. Obviously, it's an important one. It's kind of unfortunate, I don't have something small to use kind of as the precedent. We're not even sure of who the approval levels are, with regard to Fish & Wildlife Service. So, there is going to be a big learning curve, and that's a big document to do it on, but it's also probably the toughest nut to crack from a land-use perspective of Fish & Wildlife Service.

So, the best I can tell you is we're -- and that's just a mark on the wall. Don't hold me to it, please, but we're looking to get some

type of resolution some time around the first of the year. And the first -- at least the first -- in the winter months of this year so we can start moving forward with the thought that in '05, I'll have some money to actually move forward with the clean-up.

Any questions with regard to that? Okay, thank you.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I think we're now down to the TAPP report, if we have one.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, there wasn't any activity on TAPP last month, so we're still at three hundred seventy-five hours left in Mr. Grant's contract, because, Ron, you haven't sent me an invoice on that, correct? You hadn't sent another invoice on that, right?

MR. RON GRANT: I sent you an E-mail today -- I --

MR. RON LEVY: I guess I hadn't seen it, then.

MR. RON GRANT: I used one and a quarter hours just reviewing the minutes and so forth, the last meeting, and putting together a summary of that and an invoice.

MR. RON LEVY: I did not get a chance to read my E-mails, so if it's in there, we'll pick it up next month.

MR. RON GRANT: I appreciate being off last time. I was basking in Orlando and I had breakfast with Cinderella and my grandchildren.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Those things are important. Mr. Schmitter is with us tonight. And I know -- I don't think anybody has contacted you. We got your E-mails, but I have been on a down trail; since I was with you all last, I turned fifty, or shall I say, I celebrated the tenth anniversary of my fortieth birthday.

And I have not been able to catch up with anything. You all are talking about getting money. We're just trying to get through this year. And, you know, for us, our year ends September the 30th. And it's just been a basket case, because we're spending money we don't have, hoping that we do get it, knowing that we're not going to.

So, hopefully, with the new one, Pete will keep me responsible and we'll do a little bit better, but I have not been able. And I do

apologize, but it's been an awful beginning of the school year.

Our upcoming programs? What do you want? What do you need? Where will we be?

MR. RON LEVY: We're looking for some input from the RAB. There are some things that we kicked around, but we're really looking for some input from the RAB, in terms of what you would like to hear about, see, discuss.

I would just throw out one of the things that we are discussing and that's to give you a feel for -- because I don't think most RAB members really know what sites are being looked at by -- as part of this ESCA by the Army, what sites are really being looked at by the JPA. So, we may be able to throw up a map, kind of talk to you a little bit about that, maybe even have the JPA come in here and talk to you a little bit about their role -- their contractor, what their role in the investigative process for those sites is going to be.

MR. JOE DOYLE: In fact, coincidentally, the next meeting is September 15th. So, as we get closer to that date, we'll have a better

feel if this is all systems are go. And Ron and I will probably make a decision probably about the first of September, if it looks like everything is going to fall into place, and we'll be prepared to provide a program as to what we can expect as a result of privatization and specifically the phase one properties involved in that.

MR. PETE CONROY: That would be an appropriate theme, especially, based on that coincidence.

MR. RON LEVY: Any other thoughts about upcoming information you would like to hear about, discussions, issues? If you get any thoughts during the week or the month, you can E-mail Brenda or myself. Everybody's -- and let us know and we'll look to it, try to set it up. Or pick up the phone and give us a call.

MR. PETE CONROY: It might be a reasonable thing to have Fish & Wildlife Service, in the September, October time frame, give us an update in terms of where they are in their thinking.

MR. JOE DOYLE: Be more than happy to. I'm thinking it might be more -- let's slip that

into October, Pete, would be my suggestion. With really just getting their feet on the ground, let's give them a month or so. They're working on all those plans that they have to -- right now they have to get out for public comment, the management plan, the fire plan.

But I'll talk to Steve about that. And if it's okay with you and he says he would like another month beyond that, with your agreement of the group here, we'll just -- either October or November. But I'll give them some --

MR. PETE CONROY: Steve Miller is the new refuge manager. And I don't know how many of y'all have met him, but it would be a terrific thing to have Steve.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Some of us met him at the loblolly festival, as they call it.

Let me remind particularly myself that the next meeting is September 15th, at it will be at The Church of the Covenant Presbyterian, which is 401 East Lenlock Lane. File that in your memory bank.

Brenda will always tell us, but even when she does, I'm so used to coming here, I get here,

nobody is here but me --

MR. SCOTT BECKETT: And me.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: And it hits me. So, we will be on Lenlock Lane next meeting.

Do we have any audience comments?

For our new board members, I know you all came on last time and I didn't get to officially say welcome. I'm sure that they welcomed you very heartily and told you how much money you were going to make. I'm real pleased.

MR. RON LEVY: Let us know when you get your first check.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'm real pleased that they shared all that information with you. Thank you for your time.

If we have nothing else, do we hear a motion to adjourn?

MR. PETE CONROY: So moved.

MS. DONNA FATHKE: Second.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)
CALHOUN COUNTY)

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 26th of August, 2003.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2005.

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