

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 10th day of January, 2005, commencing at
approximately 6:30 p.m.

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

CAPTION SHEET	1
REPORTER'S INDEX	2
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD	3-105
CERTIFICATE106-107

1 DR. STEFFY: Let's call the meeting to
2 order. And I would like to do a roll call first.

3 Let's see, Gary Harvey has an excused.
4 Cheryl Bragg? James Buford? Phillip Burgett?
5 Monty Clendenin?

6 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN:

7 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Pete Conroy?
8 Barry Cox? Jerome Elser?

9 MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

10 DR. STEFFY: Donna Fathke?

11 MR. JIM MILLER: Fathke.

12 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Fathke?

13 MR. JIM MILLER: She's not here.

14 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Curtis Franklin?

15 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Here.

16 DR. DAVID STEFFY: James Hall?

17 Dr. Mary Harrington is excused. Robert Jackson?

18 MR. ROBERT JACKSON: Here.

19 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Mayor Ed Kimbrough?

20 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Delete the mayor.

21 MR. JIM MILLER: The distinguished
22 former mayor.

23 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Former mayor.

1 MR. JEROME ELSER: Distinguished former
2 mayor.

3 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Joe McCary?

4 MR. JOE McCARY: Here.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Jim Miller?

6 MR. JIM MILLER: Here.

7 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Dwight Mitchell?

8 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: What do y'all have
9 on Dwight, as far as E-mail? He's no longer with --

10 MR. RON LEVY: I don't think we've
11 gotten anything on him, one way or the other.

12 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: I didn't know how
13 you notified him, because he's no longer with the
14 City of Weaver. He left.

15 MR. RON LEVY: As far as we're
16 concerned, I guess he's still member, but he hasn't
17 notified us.

18 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: I just wondered how
19 y'all notified him, because if you were doing it
20 through the City of Weaver, he's no longer there.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Do we have an E-mail
22 address on him? I would have to ask Brenda, and she
23 just stepped out of the room.

1 DR. DAVID STEFFY: The JPA,
2 Mr. Greg Schank?

3 MR. GREG SCHANK: Here.

4 DR. STEFFY: BCT members,
5 Mr. Doyle Brittain? Ron Levy?

6 MR. RON LEVY: Here.

7 DR. STEFFY: And Ms. Shana Decker?

8 MS. SHANA DECKER: Here.

9 DR. STEFFY: And we need nine for a
10 quorum. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven,
11 eight --

12 MR. RON LEVY: You didn't count
13 yourself.

14 DR. STEFFY: No, I didn't. Nine, we've
15 got a quorum. Let me let Brenda certify that.
16 She's out right now.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, it's a quorum.

18 DR. STEFFY: Nine, okay, yeah, we do.

19 Just an announcement, I want to make
20 sure that all guests and contractors sign in before
21 you attend the meeting. So, there is a sign-in
22 sheet left over at the door. Please, sign it.

23 And also, I'd like to introduce the

1 guests, if we could go around the room and introduce
2 yourself and who you represent.

3 MR. TODD BIGGS: City of Weaver,
4 citizen.

5 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Art Holcomb,
6 TetraTech.

7 MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James,
8 Army National Guard Training Center, Fort McClellan.

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

11 MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein,
12 Fort McClellan, Transition Force.

13 MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson,
14 Fort McClellan Transition Force.

15 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Steve Young,
16 Matrix Environmental Services, JPA's contractor.

17 MR. RICHARD SATKIN; Richard Satkin,
18 Matrix Environmental Services.

19 MR. LaBARRON RUDOLPH:
20 LaBarron Rudolph, ADEM.

21 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Okay, very good.
22 Thank you.

23 The next order of business is approval

1 of the minutes from last meetings. We haven't
2 approved the last three months. And according to
3 Brenda, I need to do this month by month. So,
4 everybody, please, look over the April minutes for
5 approval.

6 MR. RON LEVY: You may not have them in
7 front of you, but they've been sent out.

8 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Make a motion we
9 approve the April minutes.

10 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do I hear a second?

11 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Second.

12 DR. DAVID STEFFY: And that's been
13 approved, so April is approved.

14 July, look over July. Do I hear a
15 recommendation?

16 MR. ROBERT JACKSON: I move we approve
17 them.

18 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do I hear a second.

19 MR. JERRY ELSE: Second.

20 DR. DAVID STEFFY: The minutes have
21 been approved then for July.

22 And October 2004. Please, look over
23 the minutes.

1 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: I move we approve
2 them.

3 MR. JERRY ELSE: Second.

4 MR. RON LEVY: For which?

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: For July. Those for
6 the minutes, say, yea. And any opposed? So they
7 have been approved for July.

8 MR. RON LEVY: July and October.

9 DR. DAVID STEFFY: October, look over
10 the minutes, please. Does anybody want to make a
11 recommendation?

12 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: So moved.

13 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Second?

14 MR. ROBERT JACKSON: Second.

15 DR. DAVID STEFFY: We have a second
16 over here. We have approval of yea if they're
17 approved. Any opposed? So, October minutes are
18 approved.

19 MR. RON LEVY: All right, all three.

20 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Just one second. We
21 have a quorum, so we approved the minutes.

22 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

23 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Old business. Need

1 to affirm the ascension of the current vice-chairman
2 to community chairman, that's me. Been a long time.
3 So, do we do a vote or what?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Do a motion.

5 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: So moved.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do we hear a second?

7 MR. JEROME ELSE: Second.

8 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do we need to do a
9 vote?

10 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: All in favor?

11 DR. DAVID STEFFY: All in favor? Any
12 opposed? So, the ascension of the vice-chairman to
13 community chairperson is approved.

14 That means we need a new
15 vice-chairperson for 2004, 2005. And how do we do
16 this?

17 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: You can ask if
18 they want to nominate anybody.

19 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do we have any
20 nominations for a new vice-chairman?

21 MR. JERRY ELSE: I nominate
22 Mr. Franklin.

23 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Second.

1 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: That sounded like
2 a --

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Make a motion we
4 close nominations.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do we have any other
6 nominations?

7 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Make a motion we
8 close nominations.

9 MR. JEROME ELSE: Second.

10 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: What did I ever
11 do to you, Ed?

12 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do we do a quiet
13 vote or do we do an oral vote?

14 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: You can do an
15 oral vote, since there is no other nominations.

16 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Okay, we have no
17 other nominations. All in favor of Mr. Franklin as
18 a new vice-chairman, yea. Any opposed?
19 Congratulations, you're the new vice-chairman, and
20 all the rights and privileges thereof.

21 MR. RON LEVY: What that essentially
22 means is at the end of David's year, you'll take
23 over the chair, assuming you get nomination for

1 ascension, and then we'll vote for another
2 vice-chair.

3 There is a co-chair on the Army's side,
4 which is Gary Harvey, which I represent, and on the
5 other side of the RAB is David.

6 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: Thank you. I
7 don't have to make an acceptance speech, do I?

8 DR. DAVID STEFFY: You can if you want
9 to. Bribes will be accepted.

10 MR. CURTIS FRANKLIN: (Inaudible.)

11 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Was that done
12 properly?

13 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: That's it.

14 MR. RON LEVY: You're doing great.

15 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Next order of
16 business, old business, is concerning the letter to
17 local rep, Mr. Dell Marsh, regarding ADEM travel.
18 And that was being taken care of by
19 Mr. Monty Clendenin.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Can we open that up for
21 discussion again? I would like to hear from Shana,
22 in terms of what their situation is on their travel.
23 They're still restricted --

1 MS. SHANA DECKER: Actually, somehow we
2 managed to get approval to travel, whenever they --

3 MR. RON LEVY: So, your attending
4 meetings like this is not an issue anymore, because
5 of travel restrictions?

6 MS. SHANA DECKER: No. And that's only
7 been a couple of months, since the last RAB, so I
8 think we're in good shape on that.

9 MR. RON LEVY: And, Monty, the purpose
10 of your letter was to bring that up as an issue, the
11 travel. Since ADEM is able to travel now, I
12 recommend that we drop it as an issue. We wouldn't
13 necessarily need to --

14 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I'm in the
15 confession business, and I will confess that that
16 letter has not been drafted yet, anyway. So,
17 patience is a virtue.

18 MS. SHANA DECKER: If it ever becomes
19 an issue again, we'll bring it up for sure.

20 MR. RON LEVY: I'll remind everybody
21 that in the past the RAB had discussed participation
22 on the part of the regulatory agencies, both EPA and
23 ADEM.

1 From the standpoint of ADEM, they have
2 been attending meetings on a regular basis. Their
3 issue was they couldn't get paid because they
4 couldn't travel overnight, unless there was
5 something else in the area going on that would have
6 kept them here for another day.

7 MS. SHANA DECKER: Another couple of
8 days.

9 MR. RON LEVY: Another couple of days,
10 which apparently, has gone away.

11 As it relates to what EPA's situation
12 is, because that was another issue, too, their
13 funding levels are not to the point to where they
14 can actually do a lot of travel.

15 So, Doyle's participation at these
16 meetings has been problematic. He does not have the
17 dollars to travel.

18 And it's not a matter of whether or not
19 EPA wants to attend, it's whether they can afford to
20 attend, because they don't get the money. So, we're
21 kind of missing EPA at our meetings because of that.
22 And unless something changes -- and they'll probably
23 tell you that it's based on the dollars that the

1 Army gives them to do oversight, because the Army
2 provides dollars both to ADEM and to EPA for
3 oversight. Part of the program that's been going on
4 for a long time.

5 But as the work load goes down, the
6 dollars go down, and it's really gone up on the ADEM
7 side, but gone down on the EPA side, because of the
8 transition over to JPA. So, ADEM has dollars for
9 travel, but EPA does not, really. They've had their
10 dollars cut.

11 And their problem is trying to come up
12 with the travel dollars to come out here, because
13 they've got to come out of Atlanta, and
14 particularly, Doyle, he actually lives on the
15 east side of Atlanta. So, when he leaves, he's got
16 to come from his own house. And he doesn't have the
17 money to do that. And that's why he's not here and
18 probably won't be here in future meetings, unless
19 something changes.

20 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Thank you. That
21 was old business.

22 Now, on to the program. And the first
23 is JPA update by Greg Schank.

1 MR. GREG SCHANK: I've been asked to
2 give a yearly update of what Matrix Environmental
3 and the JPA has accomplished in this last year, and
4 so that's what this presentation will be.

5 I will be happy to answer any
6 questions. Please, stop me. If I don't have an
7 answer to a question -- and I won't profess to have
8 answers to all questions -- then I will find out and
9 get back to everyone with an answer.

10 Let's see, I was taught how to do this.
11 The sites that we looked at last year. And I think
12 everyone has this presentation in a handout, so you
13 can follow along.

14 Landfills one, two, four, the
15 industrial landfill, the fill area north of landfill
16 two, they were all lumped into a landfill EE/CA
17 report.

18 Landfill three and landfill northwest
19 of Reilly Field. The post garbage dump and fill
20 area east of Reilly Field. The reason there is more
21 than one site is these sites are continuous and we
22 have lumped them together to deal with them.

23 The small weapons repair, former

1 chemical laundry, T-6 Naylor Field and the Alpha UXO
2 area, those are the sites that we worked on this
3 year.

4 We'll start with landfill one. In
5 April of 2004, we took some water and sediment
6 samples, a total of four samples each, of the
7 surface water and sediment. And I hate just reading
8 from these things, but there is not much more I can
9 add to this.

10 Samples are collocated upstream and
11 downstream and they were analyzed for those
12 analytes.

13 This is a map that shows where those
14 samples were taken. You can see the three green
15 triangles represent the sediment and surface water
16 sampling locations.

17 Landfill one conclusions: The sediment
18 exceeding ESV, either upgradient of the landfill or
19 no habitat was present. So, basically, any of the
20 sediment values that exceeded the environmental
21 ESVs, were either upgradient or there was no
22 habitats. Therefore, there is no risk to either
23 human health or the environment.

1 DR. DAVID STEFFY: What's ESV?

2 MR. RICHARD SATKIN: Ecological
3 screening values.

4 MR. GREG SCHANK: Ecological screening
5 values. Thank you.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: And that's
7 established by ADEM or EPA or --

8 MR. RON LEVY: He used EPA regs or
9 EPA -- not regs -- but EPA screening values on the
10 ECO piece.

11 MR. STEVE YOUNG: He used ESV from the
12 (inaudible) developed by Shaw for the Army.

13 MR. RON LEVY: He used ours, okay. But
14 those screening values were reviewed and approved
15 both by EPA and ADEM, at the time.

16 MR. STEVE YOUNG: And we presented that
17 approach to ADEM six months ago and -- as a starting
18 point, so --

19 MR. GREG SCHANK: Did that answer your
20 question? All right.

21 Our recommendations for landfill one
22 were to implement the land-use controls to protect
23 future users. And those land-use controls included

1 no excavations on the landfill and no residential
2 use on the landfill.

3 Then we implement post-closure
4 maintenance in the form of cap repair and
5 maintenance.

6 The status, we submitted the EE/CA
7 report to ADEM on November 10th. We're waiting for
8 ADEM's review and comments to finalize the EE/CA.
9 Once the EE/CA's finalized, then we'll prepare a
10 CMIP, where the land-use controls that we discussed,
11 and implement post-closure care.

12 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Is there a buffer
13 zone placed around the landfill? You say there is
14 no development on the landfill, but what about
15 adjacent to the landfill?

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: As far as I know
17 right now, there are no houses that encroach on that
18 landfill. I don't know that a buffer zone has been
19 recommended for that.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Actually, there is a
21 house that you're removing off of it --

22 MR. GREG SCHANK: Well, that's true.

23 MR. RON LEVY: -- because of the

1 (inaudible) --

2 MR. GREG SCHANK: And we'll move it up
3 to the houses. There are three houses out around
4 landfill one that are going to be torn down very
5 shortly, and that's further on in the presentation.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: So, conceivably,
7 they can build a house adjacent to the landfill at
8 no risk?

9 MR. GREG SCHANK: That would be my
10 understanding of the land-use controls.

11 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: No, there is some
12 already there.

13 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah. But based on the
14 data that the Army produced and what Matrix is now
15 telling you, it wasn't a ground water issue
16 associated with the landfill. What you've
17 essentially got is fill in there --

18 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right.

19 MR. RON LEVY: -- and you don't want to
20 break into that fill. But there wasn't a pathway or
21 contaminant of concern from an exposure standpoint.
22 So, yeah, it may be -- it could be a construction
23 issue, but it really is not an environmental issue.

1 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Could you go back
2 just one slide?

3 MR. GREG SCHANK: I think I can.

4 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: What about the
5 implement post-closure maintenance in the form of a
6 cap repair? Now, you're going to put a top over it,
7 you're not going to remove anything?

8 MR. GREG SCHANK: We're not removing
9 anything from the landfill. The landfill is covered
10 right now, but some of the edges of the landfill
11 have eroded away, and that's what we're talking
12 about when we say cap repair.

13 And I think it's a misnomer to call it
14 a cap. It's more a cover. A cap, in my mind,
15 implies an engineered, placed, you know, cover on a
16 landfill. But this landfill has a cover that -- and
17 I don't know that I'd consider it a cap.

18 But again, some of the edges of the
19 landfill have eroded away and we will be going out
20 there and putting dirt over that and revegetating
21 it.

22 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Now, wasn't that
23 landfill household garbage? Wasn't that basically

1 what that was?

2 MR. RON LEVY: That was the original
3 landfill for Fort McClellan.

4 MR. GREG SCHANK: That's the oldest
5 landfill on base.

6 MR. RON LEVY: Do you know what the
7 dates are on that, Lisa? Phil (phonetic) is not
8 here. Karen, do you know what the dates are on that
9 landfill, landfill one?

10 MS. KAREN PINSON: No.

11 MR. RON LEVY: I want to say it's from
12 back in the '40's.

13 MS. KAREN PINSON: Yeah.

14 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Is there a concern
15 for gas for this landfill?

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: No.

17 MR. RON LEVY: We've done testing on
18 soil gas -- or gas or methane gas, as well.

19 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right, landfill one
20 has been investigated and it's been determined there
21 is no environmental -- or risk involved with this
22 landfill.

23 Status, we went over that.

1 At landfill two, we did surface water
2 and sediment sampling at this landfill, both
3 collected upstream and downstream of the landfill.
4 The samples were analyzed for high resolution
5 dioxins and furans.

6 We did some groundwater sampling in
7 April. Three existing monitoring wells. The
8 samples were analyzed for total dissolved solid
9 (phonetic) metals, pesticides, PCBs, SVOCs, and
10 VOCs.

11 This is a figure showing where the
12 surface soil or the sediment and surface water
13 samples were taken, and also, the three wells you
14 can see are on the figure.

15 Conclusions, there was a single
16 instance of bis(2ethylhexyl)phthalate that exceeded
17 the site screening -- the SSL, that's --

18 MR. RON LEVY: -- site-specific screen
19 levels.

20 MR. GREG SCHANK: -- site-specific
21 screening levels, but it's not significant,
22 therefore, there is no risk to either human health
23 or the environment from landfill two. That was the

1 conclusion from the investigation, both that the
2 Army and Matrix did.

3 Recommendations, to implement the land
4 use controls, and they're the same as landfill one,
5 no excavation and no residential use and likewise,
6 to do post-closure maintenance in the form of cap
7 repair and maintenance.

8 We have the same problem here at
9 landfill two. The edges of the landfill have eroded
10 slightly and we need to cover that back up and
11 revegetate.

12 The status of landfill two, that was
13 part of the EE/CA submission on November 10 and
14 we're waiting for ADEM's comments. It's the same as
15 landfill one, we'll finalize the EE/CA, prepare a
16 CMIP and implement post-closure care.

17 DR. DAVID STEFFY: What is CMIP?

18 MR. GREG SCHANK: Corrective measures
19 implementation plan.

20 MR. RON LEVY: It's a RCRA term, as
21 opposed to the terms we use for (inaudible).

22 MR. GREG SCHANK: And the corrective
23 measures implementation plan, that will recommend

1 the land use controls and how we will implement the
2 land use controls, corrective measures
3 implementation plan. Corrective measures being land
4 use controls.

5 MR. JOE McCARY: These areas, once
6 they're covered over and vegetation grows on it,
7 will they be marked or --

8 MR. GREG SCHANK: Yes. Part of the
9 land use controls requires us to put markers around
10 the landfill and monuments that tell you that there
11 is a landfill. And we will have some kind of
12 markers that will outline the edges of the landfill.
13 So, yes, we will be marking the position of these
14 landfills.

15 MR. JOE McCARY: Okay.

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: Landfill four and the
17 industrial landfill, they are next to one another,
18 therefore they're lumped together. Again, we did
19 some groundwater sampling from five existing wells.
20 The samples were submitted for metals, VOCs and
21 SVOCs.

22 You can see landfill four and the
23 industrial landfill. The industrial landfill is

1 still a permitted landfill. JPA has a permit to
2 operate that landfill. Right now they don't choose
3 to operate it, but they do have an active permit on
4 that landfill.

5 I know that you have a copy of that map
6 in your handouts, so, you can probably find all the
7 figures of where we took our samples.

8 The conclusions and recommendations.
9 The metals exceeded the site screening levels. They
10 did not exceed backgrounds and -- the metals that
11 did exceed the SSLs did not exceed background and
12 they're not contaminants of concern. How can that
13 happen? Perhaps, aluminum. I mean, normally
14 occurring metals might cause that.

15 There is no risk to human health or the
16 environment. I will address future risk through
17 land-use controls and permanent closure
18 requirements.

19 And then post-closure care includes
20 ground water monitoring, per the permit
21 requirements. And that's mainly for the industrial
22 landfill.

23 We have five wells at the industrial

1 landfill that we sample twice a year and we send a
2 report to ADEM on that as part of our permit
3 requirements.

4 The status, this one was also part of
5 the EE/CA submission. And we're pending ADEM's
6 review. Well, it says to prepare to accept debris
7 at the industrial landfill. Again, that is a
8 permitted landfill, and if JPA chose to reopen it,
9 they could reopen that landfill and accept
10 construction debris.

11 That's the only thing it's permitted
12 for. It's not permitted for any other kind of
13 waste, just construction debris.

14 Fill area north of landfill two, it's
15 collocated with the anti-tank range. There was no
16 additional investigation required.

17 The Army had a draft EE/CA that
18 recommended placement of some stone to stabilize an
19 embankment. And we expect that this year we will be
20 putting in the riprap to do just that, to stabilize
21 along the creek.

22 I'm trying to get to that figure to see
23 if there was anything on that figure. There was

1 nothing on that figure that I really wanted to point
2 out to anyone. There is no legend on that figure,
3 and that's why I wanted to check and make sure there
4 was anything I needed to discuss.

5 There were a couple of figures that got
6 put into this presentation without legends. But I
7 do have information on those that I'll share with
8 you.

9 The fill area north of landfill two,
10 the status the EE/CA was submitted -- again, this
11 was part of the landfill EE/CA. And we're waiting
12 for the comments. Prepare the CMIP for the LUCs and
13 implement the post closure.

14 Landfill three, we did install
15 monitoring wells at landfill three, eight residuum,
16 one within the boundaries, one residuum west of the
17 landfill, three transition wells north, south, and
18 west of the landfill, and five bedrock wells. We
19 did a round of groundwater sampling and analyzed for
20 metals, VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides and PCBs, and we did
21 a water-level measurement.

22 This is one where I can tell you where
23 these wells are. That's a bedrock well, there is a

1 bedrock well there, there is a bedrock well right
2 there, and there is a bedrock well right there.
3 There is also a bedrock well there.

4 Some of these wells were nested, what
5 we call "nested". They were put in the same
6 location. So, there is a transition well that was
7 nested with that bedrock well.

8 There is a transition well right there
9 that we installed. There is a transition well that
10 was nested there with a bedrock and a residuum. And
11 the rest -- all these wells in here were the
12 wells -- they were the residuum wells.

13 DR. DAVID STEFFY: What do you mean by
14 a "transition well"?

15 MR. GREG SCHANK: When you drove
16 down -- normally, you'll hit your groundwater, which
17 would be maybe perhaps considered your water table.
18 And then out here, the geology is such that you'll
19 get a transition zone, which is a weathered zone,
20 weathered rock zone, before you get into the
21 bedrock. And that's what we consider a residuum.

22 And then you get below that, you're
23 into the bedrock. So, in the overburden, which is

1 not rock and not residuum, but just the soil, that's
2 either an overburden well or, you know, just your
3 water table well.

4 Then, once you get into that weathered
5 rock, you're into the residuum, and then you're into
6 the bedrock. That's another figure that -- that
7 shows the same thing. It just highlights from that
8 previous slide. It just highlights the fill area
9 that is north -- northeast of the landfill.

10 Landfill three -- the northwest Reilly
11 is what that area was. We've submitted a DQS -- and
12 that's a data quality submission and data package --
13 to the Army in December that was delivered. The
14 draft RFI facility inspection currently scheduled
15 for completion in April. So, we have sent the data
16 from all that well sampling to the Army for their
17 review.

18 MR. RON LEVY: We're presently looking
19 at the data and we're waiting on the report, as
20 well. We're aware of additional finds, because the
21 JPA has also sent us a letter, in terms of their
22 additional well samples. So, we've got a discussion
23 to occur at some point, Steve --

1 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yes.

2 MR. RON LEVY: -- with them about what
3 this all means, really and where it's going to go.

4 But essentially what we defined
5 originally as the plume is changing.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Really?

7 MR. RON LEVY: Yes.

8 DR. DAVID STEFFY: How was it changing?

9 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I think what
10 they've seen is they've seen that we really didn't
11 hit the edge of the plume, in terms of going north,
12 and it's diving a lot deeper, am I right?

13 MR. GREG SCHANK: That's correct.

14 MR. RON LEVY: And to the west you're
15 seeing --

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: We're seeing it over
17 here.

18 MR. RON LEVY: I think as we defined
19 the plume, we -- you know, of course, we didn't
20 completely sample to the left, that's why we paid
21 them some additional monies, to do some additional
22 work, so --

23 DR. DAVID STEFFY: So, it's diving into

1 the bedrock then?

2 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yes.

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Is the
4 contamination elevated? Did you find any difference
5 in the numbers, as far as the contamination?

6 MR. RON LEVY: I'm not sure what you
7 mean by "elevated". I certainly think that it's
8 gone a little further.

9 Would you characterize that you think
10 you've gotten the edge of it now, Steve?

11 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Not quite to the
12 west, Ron, but I think we do to the north. And just
13 to clarify, and to answer the distinguished
14 ex-mayor's question, I don't think the levels are
15 any higher, in terms of greater than what the Army
16 saw, it's just that we stepped out a little further,
17 closer to the edge.

18 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: But you found
19 basically the same elevations, just a little bit
20 further?

21 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Right. In other
22 words --

23 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: And were those above

1 the standard --

2 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yes, one of them to
3 the west.

4 DR. DAVID STEFFY: The plume is getting
5 wider as it's going deeper then?

6 MR. STEVE YOUNG: I wouldn't
7 characterize what we found as the plume is getting
8 wider. I think what's happening is, we're stepping
9 out with the investigation, so we're refining the
10 shape of the plume. It's not that the plume is
11 growing as fast as we're investigating it, it's just
12 that we're kind of finally getting our wells out on
13 the edge of the plume.

14 MR. RON LEVY: I've got to say that we
15 kind of suspected it went out a little further to
16 the west --

17 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Right.

18 MR. RON LEVY: -- but we had a hard
19 time -- we had a hard time in some of the
20 neighborhoods up there, trying to get some wells in.
21 Some people wouldn't let us do it.

22 MR. STEVE YOUNG: It's difficult.

23 MR. RON LEVY: And the JPA actually was

1 successful in getting some of the land owners up
2 there to let them put wells in where we necessarily
3 weren't. But we had projected that it may have been
4 further to the west. And I think to the north, we
5 thought we had it, but, you know, the fact is, it's
6 diving, the concentration's really not changing, in
7 terms of -- well, maybe they are changing.

8 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Can I ask one more
9 question? Well, I'm not going to say one more. But
10 we were told at one time because of the fractures
11 and everything, that there was no danger of that
12 water moving toward our water source. Is that still
13 the assumption that -- since you have found that it
14 has gone a little bit further west, is it still
15 short of that -- of the fracture or --

16 MR. STEVE YOUNG: I honestly don't have
17 an answer to that question, yet.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Ed, what I remember --

19 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Here's why, it also
20 has -- remember what Ron said, it's the depth of the
21 plume is moving deeper as it goes. What -- we
22 haven't completed our analysis to look at the depth
23 of the concentration that we found to the west and

1 where it is, with respect to the fault. Okay?

2 So, we know that on the surface, we're
3 on the west side of the fault. But, you know, the
4 fault, as it gets deeper, it moves sideways. It's
5 at an angle. It's not straight up and down.

6 So, until we look at the whole three
7 dimensional problem, we don't know where that sample
8 is, which side of the fault it's on.

9 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: You're saying on
10 the surface it's past the fault?

11 MR. STEVE YOUNG: From --

12 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: It's going west
13 toward Weaver?

14 MR. STEVE YOUNG: From the Army's work,
15 the top of that well is to the west of the fault
16 line, where it's been now. But until we look at the
17 logs, the geological logs from those wells, we won't
18 know where we found it and what angle it's at.

19 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Is the fault dipping
20 to the west then?

21 MR. STEVE YOUNG: I think that the
22 Army's map showed it dipping west, but to be
23 perfectly honest, I'm not a hundred percent sure.

1 But regardless, until we look at the
2 data from our logs, in conjunction with the Army's
3 data, to try and map the present, where that fault
4 occurred, I won't really know the answer to
5 Mayor Kimbrough's question.

6 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: So -- and that's
7 why I said, I don't want to ask just one more. So,
8 we were told at one time that it would be twenty-one
9 feet, I think, to the west, that the
10 contamination -- I believe I'm correct. Ron, am I
11 correct?

12 MR. RON LEVY: I can't remember to
13 tell you the truth. It may be. I just don't know.

14 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: They said it had
15 just moved twenty-one feet, so we're assuming that
16 that's been extended a little bit more now.

17 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, their wells that
18 they've got in there aren't that significantly
19 further west than what we had. I mean, they're
20 really not that -- right, not from the standpoint of
21 that plume.

22 MR. STEVE YOUNG: It may be extended,
23 but not by hundreds of feet, by another twenty-one

1 feet or something on that order. I don't know the
2 answer to your question, exactly, but it's not
3 several hundred feet farther west.

4 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Okay.

5 MR. RON LEVY: And it's the same thing
6 to the north, although it is further north that it's
7 diving, it's certainly not that significant in
8 overall length. And if I remember -- from what I
9 remember, in terms of that fault, it ran north,
10 south, going towards Jacksonville. But in order for
11 it to truly cross over towards Weaver, it would have
12 to run several miles north and then come several
13 miles west --

14 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Well, see, that was
15 the question, Ron -- and I've asked, I think I've
16 asked Matrix and I asked the Army, too, because it
17 was recommended by our geologists that if we look
18 for another water source, that we go northwest,
19 because that's -- be more likely.

20 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah.

21 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: So, my question, you
22 know, was: If it is moving north, and in some of
23 the materials that we've gotten in the past, they

1 said there is a probability that your groundwater
2 and the water underneath flow in the same direction,
3 is there a possibility, you know, that that could go
4 north and then turn and come west? And I think, at
5 that time, both of you said that you hadn't gone
6 that far north to really -- to determine that.

7 MR. RON LEVY: I think there was
8 something -- I think one of our geologists said that
9 it's not practical that that would happen or it's --
10 obviously, it is going north, but it's not practical
11 that it would -- or I don't know the term you would
12 use to -- but it's not probable that you would see
13 it do that, to a significant concentration that
14 would impact on a water source up in that area.

15 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: But you know my
16 concern is the "not probable". If there is
17 one-tenth percent chance if it were to happen -- and
18 y'all know where -- you know, this has been my main
19 thing, and then I'll shut up -- but that is a
20 very -- it would be a crucial impact on that
21 community.

22 And that's why -- we know there are no
23 absolutes. And we know that our geologists that we

1 had at one time and your geologists differed in some
2 opinions about the structure and the fractures and
3 everything. They said there were lots of
4 uncertainties in the formations of this ground.

5 And, Jim, you know more -- a lots more
6 about it than I do, probably.

7 MR. JIM MILLER: It's a complex geology
8 and it's hard to get (inaudible).

9 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: And that's my
10 concern. That's why I'm asking these questions. If
11 there is the slightest possibility that that
12 groundwater could ever affect the water that that
13 community was using, then it would be devastating.

14 MR. RON LEVY: And if I remember the
15 briefings that were done -- and I think some of your
16 own folks said this -- it was improbable that that
17 would impact on your water, at that distance.

18 Obviously, we've got a remedy still to
19 come on this.

20 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

21 MR. RON LEVY: We paid the JPA for
22 that. We've still got to discuss, you know, whether
23 that's going to be changing in any way, based on

1 this new data. But I think, you know, overall it's
2 not going to impact on Weaver.

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: "I think"?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I'm not a
5 geologist, but --

6 MR. JIM MILLER: Well --

7 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: I'm not doubting
8 you.

9 MR. JIM MILLER: It's likely to be
10 highly diluted. You've got small areas that holds
11 contaminated water, so I compare it to a drip-drip
12 in the aquifer that you and I rely on. Probably, by
13 the time it gets into the, what we call the "big
14 water" and the large aquifer, it's probably going to
15 be so diluted that it would be below the safe water
16 drinking standards.

17 That's certainly been the case until
18 now in our drinking water. But it's a justifiable
19 concern. Something you would want to keep an eye
20 on, but I don't think it's an imminent threat, just
21 my personal --

22 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: But y'all haven't
23 had the treatment from the Depot --

1 MR. JIM MILLER: Well, no, we didn't
2 have to. They changed it. We never exceeded the
3 safe drinking water (inaudible). (Inaudible) the
4 aquifer and got the Army's help in doing that.

5 It's anybody guess whether it would
6 ever exceed that five parts per billion threshold,
7 we don't know.

8 MR. RON LEVY: Except for that area,
9 the plant is around, it's a lot -- distance wise,
10 you're not talking quite the same thing.

11 MR. JIM MILLER: Yeah, it's in the same
12 neighborhood, it's in the backyard.

13 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Well, I don't want
14 to prolong it, but that's my concern for the
15 community that I come from.

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: I wanted to correct
17 myself. I just got to thinking when that question
18 on the transition well. Residuum wells are the
19 wells that we put in the overburden, in the water
20 table, more or less. Transition wells are wells
21 that get (inaudible) a zone of weathered rock. And
22 then the third well down is the bedrock well. So,
23 if you think about it, the residuum wells are kind

1 of in the dirt.

2 The transition wells are in the area
3 right between where the dirt and the rock parts.
4 And you'll have a lot of weathered rock there. And
5 then the rock wells are your deep wells. I think I
6 said those residuum wells were in that transition
7 zone, and that's not true. Just wanted to correct
8 myself on that.

9 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I have a
10 question.

11 MR. GREG SCHANK: Yes.

12 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Would the plume
13 be more likely or less likely to grow if that stuff
14 was dug up instead of just covered and hauled off?

15 MR. GREG SCHANK: You talking landfill
16 three?

17 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Yes. I've seen
18 Sam Walton move a mountain right by my church, just
19 pick it up and move it, changing the whole landscape
20 over there. And this landfill is not that big. Why
21 is it not being considered to get that garbage out
22 of there, seal it, put it in a proper landfill, and
23 then cap it? Would the water that's going through

1 that be more or less likely to have contaminants?

2 MR. GREG SCHANK: To answer your
3 question, we are still in the process of producing
4 the report and to making recommendations as to how
5 we feel, you know, or what we think the solution to
6 this problem is.

7 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: So, it hasn't
8 been decided, yet?

9 MR. GREG SCHANK: So, it has not been
10 decided. Now, landfill one, two, and four in the
11 industrial -- well, the industrial landfill, yeah,
12 those landfills, you know, the decision was made
13 that they weren't going to dig them up.

14 But landfill three, there's no decision
15 been made on whether or not to dig that landfill out
16 of there or not.

17 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: While they're
18 deciding that, is it leaking more or less?

19 MR. GREG SCHANK: I can't tell you if
20 it's leaking more or less. Now, we probably will
21 schedule another round of well samples and that may
22 be able to answer your question. But this stuff
23 doesn't run like a river. Okay?

1 MR. STEVE YOUNG: There is two things
2 to think about -- and Greg's absolutely right, but
3 I'll add two things: One is, it's a very, very old
4 landfill, and so whatever was put in there is very
5 likely already done all (inaudible) going to do. We
6 don't know that. And if I could look into the
7 ground and tell you that answer I would.

8 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: But stirring it
9 up would be more --

10 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Well, there are a
11 whole lot of issues of digging up a landfill like
12 this.

13 The other point I wanted to make is:
14 We put eight of the wells that we saw on the map --
15 this is a trench fill, all the materials put in here
16 were put in long slit trenches. So, between the
17 trenches, there is native dirt that we can still
18 manage to get a drill rig, small one up on.

19 And so what we did was put eight wells
20 in between the trenches to try to get a partial
21 answer, at least to your question. And what we
22 found was, surprisingly, very little of the seen
23 contaminants that we see out further away from the

1 landfill. Which tends to support what I just said
2 about the landfill being old and it having done all
3 the damage it's capable of.

4 So, those are two other things to think
5 about when you think about what remedy makes sense.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Are these trenches
7 east, west trenches?

8 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yes.

9 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Or do they line
10 up with the contour of the land, the surface water,
11 or do they go across it?

12 MR. STEVE YOUNG: It's actually fairly
13 flat. And I don't know if that's because the
14 landfill is there or it was flat before they
15 started, I don't know the answer to that.

16 MR. RON LEVY: One of the things you
17 can do when you go out to that landfill is you can
18 visibly see where the trenches were, where the
19 military put the garbage, the trash in. The
20 depressions are there. And what it tells you, as
21 you see those, is that it was improperly capped.

22 In fact, we probably did the worst
23 thing -- we, the Army, at the time they closed that

1 landfill, and not only did they not put a proper cap
2 on it, they went and they planted trees. So, what
3 we've done essentially is provide a direct conduit
4 into the groundwater, by allowing from the roots and
5 whatnot of the tree.

6 So, infiltration's constantly going on
7 in that landfill. And one of the things we talked
8 about -- or we addressed in cost studies with the
9 JPA is a cap or a cover, I should say, for that
10 landfill, as part of the cost.

11 MR. GREG SCHANK: The decision has not
12 been made as to what the remedy for that landfill
13 three is going to be.

14 The garbage dump in the fill area east
15 of Reilly, we installed one monitoring well,
16 abandoned fifteen temporary wells, collected
17 groundwater, collected sediment and surface water
18 samples, we collected fish samples, and we analyzed
19 the fish tissue for metals. And that says in
20 progress. That was done.

21 DR. DAVID STEFFY: What metals did you
22 analyze for?

23 MR. GREG SCHANK: Do you remember,

1 Steve? Do you remember what metals we analyzed the
2 fish for?

3 MR. STEVE YOUNG: I think it was the
4 full RCRA list.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Does it include
6 Mercury?

7 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yes.

8 MR. GREG SCHANK: All right, the
9 results of the fish sampling showed us there was no
10 risk to human health, no risk to the fish, and no
11 risk to the animals that are feeding on the fish.

12 MR. RON LEVY: Steve, does that mean
13 that you didn't see any levels of metals in the
14 fish, at all?

15 MR. STEVE YOUNG: We saw it,
16 definitely. You always detect metals as part of the
17 natural process. But the levels -- we did
18 whole-body analysis and we did fish-filet analysis,
19 so that we could look at both ecological,
20 (inaudible) raccoons that might eat the fish, and
21 also what the human consumption pathways, as well as
22 impact to the fish themselves. And it all came back
23 good to go, basically.

1 MR. JIM MILLER: Who had the nasty job
2 of catching the fish?

3 MS. SHANA DECKER: They had to do it
4 twice.

5 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Do you need some
6 more samples?

7 MR. GREG SCHANK: They have some very
8 nice fish in that lake.

9 That transition or the well that we put
10 in is right there. And again, I apologize, some of
11 these figures did not get legends put on them.

12 The status of this site is the
13 analytical results are complete. The data quality
14 summary is nearly complete. And we will have the
15 RFI facility investigation scheduled for
16 January 2005. We expect to have that report out
17 this month.

18 The next site was the small weapons
19 repair. We installed two residuum wells and four
20 transition wells and two bedrock wells.

21 Did some groundwater sampling. You can
22 see what we analyzed for. We did some soil sampling
23 and we did some subsurface soil samplings from eight

1 of the soil borings. And again, we analyzed those
2 metals and VOCs. VOCs in the shallow and subsurface
3 soils only.

4 Well, everything we did, I can point
5 out all these different wells, if you like. This is
6 the residuum well. This is a bedrock well. This
7 is -- that's a transition well right there. That's
8 another transition well right below it. This is a
9 transition well here, number twenty-four. Nineteen
10 is a residuum. Seventeen is a bedrock. And
11 eighteen is a transitional. Twenty-one is a
12 bedrock. I think I already told you, twenty is a
13 residuum, if anybody is writing these down. So,
14 that's where we put our wells.

15 The data quality summary is complete.
16 The preliminary data package was delivered to the
17 Army and the RFI facility investigation report was
18 delivered to the Army in December. That report is
19 out and in review.

20 Chem laundry, we did some groundwater
21 sampling from eight residuum monitoring wells and
22 seven bedrock wells and analyzed for VOCs, metals,
23 cations, anions, total organic carbon.

1 And let me get to this map and I can
2 tell you -- well, actually, there is a legend on
3 this map, so, you can see what these wells
4 represent.

5 The status, the corrective measure
6 implementation plan was delivered to ADEM and the
7 Army -- and I believe that was back in the summer.
8 We're waiting for comments. And once we receive
9 comments, we'll finalize the RFI report.

10 The MNA sampling is scheduled for
11 January. And we're going to begin the preparation
12 of the corrective measures progress report.

13 T-6 Naylor Field, we installed one
14 bedrock and two residuum transition wells. We did a
15 round of groundwater sampling from sixteen existing
16 and three new wells. Sampled and analyzed for VOCs.
17 Collected three surface water and sediment and also
18 analyzed them for VOCs and did hydraulic testing.

19 And MW17, which is right there, is a
20 residuum well that we put in. Number twenty-seven
21 is a bedrock well and fourteen is a residuum well.
22 Those are the three wells we put in.

23 As you can see, there is other wells

1 collocated. A lot of times, we do nest wells.

2 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Where is that?

3 Can you tell me, where is that located?

4 MR. GREG SCHANK: Where is it on the
5 base? Is there a map up there you can show
6 where --

7 MR. STEVE YOUNG: (Pointing.)

8 MR. GREG SCHANK: T-6 is Naylor Field.

9 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: What is the building
10 there?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you know what it
12 is?

13 MR. RON LEVY: Do you know where the
14 old auto craft shop was on post?

15 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Right here.

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right there.

17 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Over by where the
18 motel is?

19 MR. STEVE YOUNG: No, it's on past
20 here. Along right here.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, not too far from
22 that.

23 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Right here.

1 MR. RON LEVY: Let me show you. Let me
2 use your pointer. This building here, I believe, is
3 the auto craft shop. That's it right there. Do you
4 know where the old auto craft -- where the soldiers
5 used to go and repair their own vehicles?

6 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

7 MR. RON LEVY: That's it right there.
8 This here is where the MP School used to have their
9 POW training are --

10 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Okay.

11 MR. RON LEVY: -- where they trained
12 soldiers from POW.

13 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Why did you do
14 hydraulic testing on those wells?

15 MR. GREG SCHANK: Steve, I'm not
16 familiar with the hydraulics, so --

17 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Why did you do
18 the hydraulic testing on the wells?

19 MR. STEVE YOUNG: When?

20 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Why?

21 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Just so that we would
22 have some site-specific data when it comes time to
23 look at remedies. You know, we're either looking

1 injection or pumping remedies on these, so we need
2 some data on hydraulic contents.

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Has that property
4 been deeded for use? Have they planned a use
5 for that --

6 MR. STEVE YOUNG: What's the planned
7 use, is that --

8 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

9 MR. STEVE YOUNG: You know, I'm not
10 sure --

11 MR. RON LEVY: Again, up here, this is
12 the JPA reuse plan right here and right there,
13 that's it. And that's called -- what's that called?

14 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Educational --

15 MR. RON LEVY: Educational campus.

16 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yeah, that's right --

17 MR. RON LEVY: It's part of their
18 defined educational campus.

19 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Oh, is that part of
20 the Auburn property that they --

21 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Yeah.

22 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: And they haven't
23 got ownership of it, yet?

1 MR. STEVE YOUNG: I believe that's
2 correct. I would have to ask Miki that.

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Thank you.

4 MR. GREG SCHANK: All right, we've
5 received the data from the laboratory, the data
6 quality is complete. And the draft RFI is scheduled
7 for delivery to the Army in February.

8 And the preliminary data package was
9 sent to the Army in December. So, they should have
10 the data and we'll be getting the report to them
11 next month.

12 Range thirty, impact area, we collected
13 five surface water and collocated sediment samples,
14 collected seven surface soils with collocated
15 subsurface soils and we analyzed for metals and
16 explosives, total organic carbon and did some
17 grain-size analysis.

18 This figure has a legend on it, so, you can
19 see where we -- where we did our sampling. The
20 status, the sampling was completed in September.
21 The analytical results received from the laboratory.
22 The data QA is still in progress. And the RFI is
23 scheduled for submission to ADEM in January.

1 Other sites. T-38, we're to begin that
2 investigation early this year. I believe probably
3 some time the end of this month or in February. And
4 there is a RFI facility investigation scheduled.

5 The anti-tank range, we're doing an
6 HTRW investigation. And that is pending the Alpha
7 EE/CA completion. You know, we've talked about the
8 Alpha area.

9 MR. JOE McCARY: What does HTRW mean?

10 MR. GREG SCHANK: Hazardous toxic
11 radiological waste.

12 MR. RON LEVY: It's just a catch-all
13 for any of those types of contaminants.

14 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right.

15 MR. STEVE YOUNG: It means not UXO.

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: Yeah, not UXO, any
17 other kind of waste.

18 The cleanup activities that we're
19 undertaking is the building demolition in landfill
20 one. There are three of those duplexes up there
21 that need to be torn down. That is going to be
22 happening probably the end of this month, beginning
23 of next month.

1 The request for bids is out on the
2 street and is due in this Thursday, actually.

3 The cap repair, the soil placement at
4 landfills one and two and the fill area north of
5 landfill two, that's pending ADEM's review of the
6 EE/CA, to see if they'll agree with what we want to
7 do there before we do it.

8 The cleanup at range thirty-one and the
9 impact area, north central main post, those are
10 scheduled for this year. That involves cleaning up
11 bullets.

12 Basically, range thirty-one and the
13 impact area north central main post, I believe were
14 mainly small arms ranges, and so there is a lot of
15 bullets just lying on the ground and we're going to
16 go in and try and scrape those up and get them out
17 of there.

18 That's a potential lead problem. And
19 if there is any brass laying around from shooting
20 the bullets, we'll get that out of there, too.

21 I know range thirty-one is about a six
22 acre cleanup and the impact area is about a two acre
23 cleanup. Those will be completed this year.

1 The Alpha UXO EE/CA complete. ADEM
2 order resolution. It's in progress. The work plan
3 has been submitted to ADEM and the Army. We've
4 received the Army's comments. We're waiting for
5 ADEM's comments before we finalize the work plan.

6 Likewise, our QA plan was reviewed by
7 the Army. And we're waiting for ADEM's comments on
8 it.

9 There's a figure of the Alpha area.
10 The up and down lined area is where we're going to
11 be performing our investigation. The areas with the
12 dark circles around them are areas that need to be
13 cleared.

14 And the other areas that have that
15 other -- these areas are no further action areas.
16 The Army's already done the investigation and ADEM
17 has agreed that these are no further action.

18 This is the area we're performing our
19 EE/CA. The Army has performed an investigation
20 here, and it's been determined that a cleanup needs
21 to be done in those areas.

22 The draft plan was submitted
23 November 10th. We had an onboard review meeting

1 with ADEM on the 12th, just to discuss it.

2 In December, our contractor came out
3 and started their field office setup and set up a
4 GPO, which is a geophysical prove-out. The field
5 ops are scheduled to begin this month. That's all
6 pending comments from ADEM and us getting them
7 resolved and getting a final work plan out the door.

8 We expect to have the draft report by
9 June of '05.

10 MR. RON LEVY: That's characterization,
11 right? That's not cleanup, is it?

12 MR. GREG SCHANK: That's all the EE/CA
13 and that's engineering estimate, cost analysis --

14 MR. RON LEVY: You still got another
15 schedule you'll have to undertake for actual removal
16 of the --

17 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right, the areas
18 that -- these areas that are to be cleaned up, we
19 haven't begun the work on those, yet. We're just
20 now -- we're just doing the EE/CA areas that I
21 pointed out.

22 The last slide, deliverables. And I'll
23 let you take a look at that and see if there is any

1 questions. But those are our deliverable dates, and
2 the documents we expect to deliver.

3 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Let me ask a
4 question, and maybe ADEM is going to cover this. I
5 know that lots of them were in November and
6 December, and you give us stuff. There was -- and I
7 forget which one it was, but there was some things
8 that y'all had referred to ADEM in last summer.

9 MR. GREG SCHANK: That was the chem
10 laundry --

11 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: And you haven't
12 gotten responses. Is there a problem?

13 MR. GREG SCHANK: There was, I think, a
14 funding issue with ADEM at the time and tended to
15 get them backlogged a little bit. And I believe --
16 Shana, correct me if I'm wrong -- they're getting
17 through that backlog now.

18 MS. SHANA DECKER: That's pretty much
19 it in a nutshell, except for that it's a monumental
20 backlog. And really, there is just a couple of us
21 able to work on it at the moment.

22 The funding has -- is supposed to be
23 here this week. And we haven't been working on it

1 for about six months.

2 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Funding from --

3 MS. SHANA DECKER: DSMOA funding, which
4 is the Army's mechanism for paying for our review --

5 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: So, there was some
6 problems with the funding from the Army?

7 MS. SHANA DECKER: Yes. And it was
8 because of many problems. It's nationwide. It's
9 not just us here. It's all the BRAC and FUDs.

10 MR. JIM MILLER: It's going to Iraq.

11 MS. SHANA DECKER: And it's going to
12 Iraq.

13 But it's been -- we've got a lot of
14 documents in. We had a lot of documents before that
15 we were -- that were under review. And in about
16 August we were told to stop work, and we couldn't
17 work on it.

18 And so, when we finally are getting our
19 funding --

20 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: You still haven't
21 gotten it? You said you --

22 MS. SHANA DECKER: We have -- we have
23 some. It's not every -- it's not the whole amount,

1 but we have some. And it's put us back in the
2 black, only because we haven't been working on it
3 for six months. And if we had been working on it,
4 we would still be in the red today, even with the
5 additional funding.

6 But, yeah, it's caused quite a bit of
7 problems. And people that were working on the
8 project before have since gone to other projects and
9 got involved in those, and so, we haven't been able
10 to pull the whole team back onto this.

11 So, we have just a couple of us
12 actually available to work on this mountain of
13 reports. I mean, you can just see, from just the
14 JPA, all these sites that they're submitting reports
15 to us and expecting comments on. And I'm not trying
16 to make excuses, but just their little part is
17 enough, you know, but we have the Army's huge --

18 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: There was a six
19 month period of time you say?

20 MS. SHANA DECKER: Since August, since
21 August.

22 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: So, nothing has been
23 done? So, you're gearing back up now?

1 MS. SHANA DECKER: Basically, yes,
2 we've done no reviews since August.

3 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Do you think this
4 discontinuity in review sacrifices quality of the
5 review?

6 MS. SHANA DECKER: Well, that's not, at
7 all, what we planned. It sacrifices their schedule.
8 That's unfortunate.

9 The ramifications, of course, are that
10 we're way behind and we'll continue to stay way
11 behind. And we're not -- and the State is not going
12 to just write off some of these places without
13 looking at them. That's just not going to happen.
14 That would be wrong, ethically, and negligent of us.
15 We wouldn't do that.

16 So, it's just going to take more and
17 more time.

18 MR. ED KIMBROUGH: Thank you.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Obviously, both the JPA
20 and Army have concerns about that, because schedule
21 drives property reuse and whatnot.

22 MS. SHANA DECKER: Yeah.

23 MR. RON LEVY: But I'll tell you that

1 we think the funding situation -- because the
2 funding she's talking about is that which the
3 Army -- which the Department of Defense supplies for
4 oversight. And there was a lag in that funding to
5 the extent where ADEM wasn't comfortable moving
6 ahead. And I don't have any control over that.

7 But the funding is there now, it's
8 flowing. And it's put things off, so --

9 MS. SHANA DECKER: And on the positive
10 side of that, the Army and JPA did get together and
11 come up with a list of their priorities, what they
12 need for us to get done right now so they can go
13 forward with negotiations for Bravo area and other
14 things that are happening, their Alpha area work
15 plan. What else?

16 MR. RON LEVY: Those -- the Bravo,
17 which affects upcoming negotiations. The areas that
18 we defined for NFAs. The areas that JPA feels that
19 are needed for redevelopment, such as the old -- the
20 area they call the golden triangle.

21 So, our focus is -- we now have
22 meetings -- or we have meetings. I'm part of that
23 now -- where we're talking about what we can tell

1 ADEM together, as prior -- to help development, you
2 know.

3 MS. SHANA DECKER: Because we have a
4 lot of reports that aren't necessarily going to
5 cause a problem with development or anything like
6 that, and we can still put those off. But the ones
7 that they really need right now are the ones we're
8 working on the hardest.

9 And at the same time, we're trying to
10 work on some of the old ones, too, to kind of catch
11 up. And it's going to take awhile. But we'll
12 eventually catch up by the end of the project, I
13 hope. But we're working together to solve that
14 problem.

15 MR. JOE McCARY: In line with this,
16 just how important is it that we get feedback from
17 EPA?

18 MR. RON LEVY: Well, from the
19 standpoint of the JPA, they're not -- the agreement
20 that's out there now on the cleanup between the JPA
21 and the Army is -- well, actually, it's between the
22 JPA and ADEM, because it's State oversight now.
23 There really isn't any input on the part of the EPA,

1 as far I know.

2 They're doing it under the State's RCRA
3 authority, as opposed to CERCLA authority. And it's
4 really just them dealing directly with ADEM and the
5 Army, but EPA is really not part of that equation.

6 Now, there are still pieces out there
7 that EPA is part of, no doubt. And the piece that
8 we're still doing, Fish & Wildlife area, that
9 cleanup that still has not been transferred to JPA,
10 EPA is part of it, and we consult with them.

11 I do want to point out that we -- I
12 think that slide is wrong -- pending Army review for
13 T-38.

14 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right, I saw that,
15 too, Ron, and I think -- did I say we sent you the
16 data? But I know you haven't gotten that report,
17 yet.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, you haven't even
19 started on the data for that --

20 MR. GREG SCHANK: Right.

21 MR. RON LEVY: -- so, we wouldn't --

22 MR. GREG SCHANK: That's a typo.

23 MR. RON LEVY: T-38, we just, this

1 past fall, completed the 3X removal. I think I
2 briefed you on that in the past.

3 It's the site that the
4 Army Chemical School used for training of live
5 agents and items that were used during that training
6 or buried, and we went up there and removed those
7 items on the chance that they may or may not have
8 been contaminated.

9 They were decontaminated, but the Army
10 has policy that removes all items that may have been
11 exposed to agent. And we removed it -- we removed
12 from the pits up there.

13 So, that's what kept the JPA from
14 moving forward on T-38, because their schedules
15 originally called for a quicker turnaround on that.
16 But because the Army couldn't -- we went through all
17 sorts of gyrations of getting that stuff out of
18 there.

19 MR. JOE McCARY: And that was rocket
20 city (phonetic)?

21 MR. RON LEVY: No, it's a different
22 area. Can you put up that map of the installation?

23 MR. GREG SCHANK: We're going to start

1 over.

2 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Which one?

3 MR. RON LEVY: Do the one with the
4 reuse plan on it. That one right there. Go to
5 view. T-38 -- let me get my bearings here. T-38,
6 that's the ASP. T-38's somewhere up in here, if
7 I've got that right. And that is an area that was
8 historically used by the Chemical School for
9 training with live agent outdoors. And that's the
10 area we're talking about, as opposed to what area
11 were you saying, Joe?

12 MR. JOE McCARY: The area that's the --

13 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Rocket city.

14 MR. RON LEVY: Rocket city was down in
15 here, associated with the eastern bypass.

16 MR. GREG SCHANK: That's all I have.

17 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Where do roadways
18 fall in your land-use controls?

19 MR. GREG SCHANK: Roadways?

20 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Roadways, are
21 they acceptable --

22 MR. GREG SCHANK: Well, now, roads
23 leading into the Alpha area or any other restricted

1 areas have gates across them, so --

2 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: But I mean, say
3 there was a future road, would it be acceptable use
4 of the land or not acceptable?

5 MR. GREG SCHANK: It depends on what
6 area it goes through and where we are in the
7 process. If land use controls say that you can't --
8 like right now, the public's not allowed out in the
9 Alpha or the Bravo area.

10 And so, we have gates that restrict
11 public access. I mean, we couldn't put a road
12 through there and open it up to the public if the
13 land use control says you can't do that.

14 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Yeah. But I
15 mean, the landfills, what would be an example of an
16 acceptable land use for a landfill?

17 MR. GREG SCHANK: An acceptable, green
18 space, park, something along those lines, walking
19 trails. There is talk about making walking trails
20 on landfill one.

21 MS. SHANA DECKER: I think there is
22 talk about a golf course on one of them.

23 MR. GREG SCHANK: If you look at the

1 land-use plan, there is some golf courses that have
2 been planned. That would be a good use.

3 MR. JIM MILLER: Be sure they're
4 sprinkled.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Moving on. New
6 business, agency reports. ADEM?

7 MS. SHANA DECKER: Well, I just gave
8 you all the financial update. So, I'll try to focus
9 on other stuff.

10 Since our last meeting -- well, at our
11 last meeting, ADEM had -- we had an administrative
12 order in place to stop work with UXO and we were in
13 the process of figuring out how to go about
14 investigating the Charlie road segments that -- to,
15 I guess, get everybody out from under that
16 administrative order.

17 Right after the last RAB, we started --
18 we settled on the work plan, settled on what
19 segments to investigate -- I can't remember now how
20 many -- it was like 16 percent of all the roads that
21 we investigated -- and ADEM was out there for that
22 whole investigation.

23 And the reason we had to be out there

1 for that, when we had no money, was because that was
2 a RCRA violation and it came from a different pot of
3 money, it came from RCRA money. And so, we did
4 that.

5 And then I think it was November and
6 December of -- and I can't remember the exact
7 dates -- but it was six or eight weeks, I guess --
8 or I don't remember how many weeks it was -- anyway,
9 so we finished that.

10 And I guess then they went into
11 negotiations for getting the administrative order
12 stop work into a consent order, which was better in
13 some ways. But that's all left up to lawyers and
14 things now, and it's over my head.

15 So, I will answer any questions I can
16 on that, but I'm not promising that they're
17 accurate.

18 Since then, we have done a lot of site
19 visits. We observed them, the JPA, installing their
20 (inaudible) valve -- we've been in several meetings
21 discussing reports, discussing M101 and M3, the
22 golden triangle area, redevelopment.

23 Eastern bypass, there is a big area of

1 land in there that's got construction debris that
2 was difficult to do UXO investigations in, so we
3 came to some agreement on that, on what to do.

4 And we're now out here doing the M101
5 investigation, where they're rechecking six grids.
6 And that's going very well. And ADEM has been out
7 there doing that.

8 In the mean time, we've just recently
9 started picking up reviewing a couple of reports.
10 They are in the pipeline. Letters will be done very
11 shortly. That includes the Bravo EE/CA, from the
12 Army; the Alpha work plan; Alpha area UXO
13 supplemental EE/CA work plan from the JPA; and a
14 couple of other ones, which are, I think, the base
15 service station 2109 is one that is just about ready
16 to go; and another one that LaBarron is doing -- and
17 I can't remember what the name of it is.

18 But we've got a few things that are
19 just fixing to come to you. And so, we've been
20 busy. We've done a lot of site visits, so that's a
21 good thing.

22 And we've had some staffing changes.
23 David Bush, who has been on this project for about a

1 year, I guess, is now leaving, and so that leaves a
2 big hole in our expertise level. He was an ex-Army
3 guy and had a lot of knowledge on this, plus, he
4 used to work for ALDOT. So, he had a lot of
5 knowledge on the road construction project out
6 there.

7 So, we're losing a good bit of
8 experience with him going. But it's a good move for
9 him, so that's good. But in the mean time, we're
10 left trying to crawl out from under the mountain of
11 documents we have to review and with fewer people.
12 So, we'll work on it.

13 And that's about all I have. Any
14 questions?

15 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Does ADEM have
16 an opinion on Bains Gap Road opening?

17 MS. SHANA DECKER: ADEM has issued an
18 opinion on that. The opinion was that any land-use
19 controls to open a road through there would have to
20 be equal to the amount of protection that is offered
21 currently, which was agreed upon by the Army and
22 ADEM and everybody else in the past. And that was
23 several layers of protection, including fences and

1 guards and the distance and the terrain and just a
2 whole bunch of stuff.

3 And basically, after ADEM said that, we
4 haven't really heard anymore suggestions to --

5 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I know the JPA --

6 MS. SHANA DECKER: -- open the road.

7 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: -- dealt with
8 that issue the last time --

9 MS. SHANA DECKER: -- what it would
10 take -- what?

11 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I thought the
12 JPA dealt with that issue the last time, and like
13 some funds were appropriated toward that end. Do
14 you know about that?

15 MS. SHANA DECKER: I don't know about
16 funds for that.

17 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I thought that
18 they were going to study it. That's what I
19 understood.

20 MS. SHANA DECKER: If they're studying
21 it at the moment, I don't know. Do y'all know?

22 MR. GREG SCHANK: JPA asked us to do a
23 cost analyses of what it would take to reopen that

1 road, which included removal of UXO and fencing.

2 And we did do that for them.

3 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: The study, you
4 mean?

5 MR. GREG SCHANK: Yes, we did a cost
6 analysis for them, if we were going to fence it.
7 And I know one problem would be that JPA does not
8 own the whole road. A large portion of that road
9 goes through Fish & Wildlife, so, if JPA put up a
10 fence, it still wouldn't open that road, unless the
11 Fish & Wildlife put up a fence. So, there is a lot
12 of players.

13 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Yeah, I know it.
14 I just wondered if this committee had any input into
15 the game.

16 MS. SHANA DECKER: I guess if they
17 cleared -- if they did the UXO cleanup in the area,
18 they could open the road again, like the whole area
19 to keep people out. I don't know what all that
20 would take, though.

21 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Does anybody
22 know? I mean, it was open when the Army was here,
23 right? We used to go in and out, in and out, in

1 and out like that for a long time. Who decided to
2 just close it? Where did that order come from and
3 who -- does anybody know why it got closed?

4 MR. RON LEVY: Well, I'm not sure
5 that's quite the right thing to say, in terms of it
6 was an order that came down to close it. Obviously,
7 we were in the process of characterizing property
8 out there, and have identified ordnance in and
9 around the road, ordnance areas in and around that
10 road, unlike what we knew of before, when we were an
11 active installation.

12 And since then, we've transferred the
13 property to Fish & Wildlife Service. At least a
14 good portion of Bains Gap Road falls inside the
15 Fish & Wildlife area. So, it's a decision on their
16 part as to whether they want to open it or not.
17 That's not an Army decision.

18 Certainly, they may want to talk to us
19 about whether there's additional clearance
20 requirements, but it's still their decision. And
21 that's something that's being worked out between the
22 JPA and the powers that are out there.

23 At some point, I'm sure they're going

1 to want to get with the Army and ask, you know, what
2 it's going to take for what they define. But until
3 there is an actual plan, or I should say, a design
4 or construction of a road, I'm not sure anybody
5 knows what it's going to take to clear it or to
6 clear whatever it is they need to do.

7 But right now, the Army doesn't --
8 we're just -- it's not our decision, and then we're
9 not taking the position one way or the other, at
10 this point, that I'm aware of, because we haven't
11 been asked to do anything, yet.

12 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Well, who got the
13 order to put a lock on the gate? Did the Army do
14 that or did JPA do --

15 MR. RON LEVY: Well, those gates
16 were --

17 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: -- that or did
18 Fish & Wildlife or --

19 MR. RON LEVY: Those gates weren't just
20 about the roads, they were about the entire area,
21 the roads that led into that area. We didn't want
22 people getting off the road, onto the sides of the
23 roads where there is ordnance or items that need to

1 be cleared. So, it's not just about closing the
2 road, it's about closing the entire area up there.
3 It's not just a road issue.

4 MS. SHANA DECKER: And that's why they
5 just can't run a fence along it and say you can
6 drive by it, because people could still get out
7 and --

8 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Well, I guess --

9 MS. SHANA DECKER: -- get off in the
10 woods and --

11 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: -- the point --
12 and I've got members on my church who live on the
13 other side of the mountain, who could benefit from
14 coming straight across, instead of going twenty
15 miles around.

16 MR. RON LEVY: I think, Monty, the JPA
17 is trying to address it and they're still working
18 through it.

19 MS. SHANA DECKER: Yeah.

20 MR. RON LEVY: They're talking to ADEM,
21 they're talking to Fish & Wildlife, and they're
22 talking to the Army. I don't think that anything's
23 been resolved, yet. I think there is still some

1 decisions to be made, but I think they're still
2 working through it.

3 Beyond that, I couldn't tell you.

4 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Nobody can.

5 MS. SHANA DECKER: I'll tell you
6 exactly, the JPA did do a cost of cleaning up,
7 putting up a fence, and they asked us if that would
8 be okay. And that was where that response came
9 from, the layers of protection, the terrain, the
10 guards that had been in place up until now, you
11 know, just the basic distance of buffer zone from
12 the general public getting in there. And that's
13 where that came from, was when they did that cost
14 analysis and they said, can we put up a fence?
15 Would that be enough?

16 And that was the answer. So, the
17 answer was, no. And they haven't yet figured out --
18 we haven't really figured out what would be a good
19 answer for that, yet. But it's still in progress.
20 But it might take awhile, as usual. Just realistic
21 with you.

22 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Okay.

23 MR. RON LEVY: I know that

1 Fish & Wildlife is looking to survey the road for
2 construction purposes, so they can start looking at
3 what the design would be and what it would
4 undertake. So, until we know really what needs to
5 be cleared, you know, can't even address it.

6 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Moving on. I assume
7 there is no EPA report? Is there a rep for the JPA
8 here?

9 MR. GREG SCHANK: That would be me and
10 we have nothing.

11 DR. DAVID STEFFY: And action summary
12 sheet?

13 MR. RON LEVY: That would be me.
14 Brenda is going to -- apparently, what was passed
15 out originally, page three was missing. At the same
16 time, we repeated page two twice. Page three, there
17 really wasn't much to it.

18 And I do this every time, if I give you
19 too much information, let me know, or if I'm not
20 giving you enough, let me know. Again, I want to
21 show you what we've done, in terms of defining or
22 splitting areas out.

23 Just to orient you towards the

1 installation, eastern bypass in the brown. The
2 Bravo area is the blue area. The Charlie area is
3 the green area, which really is part of -- for the
4 most part, part of the Fish & Wildlife area. And
5 this -- what's this color, someone --

6 MS. SHANA DECKER: Mustard.

7 MR. RON LEVY: Some sort of yellowish
8 color, yeah.

9 MS. SHANA DECKER: Yeah.

10 MR. RON LEVY: This is the Alpha area.
11 And from what we've said in the past, the Army still
12 has responsibility at this point for the
13 characterization and investigation for those ranges
14 and UXO areas within the Bravo area and within the
15 Charlie area.

16 We're still doing work on the eastern
17 bypass. Essentially, we've transferred this part
18 down here in the south. There is a piece up here
19 that has not been transferred that we have completed
20 the clearance. We've got a couple of issues in
21 there that we're still dealing with. And I'll talk
22 to you about them in a second.

23 And then this area up here really,

1 which is the golden triangle area, it's a priority
2 on the part of the JPA for cleanup and clearance,
3 because they have development slated for that area,
4 that they're looking to get into, as soon as
5 possible.

6 So, for the Bravo area, which I want to
7 talk to you about, which is the first thing on your
8 list -- it's again, this light blue area right here.
9 We recently sent the draft, the revised draft EE/CA
10 to ADEM that went out on the 3rd of December. We
11 told ADEM, because that's part of an area that's to
12 be negotiated with the JPA here in the future, that
13 we want them to look at areas we define for no
14 further action.

15 So, that document's out to them. And I
16 want to say, although it's not shown on here, there
17 is -- a good 70 percent of that -- well, no, maybe
18 65 percent of that area is defined for no further
19 action. And then there is a percentage in there
20 that some level of clearance is based upon the JPA's
21 reuse plan. That's over here in the back corner,
22 above Dan Copeland's head. So, that document's out.

23 I know ADEM has talked to you about

1 their backlog. I'm sure that they're going to do
2 their best to get to that document, because we
3 consider it a critical document in negotiating any
4 phase two work with the JPA. I know that JPA,
5 through Matrix, is also reviewing that document, at
6 this time.

7 The Y area in here, it's right above
8 the eastern bypass, it's this little blue area right
9 there, we did do a clearance in there. There was a
10 draft final report submitted to ADEM.

11 ADEM submitted comments back to us and
12 we responded to those comments. So, we're kind of
13 waiting to hear back from ADEM on that. But I know
14 it's caught up in their backlog of documents, right,
15 Shana?

16 MS. SHANA DECKER: Yeah.

17 MR. RON LEVY: But for the most part,
18 we've done a clearance in that area. And that area
19 is an area that's important to the JPA, too, because
20 it's part of the golden triangle area for
21 development purposes.

22 There are several water tank sites --
23 Brenda, you got the map on that one, too? These

1 areas in purple, you'll see them, here, here, here,
2 here, and here. And Jim can tell you about these,
3 because they're to go to the board -- in other
4 words, water and sewer board -- as part of sites for
5 future tank, water tank sites.

6 We have completed, for three of those
7 sites, a clearance on those, and we have submitted a
8 removal report to ADEM. We did that back in July
9 and we're waiting. Again, that's another one we're
10 waiting for your -- for your requirement -- your
11 review on.

12 The dog kennel area, which -- I don't
13 believe we have a separate map for that. Just go
14 back to the reuse plan map, the first one.

15 It's an area down in here, which
16 Auburn University -- or the Auburn folks -- help me
17 out here -- what's their real name? It's Auburn's
18 training site for dogs -- wanted to use for kennels.
19 It was originally used by the MP School as a kennel
20 for the dog training, for training for dog drug
21 interdiction. And they wanted to use it for the
22 same thing.

23 We did a clearance out there, surface

1 clearance out there. Don't know what the status is
2 with the JPA, in terms of their negotiations with
3 Auburn, for use of that facility. Know they were
4 doing some work out there, but it -- we did a
5 complete report on that. The site's available for
6 temporary use. It's only good for a year, so -- but
7 I can't tell you what the status is with the JPA, in
8 between Auburn and JPA, in terms of its use, but
9 it's available from the Army's standpoint. And you
10 can read my notes as to what's going on.

11 The Charlie area, again, that's this
12 green area here. It's been transferred to
13 Fish & Wildlife Service. We did complete a draft
14 final report in the Charlie area. And that draft
15 final EE/CA report went out as of the
16 4th of January?

17 MR. ART HOLCOMB: December 29th, I
18 think is when it actually went out.

19 MR. RON LEVY: Actually went out. I
20 thought we didn't do that until (inaudible).

21 MR. ART HOLCOMB: I think the -- went
22 to ADEM. ADEM should have gotten it on the 4th.

23 MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And that has a

1 series of recommendations in it. And that report
2 basically defines, for the most part, surface
3 clearance with anomaly avoidance.

4 I don't have a map showing what that
5 looks like. At some point in the future, certainly,
6 we'll come back with the JPA and brief what that
7 looks like.

8 We do have ongoing discussions with
9 Fish & Wildlife on that document. There are some
10 differences of opinions between Fish & Wildlife and
11 the Army on the document, in terms of the clearance
12 levels and possibly even the characterization.

13 More to follow on that. We will
14 continue talking with Fish & Wildlife and no doubt,
15 when they get through with their review, we will be
16 looking at their comments associated with that
17 document.

18 Again, that's this area here. We've
19 essentially sent in our characterization and now we
20 need to start talking to them about where we're
21 going to end up with that.

22 We talked last -- one of the things
23 about this area, too, that we mentioned before,

1 there was a -- we did a clearance of the roads and
2 fire breaks within the Fish & Wildlife area. We did
3 that to allow Fish & Wildlife to go in there and do
4 a prescribed burn and fire fighting, so the roads
5 were essentially cleared.

6 But as we mentioned during the last
7 brief -- at the last RAB meeting, that there was an
8 issue that came up or a violation that came up.
9 ADEM issued an administrative order against the
10 Army, its contractor, and Fish & Wildlife Service,
11 for violations under state law, RCRA. Essentially,
12 they had gotten information about items, during the
13 clearance, that had been moved off the road into
14 other areas, which is a violation.

15 Part of the administrative order called
16 us to re-investigate certain areas. We did
17 re-investigate those areas. We did find those items
18 in one area. Those items were taken -- were removed
19 and disposed of properly.

20 We also entered into a consent order
21 with ADEM after that, which defined, and which we
22 agreed to, where additional areas were agreed to, to
23 be relooked at, to be re-investigated. And we did

1 complete that re-investigation. We submitted that
2 report -- what's the date on that?

3 MS. SHANA DECKER: December 10th.

4 MR. RON LEVY: What was the date on
5 that, Art? I don't remember.

6 MR. ART HOLCOMB: 22nd, wasn't it?
7 December 22nd.

8 MR. RON LEVY: 22nd.

9 MR. ART HOLCOMB: It was right before
10 Christmas.

11 MR. RON LEVY: The bottom line of the
12 report is: We did not find any additional moved
13 items or items that would have been in violation of
14 the state law. And that's basically what that
15 report says.

16 We're now waiting for ADEM to finish
17 their review of the report and allow us -- give us a
18 relief from their consent order, to get us out from
19 under the consent order.

20 Anybody have any questions about that?

21 MR. JOE McCARY: Were these items moved
22 by construction people or --

23 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Moved by a team of

1 our employees -- former employees, excuse me.

2 MR. RON LEVY: What we discovered -- it
3 was an isolated incident -- one of the teams, in the
4 process of clearing the road, for lack of a better
5 word, did not do what they were supposed to do and
6 took the items out of the road, instead of disposing
7 of them, blowing them or disposing of them the way
8 they should be, put them off on the side of the
9 road.

10 So, we identified all those and they
11 were all removed. So, that really should be -- the
12 Army considers it an isolated incident; one team
13 that just didn't do what they were supposed to have
14 done.

15 And as we re-investigated everything
16 else -- because obviously, the State had concerns as
17 to whether or not that was going on across the areas
18 that were cleared, so -- and we didn't find anymore
19 items. That's the good news.

20 MR. JIM MILLER: (Inaudible) they were
21 well hidden. Just kidding.

22 MR. RON LEVY: The one thing I can tell
23 you is that we had some great help from the State in

1 watching us do this work, redo this work.

2 MR. JIM MILLER: I bet you did.

3 MR. RON LEVY: They were constantly
4 watching the teams as they re-investigated the area.
5 Anything that looked suspicious, whatnot, was looked
6 at seriously and hard, so -- and they were on site.
7 So, we think that we did a good job. And I'm sure
8 ADEM will agree with us, when we get the release in
9 the consent order.

10 In terms of the eastern bypass, again,
11 this piece here has not been transferred to the
12 Alabama Department of Transportation, yet. We did a
13 clearance in there. We submitted that report to the
14 State.

15 We know we've gotten some comments
16 back -- excuse me, we didn't get any comments back,
17 but we submitted the report to the State. We had
18 another issue in there. When we did the clearance,
19 there was a series of grids in there that we didn't
20 do clearance on. There is about forty-eight grids
21 within the eastern bypass, right around this area
22 here, where we didn't do a clearance at.

23 We had discussed it with the BRAC

1 cleanup team. We thought at the time that we
2 would -- because the road was going to be
3 constructed over the top of those grids and the
4 depth of the potential ordnance was such that it
5 might -- we thought it would be better just to go
6 ahead and construct it over the top.

7 Well, since that time, we've had
8 further discussions with ALDOT,
9 Alabama Department of Transportation, and with ADEM,
10 to include with the JPA. We discussed an
11 alternative action to that. We are going to go in
12 there and remove a portion of those grids, where we
13 know construction or the fill material won't exceed
14 four feet in depth.

15 That's where we're at right now. We've
16 prepared, actually, the contract specs, and it's
17 been negotiated. We're ready to execute. We're
18 waiting for the State and for ALDOT to come back
19 with letters that concur with that or provide
20 comment otherwise.

21 We had a meeting. And at the time of
22 the meeting, I believe everybody agreed, so it's
23 something we're kind of waiting on before we

1 execute. The money is there -- or the money will be
2 there, so, we'll be able to complete that.

3 There is another piece -- and can you
4 get a better picture of the eastern bypass again?

5 The forty-eight grids I was telling you
6 about for the ones here in brown, this is one we did
7 not complete the clearance on because of the depth.

8 What happened was, when they
9 constructed Iron Mountain Road, when the Army
10 constructed Iron Mountain Road, they had to put
11 upwards of thirty foot of fill on top of that, Art?

12 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Eighteen feet on
13 average.

14 MR. RON LEVY: On average, eighteen
15 feet of fill on top of an area that once was
16 considered an impact area. So, when we came to this
17 area, because the fill was so large and because what
18 they filled it with was concrete and rebar and all
19 sorts of stuff, it was difficult, from an instrument
20 standpoint, to actually detect what was underneath
21 there. In fact there may not be anything underneath
22 there, but we were unable to actually look down to
23 see if there was anything there. So, those grids

1 never got cleared as part of the rest of this
2 clearance in here.

3 What we're doing now is we went back
4 and we've looked at the construction plans from the
5 State. And basically, there are a number of grids
6 in the southern portion and over here on the west
7 that will actually get removed. And we'll do the
8 investigation and clearance and then refill them.

9 The rest of those, based on their
10 construction limits, will actually be filled over
11 the top. I know there is a trench that goes across
12 part of it. We'll also clear that piece.

13 But our intent here is to only remove
14 that which is not going to be impacted by fill, to
15 the extent of four feet or less. And that's what we
16 discussed with both the State and with ALDOT. It
17 seemed everybody at the time was okay with that.

18 There is some other things within the
19 eastern bypass. These areas here represent small
20 arms firing ranges that impact into the eastern
21 bypass. There is lead issues in there and
22 particularly, in this one right here, we're doing a
23 removal action, to remove the lead that's inside of

1 the eastern bypass portion.

2 The rest will have be to handled --
3 because the ranges actually go out into this white
4 area -- will be handled as a separate action at
5 another time. So, actually, what we're doing is an
6 actual removal here.

7 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Does the
8 clearance on that roadway consider the ultimate
9 installation of possible utilities, say that might
10 be --

11 MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, in fact --

12 MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: -- four to six
13 feet deep?

14 MR. RON LEVY: -- that one trench I
15 was mentioning to you was a utility trench, wasn't
16 it?

17 MR. ART HOLCOMB: Culvert.

18 MR. RON LEVY: Culvert, yeah. One of
19 the things we will do in the future, too, is provide
20 anomaly avoidance or construction support to ALDOT
21 during the time they actually construct it. So, if
22 they run across anything, we'll be there.

23 The land, also, as it transfers, will

1 also transfer with a restriction; it can only be
2 used as a roadway, so you can't go back in there and
3 put residential, if you ever -- if that were to ever
4 happen.

5 MR. JIM MILLER: What if, for instance,
6 a roadway was built, though, and some humble, local
7 utility wanted to come along and bore under the road
8 and put a pipeline in. Is that feasible?

9 MR. RON LEVY: The restrictions
10 require that they have to coordinate for some
11 support on that. They couldn't just put it in
12 there.

13 MR. JIM MILLER: But it's doable?

14 MR. RON LEVY: It will be in the deed,
15 too, that way. Yeah, I'm sure it will be doable,
16 through some sort of anomaly avoidance or
17 construction support provided by the Army.

18 MR. JIM MILLER: See my point, if
19 that's not possible, then that becomes a barrier
20 where you have -- (inaudible) -- to utility systems.

21 MR. RON LEVY: Right. Well, we've
22 been down that road. We realize that that's
23 something that's going to have to be considered, in

1 terms of future development of the road or
2 particular utilities.

3 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Ron, is that
4 issue holding up or slowing down the eastern bypass
5 or is the eastern bypass stuck because of fundings
6 and other issues besides that?

7 MR. RON LEVY: From what I know --
8 from what I know, okay, and again, the State is
9 still trying to buy property up in here. So,
10 they're not even ready, yet. I don't even know
11 about the money issue, but I don't think they've got
12 all their funding, but they're still trying to buy
13 property up on this side over here. And they
14 haven't started work down here in the southern part.

15 MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: But they're not
16 waiting on this issue to be resolved before they can
17 move forward or --

18 MR. RON LEVY: Not that I'm aware of.
19 I mean, they haven't even started down here where
20 they could -- where we've already transferred the
21 property. So, I'm not aware that this is holding
22 anything up, at this point, but somebody else might
23 tell you something different.

1 Moving on, 3X scrap -- T-38, as I told
2 you, was up in this area, in this general area. You
3 heard the JPA's brief, that that's an area that
4 they've got -- we've got -- they've got an RFI
5 that's going to be going on, so they've got
6 additional work that's going on up there, based on
7 groundwater contamination associated with past
8 practices of the Army.

9 Again, we used live agent up there. We
10 decontaminated the agent with various things,
11 solvents that are -- now pose a problem to
12 groundwater. We did some characterization. The
13 characterization is not complete.

14 And the JPA is picking the piece up to
15 complete that. And then we'll have to look at a
16 remedy.

17 But as I mentioned to you, part of that
18 area, several pits up in that area, we had 3X scrap.
19 We completed that 3X scrap and we did a site
20 close-out report.

21 Landfill EE/CA investigations. You
22 heard a lot about landfill EE/CAs from the JPA
23 standpoint.

1 The Army still has responsibility for
2 three fill areas. The stump dump, which is an area
3 right here, it's in the Fish & Wildlife area -- I
4 think I've got it right -- it's right here. It's
5 not a really good map -- we actually put monuments
6 about and around that area that have been done.

7 There is a fill area west of
8 Iron Mountain Road and range nineteen -- and I'm
9 trying to remember exactly, it's somewhere up in
10 here -- and then there is one fill area at range
11 thirty. I'm sorry, Iron Mountain Road -- this one
12 was obliterated. And then the one up here, in this
13 area, here. And we're trying to do a close-out on
14 those.

15 I mentioned the lead removal. I showed
16 you that map that's back in here. We're doing inner
17 removal, associated with the eastern bypass. We
18 began that work.

19 We have done a foot -- we did do a foot
20 clearance on those sites. Apparently, we have not
21 got down to the levels we said we were going to get
22 down to, 880, which is industrial standards. We
23 have to go back in there and do some more work.

1 Right now we're in the process of
2 trying to get money to the contractor to complete
3 that work, but it's inside the eastern bypass.
4 Again, it's in this area here.

5 Former fueling point, I think we've got
6 a map on that, Brenda.

7 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Do you want to
8 pull that one up?

9 MR. RON LEVY: It's really right down
10 the road from our building. This is our building
11 that you're in right here. And it's right here.
12 This historically was a site that the Army used for
13 fueling its fleet of vehicles, everything from GS-80
14 vehicles to tanker trucks, series of tanks within
15 that area.

16 We transferred the property to the JPA.
17 They were going through closure of their -- of the
18 tanks in that area, and as part of their closure,
19 they sampled and obvious contamination being within
20 the soils. We're in the process of removing those
21 soils, because they asked the Army to come back and
22 do that.

23 We've already removed -- well, they've

1 already excavated over twenty-three hundred tons,
2 and we've removed nine hundred out of the area.

3 We're still thinking there is another
4 five tons of soil we're going to have to remove.
5 We're waiting on a re-programming action, so the
6 funds -- so that we can get back in there and
7 complete the work. And then we'll provide the
8 information to JPA for their site tank closure, so
9 they can submit that to the State.

10 So, if you walk down the road here,
11 you'll see those soils that we've already removed.
12 They're under plastic. And they're waiting for us
13 to complete the rest of that removal. Again, we're
14 still waiting on funds, but we expect those
15 within -- should be within this month, so we can get
16 back to work out there.

17 M1.01 parcel and M3, miscellaneous
18 property. You heard Shana talk about their
19 oversight work that they're doing. There is a piece
20 in here -- this blue piece and that tan piece, there
21 is areas in here that initially, we did a clearance,
22 a one foot clearance in.

23 The State took exception, in the sense

1 that they didn't think that we had done an adequate
2 job or they weren't sure that there was -- actually,
3 the issue was whether or not there was something
4 below one foot that we didn't get. So, we said we
5 did a clearance that was adequate, given the area.

6 We had a meeting back in September.
7 And what we agreed to with the State was to go back
8 in and look at six more grids. We would go in there
9 and re-sample six more grids. And pending the
10 outcome of that, looking at -- looking below a foot,
11 pending the outcome of that, we could either prove
12 or disapprove that there was additional clearance
13 needed. And that's really the bottom line of that.

14 At this point, we're probably about,
15 what, 60 percent completed, Todd?

16 MR. TODD BIGGS: 67, somewhere in
17 there.

18 MR. RON LEVY: In terms of looking at
19 grids. We have not found any UXO items, at this
20 point. We have found OE items, but they're not --
21 but they were inert practice items, which don't
22 imply there was an impact area. So, I think the
23 work's going well.

1 We haven't found anything that's truly
2 a surprise, at this point, is the best I could say.
3 And hopefully, we'll get that completed the end of
4 this week and produce the report and submit it to
5 the State and then listen back, in terms of what
6 they want to tell us.

7 This area again, is important to the
8 JPA. They call it the golden triangle. They want
9 to develop it, so, getting the State to agree that
10 it is clear and that they can go in there and start
11 their construction is paramount to the Army and to
12 the JPA.

13 Finding of suitability for transfers.
14 Highway 21. There is a piece of Highway 21 -- if
15 you remember in the past, I briefed that this --
16 Highway 21 runs along the periphery of the
17 installation -- was Army property or at least most
18 of it was Army property. And we've provided
19 essentially an easement for the State to build their
20 road. So, we had to go back, after we did all this,
21 and we realized that it was just an easement, as
22 opposed to actually transfer. We had to go back and
23 work the actual property transfer.

1 There is a piece up in the north that's
2 associated with the landfill three, and the
3 groundwater contamination's under investigation,
4 that has not been transferred. But there is also --
5 and that will come at a -- that we'll know at a
6 later date. But there is a piece down here, in the
7 south, in this general vicinity, that we're working
8 to transfer now. It's about 4.63 acres. And that
9 deed has been prepared and it's working its way
10 through.

11 And then for eastern bypass, tract
12 three, I told you what we've got, we've got an inner
13 removal for lead and we've got the forty-eight grids
14 that we're still working on, but we've got a FOST
15 out there and we're continuing to work towards a
16 transfer of that last piece to the State, to ALDOT.

17 With that, I'll take any other
18 questions about work or anything else that's going
19 on around Fort McClellan? Okay. Thank you.

20 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Let's see. TAPP
21 report?

22 MR. RON LEVY: Doesn't come from me. I
23 don't see Ron Grant here tonight.

1 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: He's supposed
2 to be here.

3 MR. RON LEVY: Most of you know
4 Ron Grant is the TAPP coordinator, which is
5 technical assistance for you guys. He's under
6 contract. He's reviewing -- right now he's
7 reviewing the Bravo EE/CA and probably will present
8 that at the April RAB meeting, next quarter.

9 At this point, he's been billing on a
10 monthly basis for attending meetings and for doing
11 these reviews. And for the year, there is still
12 about ninety-five -- about ten thousand dollars --
13 nine thousand, nine hundred and fifty dollars, that
14 he can bill us. And he bills at a hundred dollars
15 an hour. So, document reviews are costed against
16 that.

17 Now, he's here also to support you.
18 And he's not here tonight -- I don't know why he's
19 not -- but he can take questions. And he's here to
20 support the RAB. He's not an Army asset, so much
21 as he's a RAB asset, from a technical standpoint,
22 can answer questions or can look into things, based
23 upon the funding that he's got to this point.

1 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Thank you. And a
2 TOSC report?

3 MR. RON LEVY: We don't have the folks
4 here from TOSC today, so I can't tell you on that.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Okay. So, no report
6 there.

7 Upcoming programs? As you mentioned,
8 Ron Grant could be reviewing the Bravo area EE/CA
9 for us next time.

10 MR. RON LEVY: Uh-huh.

11 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Is there anything
12 else you want to see at the next meeting? I'll put
13 it up to the committee.

14 If possible, could we see a result of
15 your re-interpretation of landfill three geological
16 analysis? Would that be available?

17 MR. STEVE YOUNG: Might be. Certainly
18 be glad to do it, if it is.

19 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Okay. Anything else
20 anybody wanted to hear about?

21 MR. RON LEVY: I tell you that this is
22 your chance, the RAB belongs to you all and you
23 should be directing the Army or us to present things

1 that you're interested in hearing about, instead of
2 just waiting for the Army to tell you things. If
3 you've got concerns and questions, let us know and
4 we can address them at future RAB meetings. Or if
5 you want something covered particularly that you're
6 interested in, let us know.

7 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Okay. Audience
8 comments? Can we go around the room, and any
9 comments from the audience? No comments.

10 The next meeting is scheduled for
11 April 18th. I assume that's another Monday at 6:30.
12 Sound all right to everybody? April 18th.

13 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Do they want a
14 pre-brief?

15 DR. DAVID STEFFY: Oh, yes, there is a
16 possibility that the committee could come and get a
17 preview of Ron Grant's presentation before he
18 actually presents it at the meeting. Do you want to
19 come early and receive a preview of his
20 presentation? I see one no. I don't think so. Am
21 I stepping out of bounds here?

22 MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Before the RAB
23 wanted to discuss whatever Ron Grant was reviewing

1 without the members -- without the audience here.

2 So, that was just something that you all used to do.

3 If you don't want to do it, that's great.

4 MR. JIM MILLER: A particular issue.

5 DR. DAVID STEFFY: All right. Is that
6 it?

7 MR. RON LEVY: That's it.

8 DR. DAVID STEFFY: The meeting's
9 adjourned. Thank you for coming.

10 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

2 STATE OF ALABAMA)

3 CALHOUN COUNTY)

4

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

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

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have

4

hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at

5

Anniston, Alabama, on this the

6

21st of February, 2005.

7

8

9

10

11

12

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE

13

Notary Public in and for

14

Alabama at Large

15

16

17

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2005.

18

19

20

21

22

23