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 17th day of October, 2005, commencing at approximately 5:00 p.m.

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

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

CAPTION SHEET 1

REPORTER'S INDEX 2

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD. 3-60

CERTIFICATE 61-62

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

MR. GARY HARVEY: As it is right now, we don't have a quorum. We'll go ahead and call the roll. Dr. Steffy is not going to be here today. He's excused. So if you would just go ahead and answer your name, please.

Cheryl Bragg?

MS. CHERYL BRAGG: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: James Buford? Phillip Burgett is excused.

MR. DEL FERGUSON: I'm here in place of him.

COURT REPORTER: And your name, please, sir?

MR. DEL FERGUSON: Del Ferguson.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Monty is here. I saw him.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Pete Conroy? Dr. Cox?

DR. BARRY COX: Here, sir.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Mr. Elser?

MR. JERRY ELSER: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Curtis Franklin not here, a pretty obvious one.

James Hall, I see he's excused. Dr. Harrington said she would be late.

Robert Jackson?

MR. ROBERT JACKSON: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: I saw him over here. Ed Kimbrough? Joe McCary is excused, Jim Miller is excused, and Rodney is sitting in for him. Penn Wilson?

MR. PENN WILSON: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: And Greg Schank is not here.

So, Doyle Brittain? No. Ron Levy is here.

MR. RON LEVY: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Brandy Little?

MS. BRANDY LITTLE: Here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: And LaBarron, right? Is it LaBarron Rudolph?

MR. LaBARRON RUDOLPH: Yes, sir.

MR. GARY HARVEY: He's here. And James Buford is here.

Still no quorum, right, Brenda?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Right.

MR. GARY HARVEY: We don't have a quorum, so I don't believe we can do any official business, but I don't know how much official we have except approval of the minutes.

I guess we'll start off first with introduction of guests. We'll go around the table and start over here. Just go around and let everybody know who you are.

MR. RON GRANT: I'm Ron Grant, the TAPP contractor.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson, Transition Force.

MR. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, Transition Force.

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

MR. STEVE MORAN: Steve Moran, Shaw Environmental.

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

MR. PAUL JAMES: Paul James,

Fort McClellan, Army National Guard Training Center.

MR. RANDY McBRIDE: Randy McBride with Shaw Environmental.

MR. TROY WHITON: Troy Whiton, Shaw Environmental.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda Cunningham, Transition Force.

MR. JEROME ELSER: Jerome Elser.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Pardon?

MR. JEROME ELSER: Jerome Elser.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Okay.

MS. CHERYL BRAGG: Cheryl Bragg.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Just for the people here in the back.

MR. RODNEY OWENS: Rodney Owens.

MR. PENN WILSON: Penn Wilson.

MR. LaBARRON RUDOLPH: Labarron Rudolph with ADEM.

MS. BRANDY LITTLE: Brandy Little, ADEM.

MR. RON LEVY: Ron Levy.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Gary Harvey.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN:

Monty Clendenin.

MR. JAMES BUFORD: James Buford.

DR. BARRY COX: Barry Cox.

MR. BOB JACKSON: Bob Jackson.

MR. DEL FERGUSON: Del Ferguson.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Thank you.

We can't approve the minutes, but they are in your books, so you can read them for next time.

Does anybody have any additions they want to put in the minutes? Just tell us before you leave and look at them. We won't approve them because we don't have a quorum.

New members, is it one?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Just one.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Next, old business, applicants for RAB members, there is a form in your book, and if you have any suggestions, we would like to put the name down and give it to Brenda, and we will contact them.

You've not gotten any since last meeting, have you, Brenda?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: No, sir.

MR. GARY HARVEY: So, if you have any suggestions, if you would, just put a name down there. If you know a number or an e-mail, give it to Brenda, and we'll contact them.

The next item on the program and the first up is going to be Ron Grant. This is something some of the members asked for?

MR. RON LEVY: Yeah, this something that -- this is one of the many sites that we're at the RI stage of the investigation. I'm going to let Ron talk to you, but essentially, it's a series of ranges along Iron Mountain Road but have been through an RI investigation, it's at the draft stage now. Ron is going to present to you that document, in terms of the findings in that document, and take any questions about that document.

We've also got representatives here from the Corps and from Shaw. So, if you've got any specific questions about contaminants at the site, site conditions, let us know, and we'll do what we can to address your questions.

MR. RON GRANT: Ready?

MR. RON LEVY: Go ahead, Ron.

MR. RON GRANT: Okay. I want to make sure you can hear me. It sounds like you can.

I've completed my review of the draft remedial investigation for the Iron Mountain Road ranges.

Let's go ahead and go to the next slide.

The primary objectives of the remedial investigation are stated there. You know, I'm not going to bore you to death by reading the charts, you know, unless I think there is some word of explanation that I can add to what's on the chart, you know, I'll throw some of that in as we go through there.

But any time, if you have a question, if something is unclear, by all means, we'll service that at the time, and be willing to back up, if necessary.

But you can see the objectives there. I think that pretty well speaks for itself.

Next slide, Brenda.

Okay. This just lists the various ranges and the parcel numbers. If you'll notice

those, there are actually seven parcels. One of those is unique, in that the very last parcel on there is an above-ground storage tank, as opposed to being a range.

The parcels that have a Q by them -- and there are -- a Q only that is, there is four of those, that means that they have no record of storage, release, or disposal activity. However, chemicals of potential concern may be present due to historical range activity.

And those parcels that have an X designation have the potential for UXO being present.

This just shows the approximate locations of the ranges, relative to one another. They're located in the western portion of the main post. This map that you see over here, showing the main post, they're located -- Iron Mountain Road runs almost north and south, right in this area right here, just south and east of Summerall Gate, and the ranges are located on the eastern side of that road.

MR. GARY HARVEY: And that's the road you take if you're going to Lake Yahoo, for the ones that don't know the names of the roads. If

you're going up to Yahoo, you take Iron Mountain Road.

MR. RON GRANT: Another thing you need to note on this chart that's on the screen there, note that four of the parcels -- there's seven of them total -- but four of them are collocated. If you'll notice the one at the upper left-hand side of the chart, Parcels 222QX and 69Q will occupy essentially the same plot of ground. One is, you know, within the confines of the other.

And then down near the bottom of the chart, Parcel 71Q, which is the Range 13 area, is where the above-ground storage tank is located. And that's for Parcel 176 (7).

Everybody see and understand that? Okay.

They will be -- it's important you understand that, because some of them will be discussed at the same time, since they're talking about essentially the same plot of ground, as opposed to seven different perhaps discussions, as I go through the rest of the report.

Okay. Next slide.

Previous investigations, I think

that's fairly obvious, you know, what those are all about. Just one thing that this RI does, it summarizes the results of all the previous studies that have been done. So, really, we'll touch on all the data that's been gathered in the previous studies and any new data that was gathered in the remedial investigation.

Next slide.

Okay. There's going to be a lot of pieces of information on these next pages. There is actually three slides covering this information describing the individual ranges.

And you'll notice the first piece of information up there is addressing Parcel 69Q and Parcel 222QX, and you'll see Parcel 69, too, the timeframe that it was used, the area involved, and the weapons used. And that same area, that same one point seven acres, you'll see the information there for Parcel 222QX.

Any question about any of that? Okay.

Same things presented then for Range 19. That's called Parcel 75Q, and you'll see the period of time it was used, the number of acres

involved, and the type of weapons that were used there.

The last item listed on the weapons used there is referring to the fact that that area was used as an impact area for thirty-five millimeter projectiles, as opposed to being some hand-held or shoulder-fired weapon.

Next slide.

Notice again, the first item on this chart is collocated ranges, the Range 13 and the above-ground storage tank that was there. And you'll see the same information, the timeframes that were used, the area, and the weapons used.

That above-ground storage tank at Range 13 was originally used as a heating oil tank for an office that was located there at Range 13. During the environmental baseline study, which was referenced earlier, it was reported to be leaking, and that's the reason it has no Q designation.

If you'll notice, everything else has either a Q or a QX designation. But since this one does have a report of a release, that's the reason the Q is not there. It makes it

unique among the seven areas.

Okay. Next slide.

And then this is the last of the ranges mentioned. You see the same information mentioned there, timeframe used, weapons used, area involved.

Next slide.

You know, identified the areas and, you know, generally the timeframes and the area, those kind of things. Now, we'll proceed to the point where we do some walkovers, some testing to try to -- and set up a program and try to see what kind of contamination exists in those areas.

And so, you can see the field investigations that are included, just environmental sampling analysis, installation of groundwater monitoring wells. Easy for me to say.

There were actually eight wells installed. Only six of those will be sampled. I'll point that out later, when we get to some of the actual data, but two of them just had an insufficient amount of water in them to be sampled.

You see the number -- the type of

samples that are collected, you know, surface soil, subsurface soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment samples. Those parens out to the side, that BGS is below ground service is what that stands for, if you have any question about that.

And then sample locations, that kind of reminded me of, you know, some people use this acronym: MBWA, management by walking around. And that's essentially what they did to determine the sample locations, they went out there and walked around and saw, you know, visual evidence of contaminants, the bullet fragments, and of course, they had historical documents that, I'm sure master plan documents, that define the confines of some of the range areas.

Next slide.

This slide just is a summary of the sampling events. If you'll notice the left-hand column shows the date of the sampling event. If you skip all the way over to the next to the last -- I guess the second column from the right, the area sampled, that just gives you the name of the individual ranges that were sampled. And then under

sample type, where the Xs are located there, you'll see the types of samples that were taken from each one, whether or not it was subsurface, depositional, subsoil, what have you.

And notice also that the comments, you know, they'll indicate some of the -- at least in very brief form, the results of some of those -- of the sampling or the types of samples that may have been taken.

Next chart.

This one is a summary of the sample types and the analysis performed. You'll see the left-hand column over there, you know, it lists the type of samples, you know, surface, subsurface, groundwater, etcetera, and it lists the total number of samples taken. And then those other columns that you see out there are samples for lead, target, analyte list, metals, VOCs, or volatile organic compounds, SVOCs, semi-volatile organic compounds.

I can't remember what P/NA is. Oh, yeah, they're down there on the bottom.

That's the perchlorate and nitroaromatic/nitramine explosives. Then we got P/H,

chlorinated and organophosphorus pesticides, and chlorinated herbicides. And then PCBs, you know, I think everybody knows what that one is. And CN is cyanide. And pH, it's determined whether or not it's acidic or basic. And then total organic carbon. That just gives you the numbers associated with each type of sample.

Okay. Next slide.

Nature and extent of contamination. And these will be addressed by whether or not they're surface soil, subsurface soil, groundwater, etcetera. We'll go through them. There is actually sixteen slides associated with this particular subject, nature and extent of contamination. The first group of slides, first group of information comes from surface soil contamination.

You can see the number of samples collected. You can see the lead is pretty well ubiquitous. What's that song I'm thinking about? Santa Clause, he's everywhere, he's everywhere. So, the lead is the same way. I can see my jokes aren't working.

The BSC is background screening

criteria. It's a number that, you know, is used to indicate whether or not there was any human activity in the area, so that if you don't exceed background screening criteria, generally that means that man has not added any contaminants to the area. So, it's naturally occurring. But you can see that criteria was -- exceeded the sediment samples.

The site-specific screening level, you know, you can see it's a significantly higher number, but that's a number that was established just -- can you add the -- can you give them a good definition of what that is, Ron?

MR. RON LEVY: The SSSLs, we've got them for most of the metals where --

Randy, go ahead, help me out.

MR. RANDY McBRIDE: Well, it's based on human health risk factors is where the SSLs come from, and that's opposed to the ESVs, which are the ecological screening values. This is the human health phase.

MR. RON LEVY: But some of those are derived, the EPA -- EPA screening values --

MR. RANDY McBRIDE: Well, the one

for lead, of course, four hundred milligrams per kilogram, comes right out of the EPA, that's for residential soils.

MR. RON GRANT: It's a number, anyway, that the regulators say, okay, you know, this is what we're looking for. If we see levels below this, it's at least one indication that there is no need for a lot of cleanup in that particular -- regarding that particular item. And see, we're only addressing lead here, at this point.

As you can see, of a hundred and twenty samples, it was only exceeded in thirty of those samples. And the maximum concentration, which is just a -- that's more like a trivia question than anything else, it has no particular significance of any kind, other than just, that was in the report, so I put it in here, also. But it was at Range 19, that particular number.

Next slide.

Okay. The reason I put this up here -- you have got a copy of that right there in front of you. The thing I wanted you to see is kind of visual explanation or presentation of the

contamination that exists. These next four slides you see are going to depict the lead concentration at the ranges.

In this particular one, you can see is the skeet range, Parcel 69 and Parcel 222QX.

If you'll look at the legend down in the lower right-hand corner, the one that says surface soil lead contours, you know, where you see the colored chart over here, remember the background screening criteria is 40.05 milligrams per kilogram, so if you see any colored area on the map, you know, any of those colored areas that are depicted on the legend, then all of those will exceed that background screening level.

So, you can look at the coloration on the map, and the only areas that don't exceed that are those that are colored or a color that is not in that little legend over here on the right-hand side of the chart.

And then note also that the site-specific screening level that -- if you recall on the previous chart, it was four hundred milligrams per kilogram, and reading those numbers over here on the

legend again, you'll see that anything that's orange, red, or to me, I call that purple -- it looks more brown here -- but all of those would exceed the site-specific screening level. So, you can see there is, you know, significant areas that fall in that category.

Does that look brown to y'all, that very last one?

MR. GARY HARVEY: It does up there.

MR. RON GRANT: Okay. On this one in front of me, it looked purple.

Okay, next chart.

Just more of the same. I won't go through all of that again. Just so you can see that this is a different range, a different set of ranges, Range 19 and Range 221QX. And you can see the same sort of things exist. You have areas that are extremely high in lead concentration and then lesser concentrations.

4-3, more of the same. 4-4 --

(Greg Schank enters the meeting.)

MR. RON GRANT: 4-4 -- again, this is for range -- each one of those is for a different

set of ranges.

Okay, next slide.

Again, we're still continuing with surface soil contamination. The first data we reported there was just on lead.

Now, for metals other than lead -- and this is metals that are in that target analyte list that was generated by the regulators, you know, metals that might be a health concern or an ecological concern. But of those items on that list, you can see the number detected and essentially what their concentrations were, depending on those screening levels, whether or not they were site-specific or ecological.

And you see VOCs, volatile organic compounds. Same thing for semi-volatile organic compounds, you can see the number of samples analyzed and essentially what the results were.

Next chart.

This is still surface soil, you know, additional things tested for were chlorinated pesticides. You know, you can see that all of those were below the site-specific screening levels, which

is good news in that although all of them exceeded the ecological screening levels, it was random distribution. So, it does -- at least it indicates that there is no concentrated area where those -- that particular contaminant would exist.

And then you see those organophosphorus pesticides. And the good news is there that they were all below the SSSL and the ESV.

Next slide.

Still on surface soil contamination. These tests, you know, chlorinated herbicides were -- and notice all of those results were below the SSSLs and the ESV, and PCBs -- one PCB was detected in three samples, and two of those samples exceeded the ecological screening value.

There's a whole family of PCBs. PCBs could be tailored, depending on what they were being used for, but only one of that family of PCBs was found at this site, which at one time, PCBs were probably -- they were no longer being used for transformers or some sort of coolant in electrical systems.

Unfortunately, sometimes they were

used as a dust palliative on the roads. But it appears that that certainly was not the case here, because the degree there is so slight.

Next slide.

So, we're changing now from surface soil contamination, if you'll notice, to subsurface soil contamination. You'll see the samples collected. And again that's BGS, that little symbol there is greater than, greater than one foot below ground surface. I think the rest of that is pretty well self-explanatory.

You do notice again sort of a trivia question, I guess; the maximum concentration was at Range 19 at thirteen hundred and fifty milligrams per kilogram. And coincidentally or not, that other sample that we reported as being the very highest surface sample was also at Range 19. I'm not sure what you can draw from that. It's just --

MR. GARY HARVEY: We shot a lot of lead into Range 19. It was a pistol range.

MR. RON GRANT: In the test -- you need to remember that. When I get through, I'm going to give you the test, you need to remember that, both

those highest samples were at Range 19.

Metals other than lead, again, this is in the subsurface soils. Keep those in mind. You see the results there.

Next slide. Still in the subsurface soil. You know, we see the results of the VOC testing. I'm going to go through these pretty quickly, unless somebody says stop. You see the results of the semi-volatiles. Only one of those -- all of those were below the SSL except the (benzo(a) pyrene). Anybody -- maybe Barry can tell us.

I had organic chemistry about fifty years ago, and I don't remember the significance of the (a) in there. Can you tell us that? It won't be on the test.

DR. BARRY COX: Actually, I'm an inorganic chemist.

MR. RANDY McBRIDE: Well, the pyrene is a ring structure, so it's got carbons in a ring basically, and there are several different shapes that that ring can take with different things that are attached to it. Benzo(a), just refers to a benzene sitting off of that pyrene ring. So, it just refers

to the structure of the compound there.

Benzo(a)pyrene, for example, has a different toxicity than other pyrenes. That's why it's called (inaudible).

MR. RON GRANT: Okay. Well, the good news is: There doesn't appear to be a lot of it.

Okay. And then you see the last one on there, what the three samples were and what they were analyzed for, and none of those were detected.

Next slide.

We've switched over now to groundwater contamination. You see six samples collected -- I'll remind you, the reason only six were taken was, you know -- of the eight wells they put in, two of them really didn't have a sufficient amount of water to sample. The good news there, you know, all of those things that were detected were concluded they were naturally occurring.

Same thing -- you know, the VOCs, again, good news, all the VOCs detected were below the site-specific screening levels.

Next chart.

Continuing groundwater

contamination, got a non detect on semi-volatiles. Only one of the nitroaromatic explosive compounds exceeded the site-specific screening level and no perchlorates found.

Next chart.

We've gone from groundwater to surface water contamination now. You can see the results there. Nothing startling there.

Questions?

Next chart.

Continuing on with the surface water contamination. You can see two non detects on both those analyses.

You know, we've switched from surface water to sediment contamination. You can see that lead, you know, is found. And again, you know, lead, you recall, it was ubiquitous in the surface soil samples, and it's also found in -- I think you can probably get an idea where the recommendations are going to go because of the findings associated with lead.

Next chart.

Metals other than lead, you can see

the numbers there and for the other two analytes, you can see that none detected.

Next one.

We've gotten, you know, this analytical data, and now we're going to determine what are the -- come to some conclusion about what the sources of contamination are. Because of the use of these areas, it's pretty obvious that there, you know, the bullets, bullet fragments and shot, and the types of those items that were found at these sites are the rifle, copper jacketing and non-jacketing and shotgun pellets.

And again, it says most of the contaminants comes from the non-jacketed rounds and the shotgun pellets, because apparently, the copper jacketing provides a protective coating around the lead projectiles, and it doesn't dissolve or go into the environment as readily as the jacketed bullet does.

Next slide.

The conclusions from the streamlined health risk assessments. Quickly, it says there is no unacceptable threat to the recreational user, but that

lead, antimony, and arsenic do pose a concern from the groundskeeper, construction worker, and on-site resident.

Next slide.

We've gone to the baseline ecological risk assessment. Summary statement there in that first one, it just says that all three of those media surface soil, surface water, and sediment have the potential to pose adverse effects to sensitive ecological receptors.

And the next one just says that they have developed risk-based remedial goals, you know, for the various items that are listed there, those metals and particulate lead density, where there are a lot of lead particles lying around in the areas on all the ranges.

If you're interested, I have those risk-based remedial goals. You can look it up on your own or I can get you a copy of it. They're on tables 8-5 and 8-6 in the report. So, if anybody needs those, I'll be glad to furnish them to you.

Okay, next one.

And the next one is conclusions.

Like I said, I thought the first conclusion up there was pretty obvious in the direction we've been going, metal contamination is a major source of environmental concern. Obvious source, contamination is mostly limited to the zero to one foot area, and recommendation is to go ahead and do a feasibility study to develop those alternatives necessary to ensure protection of human health and environment.

Questions? Yes, sir.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I can imagine an old automobile out in the woods, you know, oxidizing and deteriorating and eventually just rusting away to nothing, you know, and it will always be there. But does lead do that? Does lead deteriorate, or would it always be there?

MR. RON GRANT: No. You know, there is a threat associated with it oxidizing, and gradually -- I have no idea at what rate, but, yeah, it would -- you know, if it laid there long enough, if it laid there for eternity, you would get to the point where you had no, you know --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: But eventually --

MR. RON GRANT: -- no lead particles that were visible anymore. They would all be dissolved into the soil.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: A lot slower than iron?

MR. RON GRANT: I don't know what the rate of oxidation would be between it and iron. I would guess yes, because lead is a much more inert material than iron is, but I couldn't give you a number associated with that.

MR. RON LEVY: You want to speak to that, Randy, at all?

MR. RANDY McBRIDE: Well, I can just say that you can see the evidence of that at the skeet range for instance, where you've got small lead articles from shotgun pellets, where we went out and sampled originally about eight years ago, you can find them in a pretty good concentration on the surface.

But now, you go out there and try to find them, you can't, because a lot of them have basically dissolved into the soil.

So, yeah, over time you will see degradation.

MR. RON GRANT: There is a statement in there -- I don't think I mentioned it, you know -- regarding the ecological receptors and the fact that those lead pellets, even the smallest pieces around, pose a threat to some of the birds in the area because they're going to peck around and get stuff and get in their craw, as part of their digestive processes, and so they do -- those lead particles do pose a threat to some of the birds in the area because of it, but that's all in the list of, you know, ecological risk assessments.

Am I done?

MR. RON LEVY: Anymore questions?

I would like to just say, Ron pointed out that we're walking through a process here. This is the RI phase, and we're going to move into a feasible study, which essentially looks at what technologies are out there to address the risk associated with human health and the environment. So what do clean-up levels look like, and what technology will be used is still to come.

Obviously, you can see from some of those plats that Ron showed up there that we've got

significant lead concentrations on the ground, in the soils, and will have to be addressed as part of the feasibility study.

MR. GARY HARVEY: And if I can add, I mean, it's not much of a surprise, they've defined the nature and extent, those were -- 19 was a pistol range, the MPs qualified on pistols. Every MP that came through here from all the time they were here, back in what -- '70s, when they came here, until they left in '99, that range was used three, four, five times a week, and those are unjacketed rounds, pistol rounds. That's why you see a lot of them left there.

And if I can, for the record, Ron, before Brenda slaps me, she's fixing to jack slap me, I need to mention for the record that Greg Schank came in, and Dr. Harrington is in, too.

MR. RON LEVY: One other thing, too, this is probably typical of what we're seeing at the other series of ranges we've got. We've got ranges on Baby Baines Gap Road, Baines Gap Road, and Choccolocco Corridor, and other places within the base that we're doing the same type of study. And we're looking at, and we're seeing similar results, in terms

of types of contaminants, lead being out there. So, you'll see more of that in the future, I'm sure. Some of that, the JPA has got, working with it.

MR. GARY HARVEY: You'll notice those ranges are all up against the (inaudible). You see the contour lines. It's all pretty concentrated where we shot the pistols into the side of the hill.

So, where the range started out as a great big thing, maybe fifteen hundred acres, comes down to just a few acres, where the lead was captured. Not much of it got out.

Thanks, Ron.

Okay. Next, agency reports, ADEM, what you got?

MS. BRANDY LITTLE: Well, with the recent departure of Shana Decker, I and LaBarron Rudolph, we're going to share the project manager duties, as far as ADEM is concerned, but due to her swift departure, we have not prepared the agency report for tonight.

MR. GARY HARVEY: For those of you that don't know, Shana Decker was the project manager for ADEM for us here at Fort McClellan, she's left,

took another job in Birmingham somewhere, was it?

MS. BRANDY LITTLE: (Nods head.)

MR. GARY HARVEY: And so, these are the new guys. They've been here before. They're going to be the project manager now.

EPA, Doyle is not here, right?

Okay. So then, that gets us to Greg.

MR. GREG SCHANK: JPA, in the last quarter, we completed additional characterization at the T-6 site and the T-38 site, which included installation of some additional monitoring wells, sampling the new and some of the existing monitoring wells, surface soil samples, sediment samples, and surface water samples.

This was done to get a better understanding of the contamination at these sites so then that now we can design the remediation that will go along with these sites.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Can I interrupt you?

MR. GREG SCHANK: Sure.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Does everybody

know what T-38 is, the old toxic gas yard, where we did the removal of chemicals and give you a report on that, up on Rosenbar Ridge (phonetic)? We removed the chemicals, the toxic agent-type stuff, and now Greg is finishing up the characterization of the site.

And T-6 is what, Howitzer Hill? I'm a real old guy, and these things had different names before y'all renamed them. It was Howitzer Hill when I was an enlisted guy out here, and that's over --

MR. GREG SCHANK: Sorry, I didn't bring a map.

MR. GARY HARVEY: -- across from the starships.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Right.

MR. GARY HARVEY: That's okay. We'll show them.

MR. GREG SCHANK: That's fine. I noticed on the Army's brief they talked about the ESCA modification, so, I won't go into that.

We're working on the Alpha area supplemental EE/CA. We've seen an internal draft of that document. They're addressing Matrix comments right now, and it will be submitted to the Army and to

ADEM once those comments are addressed.

We've completed a MET contract selection process, and we have selected a MET contractor. ECC was successful in that bidding. And that's to do cleanup in the Alpha area, Baines Gap Road, the industrial access road, and a very small portion of the Bravo area.

An action memorandum was approved by ADEM for the Alpha area cleanup. We're in the process of doing an Alpha -- or an action memorandum for Baines Gap, and we'll probably have to do one for the industrial access road to Bravo area, also.

Once the action memorandum gets through the Army and ADEM -- the Army also reviewed the Alpha area cleanup action memorandum -- then an environmental safety submission has to go to the Department of Defense --

MR. GARY HARVEY: DDESB, Department of Defensive Explosive Safety Board.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Right. Once it's approved by them, then we can begin clearing these areas.

We have started looking at the

requirements for capping Landfill 3 and the fill area of Northwest Reilly. Landfill 3 is in the very northwestern portion of the base and directly adjacent to it is the fill area of Northwest Reilly.

That area will be clear-cut, and then an engineered cap will be put on both of those fill areas. We expect that to begin probably in December, maybe January.

That's about all that we have going right now. If anyone has any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Is it just going to be a cap on landfill three or going to be chemicals in the ground, too?

MR. GREG SCHANK: We eventually will put chemicals in the ground, once -- we have some further characterization we want to do up there to get a better handle on the contamination before we design the remediation system. But, yes, we will be putting a remediation system in place on top of that, on that landfill.

Yes, sir?

DR. BARRY COX: Since JPA has taken

over a lot of the environmental remediation, could we get the action summary sheet in writing from the JPA, just like we do from the Army?

MR. GREG SCHANK: Sure.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. RON LEVY: That's only fair.

MR. GREG SCHANK: I'll have that for you at the next meeting.

DR. BARRY COX: Appreciate it.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Okay. Any questions of Greg while he's here?

MR. PENN WILSON: What substance do you make the cap -- what is that made from?

MR. GREG SCHANK: Once the -- I don't know if you're familiar with Landfill 3. Landfill 3 was a trench-and-fill landfill. I don't know exactly how many trenches were out there, but if you ever get out there, you can actually see the trenches, because they differentially settled.

So, we'll clear-cut that, get all the vegetation off of it, they'll totally level it, but then what they use is clay. They'll come in and compact clay. It has to be to a certain density and a

certain permeability, and that's all -- you know, the State, you know, drives those parameters.

I do believe that once they put the engineered clay cap on that they're going to asphalt that. There is some discussion about a driving course for that -- you know, the police are out here having their academy, and there is some discussion with them about perhaps making their driving course on top of that after we cap it.

MR. GARY HARVEY: You know where Landfill 3 is?

MR. PENN WILSON: Yeah.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Back behind the old WAC building, the WAC area.

MR. PENN WILSON: Yeah, I used to run it, walk it.

MR. RON LEVY: Right --

MR. GARY HARVEY: I figured if I explained that part, you'd know where it was.

MR. RON LEVY: Right behind Mr. Jackson's head, that's -- point to it.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Landfill 3, right by the highway.

MR. PENN WILSON: Thank you.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Ron, you got the action summary sheet?

MR. RON LEVY: Yes. And everybody has got a copy of that, and I won't bore you to death by going through all the details of it. I'll just recap a few things concerning the Bravo area and the Bravo EE/CA, that was sent in draft to ADEM. We did receive extensive comments back from ADEM back in March.

Subsequently, the Army has submitted responses back on the 3rd of August, and then ADEM sent some additional comments related to the document. We wanted them to focus on those areas, which we believe was no further action first, and that's what they did.

And then they came back with additional comments for the other areas. And the Army is still working in responses. We've had meetings with ADEM, I think pretty good meetings with ADEM, and I think we're moving along in the right direction, in terms of getting somewhere.

Hopefully, at some point, we can

define -- fully define those areas that do require some sort of removal action, and those that don't.

Other areas in the Bravo EE/CA area, the water tank sites and the other sites that were identified for future storage tank locations for the water board, total of nineteen acres. There are several sites that -- there were a couple of sites that we did a removal action on. We submitted that removal action report back in July -- excuse me, back in May, and ADEM came back in July with some comments, and we're working through the comments on that.

In the Charlie area, I think really there has been no change per se in the Charlie area, in terms of the project, other than the fact that we're working to complete action on Baines Gap Road removal. This is in support of public use of the road. Both us and the JPA is working a piece of that, as well.

Our piece is that which falls within the Fish & Wildlife Area, since it's still an Army piece that will continue. There has been a contract let for that, about nineteen acres. Right now, the work plan is out, so ADEM has been -- we submitted a

copy of the work plan to ADEM back in October, so we're hoping that will move smoothly, and we're hoping we can put to action within the next eight months, Dan -- within the next eight months.

The Eastern Bypass, the one thing that's been done that's still left is the tract three piece. We had a construction debris area scenario where we weren't able to fully characterize the area because of all the construction debris that was in the ground, including rebar and heavy concentrations of concrete and other rubble.

At the time we did the initial investigation, as we further discussed it with ALDOT and ADEM, we determined that there was certain areas that we did need to go in and look at where there was going to be fill of four feet or less.

Field work began in May. It was completed in August. The draft removal report is being worked right now internally with the Army. Hopefully, that will come out soon to ADEM.

MR. GARY HARVEY: That's the last bit of UXO work for the Eastern Bypass.

MR. RON LEVY: With that done, we're

hoping we can FOST it and turn it over to ALDOT --

MR. GARY HARVEY: Uh-huh.

MR. RON LEVY: -- within this calendar year, within this fiscal year.

DR. BARRY COX: What is the projected completion of the bypass?

MR. GARY HARVEY: Oh, I think it's moved way out. The latest proposal I've heard, Barry, with -- I don't know the status of it. ALDOT was going to meet with the community. You know, they got about thirty-one million dollars, you remember, less than they thought, which is still quite a bit for a new congressman to get -- thirty-one million, which is not enough to do the whole thing.

So, there was a proposal on the table that JPA made. And all I know is about the proposal -- I don't know if anybody has agreed to it, yet -- was rather than come all the way through and not finish the whole thing, maybe come back to Iron Mountain Road, do a complete highway to Iron Mountain Road, so they would have access to Greg's industrial access road, so you would at least have connectivity to the interstate.

MR. RON LEVY: The proposal was this area down here.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Right. Right out there to Iron Mountain Road or Ten-Mile Road there.

MR. RON LEVY: That's where the industrial access --

MR. GARY HARVEY: And that's where the industrial access road will go out, Barry.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. GARY HARVEY: And so, the idea was: If you only got thirty-one million, why not just complete that whole thing and then work on getting the money for the rest.

Now, I don't know where that stands. I wasn't at the meeting between ALDOT and JPA. It seemed to makes sense from developing this place.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: On the other end, does anybody have any idea how many more times they're going to resurface that road that goes in front of the middle school, and when that will be opened up?

MR. GARY HARVEY: The New Summerall Gate Road?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Is that what it's called?

MR. GARY HARVEY: That's the New Summerall Gate Road. A lot of people think that's the Eastern Bypass, but it's not. It's the New Summerall Gate Road. It's a new exit for the southern part -- Summerall Gate Road, the original one gets taken over by the Eastern Bypass. This will be the new entrance to Fort McClellan.

That was the Flying J. Remember the Flying J?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Yeah. But I've seen them resurface it about forty times.

MR. GARY HARVEY: They've been building it up, but I thought I saw a paint stripe right there today at lunch.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Is there a plan to open it?

MR. ROBERT JACKSON: If that's the turning lane, he's painted it today.

MR. GREG SCHANK: It's my understanding the Mayor wanted that open as soon as possible.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Will that come out by the soccer field?

MR. GREG SCHANK: Yes.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Yeah.

I understood they're trying to open it sometime this fall, but I don't have any date.

MR. PENN WILSON: We kind of tracked that, where I work at JSU, and we had some charts for a presentation a couple of weeks ago, and we checked with ALDOT, and they said winter of this year. So, it's soon, I believe.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Yes.

MR. RON LEVY: Concerning Iron Mountain Road ranges, this is what Ron Grant just briefed you on, the RI for Iron Mountain Road ranges, along the eastern part of the Eastern Bypass. There is about four acres of one of those ranges. And it's Range 12, I believe, is in the very southerly portion that actually fell within the bypass area.

And since our focus is to get that property cleaned and over to ALDOT as soon as possible, we focused on a removal action, interim removal action in that area.

And we did complete the removal action, provided a draft report to ADEM in May. ADEM's provided us comments back, and we're working on preparing a response to those comments on that draft removal action report.

A little bit about the ESCA that I can talk to you about, most of you know that -- and for those of you who don't know, the Army entered into an agreement with the Joint Powers Authority for cleanup or portions of cleanup of Fort McClellan. A majority of that area sits within the Alpha. As most of you know, the Alpha area is that yellow area up here.

There has been some changes associated with that since the initial application of that in '03 --

MR. GARY HARVEY: '03.

MR. RON LEVY: -- September of '03. There's been a modification. One of -- that modification includes some areas in the Bravo and some reworking of areas in the Alpha, in and around the Alpha, from a prioritization standpoint. And it also had to do with the fact that congressionally there was

a change in the requirement of the way funding had to be done, there was a two-year restriction on that.

So, this being the end of the two years, we had to go in and redo the document. Suffice to say that we've now entered into a new one and added additional cleanup. Approximately, an additional six hundred million -- excuse me -- six million -- that's a lot --

MR. GARY HARVEY: We wish we had six hundred million.

MR. RON LEVY: Approximately, an additional six million went to the JPA for the cleanup of these additional sites. If anybody is interested in seeing what that looks like, I can send you a map of that by e-mail. And that is all I've got.

MR. GARY HARVEY: The significance of that, in the authorization bill that no one noticed, became a requirement the ESCA could only be for two years, so, we were lucky we got it renegotiated, and didn't lose any of the money, because that all of a sudden put up a risk when it runs out, and all the money was plowed back in, so nobody lost. In fact, JPA gained an additional six

million and more responsibility for the cleanup.

MR. RON LEVY: Any questions?

DR. BARRY COX: Ron, what is the -- I noticed some e-mails from Doyle -- but what is the -- could you summarize the issues there?

MR. RON LEVY: On what? On --

MR. GARY HARVEY: On bullets?

DR. BARRY COX: Yeah. The one that I think we all got a couple, Doyle Brittain sent out.

MR. GARY HARVEY: (Inaudible.)

MR. RON LEVY: I'm not sure. I can't remember, myself. Can you --

DR. BARRY COX: Do we have any idea when Doyle will be back?

MR. RON LEVY: Doyle is back, and we're talking to him. And we do have some discussion ongoing about the geochemical analysis and risks ongoing. I don't know that we've hit any impasse. We're still talking about it. There is still lots of discussion going on.

Some of the geochemical stuff has been resolved with ADEM. We've kind of gotten through -- there may be a difference with EPA, but

we've got an agreement from the part of ADEM. So, ADEM being the lead regulatory authority here, we've moved ahead on some of that stuff.

Other parts concerning the metals and the risk, you know, we're still talking through that. ADEM has still got the same kinds of concerns as EPA, and we haven't finished concluding where we're going to go.

DR. BARRY COX: Do we expect Doyle to be back? I guess that's a general question. Do we expect him to be back any time soon?

MR. RON LEVY: Doyle is back. Doyle is back.

DR. BARRY COX: Back at our meetings is what I was --

MR. RON LEVY: Well, Doyle's problem is funding, and the ability to get travel dollars to come here. I haven't heard him tell me that he's going to be attending future meetings. I think what he basically said, unless he gets more funding, he's not going to be able to attend the meetings.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

MR. GARY HARVEY: We don't have a

TAPP or TOSC --

MR. RON LEVY: No TOSC.

MR. GARY HARVEY: -- no TAPP report, no TOSC.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, I'll give you the TAPP report. For those of you who don't know, TAPP is the technical assistance -- help me out here. What does that stand for? Technical assistance --

MR. RON GRANT: Public participation.

MR. RON LEVY: -- public participation. Dollars that are provided by the Army to the RAB, so that they can bring -- so that you can bring in a person, a technical person, which happens to be Ron Grant, to help explain some of the technical aspects of the cleanup.

And that's what Ron has been doing, particularly in the case of the RI that he briefed.

We're limited in terms of the dollars that can be spent on that, essentially, twenty-five thousand dollars a year. Ron Grant has been under a contract. He had a base period. Now he's in his option year.

We didn't spend all the dollars in the base year. Some of that's rolled over. There is about -- since -- well, since the last -- since the start of the new option year, he's spent about nine hundred and seventy-five dollars, about nine point seven five hours working off of about an eighteen thousand, five hundred dollars worth of effort. Ron bills against that based on participation at the RAB, reviews of documents, and other things. And we track it in accordance with Army policy.

But he's here for your support. If you've got questions, Ron can do the research for you, bill it against the contract. That's what he's here to do, to be able to try to lead you through the technical stuff and help put that in laymen's terms so you can better understand what's going on with the cleanup.

MR. GARY HARVEY: So, if you've got anything that's burning right now you want him to look at, say so or just send Brenda or Ron or I an e-mail, letter, or whatever, what you want him to look at. I mean, this briefing today is what y'all wanted him to look at.

If you want another one, different topic, whatever, just say it. He's here for y'all. And it don't have to be right now, just fire us off an e-mail, phone call, a "hey you" will do.

MR. RON LEVY: That's all I've got.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Okay.

MR. RON LEVY: Upcoming programs --

MR. GARY HARVEY: I'm not sure we have any.

MR. RON LEVY: We want to ask Greg when he may be available to do the Landfill 3 analysis that he's been talking about.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Yeah. I don't have an answer for you right now. The last time I checked with Steve Young out in Denver, he did not have anything prepared on that, yet. And I'm not sure if he -- you know, we are going back out there to put -- to do some more characterization, put some more wells in. And I'm not sure if he's waiting until we get that submitted to him.

Is there something specific that you would like to know about Landfill 3?

MR. RON LEVY: The RAB had asked

about geological analysis. They were interested in what was actually going on under the ground.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Okay.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Well, we got three months to get that, so --

MR. GREG SCHANK: I'll bring that up again with him. I know that that was brought up --

MR. GARY HARVEY: We have that much time 'till the next meeting.

MR. GREG SCHANK: Right. I'll bring it up again with Steve and see if we can't have that at the next meeting.

MR. RON LEVY: Monty, you had asked about the water shed, where the water comes from, and where it ends up. And we had sent you something, but we were kind of interested in where you were going with this and what specifically you were looking for, in terms of the water shed, because it's a big question and there's a lot about the water shed that can be addressed.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Well, just mostly what I was interested in is where the water, the groundwater exits the Fort, and I think that's two

creeks, Cane Creek and --

MR. RON LEVY: You weren't looking at this from a cleanup standpoint? You were just looking at it from a natural resource standpoint?

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Yeah. Not in terms of cleanup, just where all the groundwater goes in the ducts, ends up in Cane Creek, you know, and just --

MR. GARY HARVEY: It ends up a lot of places. You go in the back side of the post, it goes another way.

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: Yeah.

MR. RON LEVY: See, if we were going to put something together, do you have particular questions in mind, particular to this, that we needed to ask? Didn't we have a discussion about that?

MR. STEVE MORAN: Yeah. The water shed would just be the Cane Creek water shed and Cave Creek water shed, the Choccolocco Corridor on the east side of the mountain, and that would be where the surface water all drains to.

The groundwater would be a different issue. Just because it's groundwater does not mean

that it's (inaudible) into the creek. For example, uphill (phonetic) from Landfill 3 (phonetic), you know, is going to the west and up to the north a little bit and other areas, it will -- on the east side of the mountains, it's going to go to the east, and so it will -- the groundwater and surface water would be different issues, so --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I guess I was thinking surface water, you know, what runs off the roads, what runs into the creeks, you know, and how much of the -- just the rainwater shed mostly is what I was thinking about, not the deep groundwater, you know, underground stuff.

MR. STEVE MORAN: I think a map of the rivers would probably do it, Ron.

MR. RON LEVY: Well, I think -- Karen, did we not send -- wasn't that information -- did you get a chance to look at the information we sent you, because I think it does list creeks and --

MR. MONTY CLENDENIN: I think it did, and I just got it tonight, so I will --

MR. RON LEVY: You might want to take a look at that and come back to us and see if

there is something else we can do for you.

I would mention upcoming programs, again, we're here to provide you the information, get input back from you, but we need something from you. You need to tell us what you're interested in seeing. You can send me an e-mail, you can tell me during this meeting, but I can't focus on what I don't know. So, please, let me know what you're thinking about the cleanup or Greg what you're thinking about the cleanup on the JPA side, and we'll try to respond back to you.

We can put presentations together and come back to the next RAB meeting and present it to you for discussion.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Another item, too, the upcoming -- and it's not really us, but you may have heard in on the radio or saw it in the paper, the work session of the JPA last week, in their executive session tomorrow, when they vote on it, they are working on the snake effigy. There's a proposal before the JPA for a study of -- don't pin me to the exact number -- a couple, three thousand dollars to further characterize that site. And it's characterizing environmental, but go into it and hire

Jax State, those archeological folks up there, and get more of an understanding of who built it, when it was built, and all those sort of historical things, and I believe they're going to vote on that tomorrow. And in fact, it was on at 8:10 today, and I do go to the JPA meetings. So, it was on there.

And another thing that you -- we didn't put on here, we had a transfer of a water site, Egbert Hill. And help me, what's the other one, Ron?

MR. RON LEVY: Sharp Road.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Yeah, Sharp Road went to the JPA, two point five acres, the water sites. And that was by deeds. Mr. Whitaker signed on the 27th of September, and the deed was delivered to the JPA. So, those two are done. So, now we have three hundred and fourteen acres of that forty-five thousand.

Any comments from anyone here, want to make any comments? Any questions?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: I do.

MR. GARY HARVEY: Yeah.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: I changed the bylaws. You all requested that the meeting start

at 5:00, so I had to change the bylaws. And they're in your packet.

And you guys also need to shake the bushes and talk to your friends about becoming a RAB member, because you're still one short, and applications are in the packet.

MR. GARY HARVEY: We would entertain a motion from Penn --

MR. PENN WILSON: I'll move for an adjournment.

MR. GARY HARVEY: -- for an adjournment.

(Whereupon, the motion was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)
CALHOUN COUNTY)

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 10th of December, 2005.

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-14-2009.

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