RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * * * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, CCR, a Court Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at Fort McClellan, Alabama, on the 15th day of April 2013, commencing at approximately 5:05 p.m.

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

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: We'll call the roll as we go. So, here we go. I am here. Ed is not, obviously, Kimbrough.

Mr. Buford? Phillip?

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Here.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: You're here. Dr. Cox is excused.

Mr. Elser?

MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Mr. Hall, not. I haven't seen Mary Harrington or Gene. Mike Kimberly is excused.

Jim Miller, for those of you that don't know, has resigned, I guess, coincident with his retirement or pending retirement.

MR. BURGETT: That's correct. He sends his regards. He hates to go away, but he's going to be in full-time farming now.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: So -- is that right?

MR. BURGETT: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: John Pearce is excused. Dr. Steffy and Mr. Thompson, I don't see them here, either.

I guess, for the record, Karen Pinson from The Guard is here, Gerald Hardy from Matrix is here, and Brandi Little is here from ADEM.

If we can, if you don't mind, let's, starting with Brenda Cunningham here, let's run down the line there and let the guests introduce themselves.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda Cunningham, transition force.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, transition force.

MS. SARAH CLARDY: Sarah Clardy, U. S. Fish & Wildlife

Service.

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Greg Quimby, AECOM.

MR. JOHN HALL: John Hall, Anniston Water Works.

MS. MARY RODGERS: Mary Rodgers, soon to be with U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Well, we do not have a quorum, so we basically cannot conduct business, so we are out of luck on that, as far as approving, really, the biggest item would have been, what, the amended bylaws, wouldn't it? The changes?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: That and two new members, voting them in.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Right, voting them in. So, I guess we kick that can down the road

again for another six months now, because we are on a semi-annual basis, just to remind everyone.

So, we do have -- since we don't have an ALDOT representative here, do we? We do not.

But we do have a program today. So, I guess what I'd like do is, I want to introduce Greg Quimby from AECOM.

Now, what Greg and his company are doing is they're doing a remedial investigation and feasibility study for munitions. Okay. It's a MEC operation. And the reason I want to emphasize that is that we have some other RI/FS, as we call remedial investigation feasibility studies, going on for the haz waste constituents,

primarily metals, as most of y'all are aware. But this is a MEC RI/FS, as we call it.

Previously, we had been doing a lot of the MEC investigation and characterization through a slightly different process called an EE/CA, engineering evaluation, was is it, cost analysis?

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Cost analysis.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: And basically, we decided we probably couldn't get the level of data delineation and everything else that we wanted out of that process, and so we decided to -- made the decision to truncate that, and do an RI, do an RI/FS.

And over the years, that's what the MMRP, the military

munitions program has gone into, using the same language as the CERCLA remediation process. So, it adds a little bit of confusion.

But what Greg's company is doing is an RI/FS. And what they're going to do -- what their mission is to do is to basically characterize nature and extent of the munitions that we have in the Army cleanup area, which is inside the Fish & Wildlife Refuge.

And once that happens, then, of course, we'll have the -- be able to do a lot tighter cost estimating and some other things and cleanups and so on, as well.

We will continue, even while they're doing their RI/FS -- we will continue to do interim removal actions and so on, as --

kind of in parallel. That's part of an agreement that Army and Fish & Wildlife Service has, that we're not going to stop things, that we'll continue to go on.

And we do have a company out in the field, as we speak, working on an interim removal action. We'll talk about that some more in the Army report.

But anyway, I would like to introduce Greg Quimby, and just let him go ahead and do his presentation on the RI/FS and what we're intending by it. Greg, it's yours.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Scott, can I interrupt you for a second?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Okay.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Back to Shannon --

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Okay.
MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: -- he wasn't going to come and brief -- you all had -- the RAB had asked for an update --
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: I'm sorry. You're right. The map.
MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: But there is a map in here that tells you what's happening, when the bypass is going to -- I didn't want you to be all confused, because you know it's in order.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah. Sorry.
MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Okay.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: No. That's a good point.
If you look in your books there, or your handouts, rather, you will see it. And I guess they're going to come up with

their, what, base and paving contract in June or something, which I think is what he said before.

Greg, on to things that are more directly --

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Good evening everyone. My name is Greg Quimby. I'm going to be the project manager for the RI/FS that's conducted in Charlie area. So, I've put together a summary of the historical work that's been done to kind of give everyone a starting point for where we're picking up, and then an outline of our technical approach for how we're going to plan to, as Scott said, delineate the munitions that are onsite and determine the nature and extent of the munitions impacts.

So, this is a timeline of the work that's been done. There has been two parallel tracts in red that shows the work that's been done on the munition side. Simultaneous to that in green shows the work for the HTRW investigations that have been conducted, as well.

Just the key things to note is in 1998, that was -- the initial HTRW study was an environmental baseline survey. And that has been the tract that all the HTRW investigation has followed to date.

The EBS identified fifty-four ranges that were applicable to Charlie area. And they've all been investigated.

In 2001, the Army conducted an ASR, which is an archive search report. And that also

identified ranges that were used for training.

And the two documents, the ASR and EBS, they, for the most part, coincided. But just from the difference in time and the difference in the analysis that was conducted, there were some variations in that some ranges were identified in the ASR that weren't previously identified in the EBS. So, that was, you know, something that's been resolved, you know, through the course of work that's proceeded so far.

Just some things to know. On the munitions side, the chemical warfare material EE/CA, and then a subsequent removal action was conducted initially.

And then, after that, an EE/CA for conventional munitions was

conducted. It was initiated originally in 2004. And then some supplemental fieldwork was done in 2010. And that was the part that, you know, at the time, the DOD had transitioned from an EE/CA process to address the munitions to a more -- they transitioned into following the CERFA process, which is where the RI comes from, and, you know, why we're pursuing that now.

And then, this shows here some of the interim removal actions that were conducted, a removal action for Bains Gap Road, the roads, firebreaks and high-use areas throughout the site. And then, there were eight more selected sites that were cleared in 2011.

And currently, there are four

other interim removal action areas that are going on right now.

So, this is just a snapshot of the HTRW investigations that have been conducted. Fifty-four of the ranges that were identified -- or fifty-four of the Fort McClellan ranges are applicable to Charlie area. And I should say fifty-four -- there were ranges and also other parcels that were identified that are located in Charlie area that necessarily weren't -- not necessarily used for training, but were used for other issues that would raise potential environmental concerns that were investigated.

So, so far ADEM has concurred with no further action for thirty of the fifty-four. One

is still under review. And then for twenty-three of the ranges, they've proceeded into the RI phase for HTRW contaminants.

So, based on the initial results, there was one soil removal action that was conducted. Range twenty, 2.3 acres were impacted with metals. And that's the area where the Fish & Wildlife Services put their facility. So, that's why that area was removed so far.

There are four other areas of known soil impacts that were delineated during these investigations. And I have slides to show where they're located.

And then, really, the soil impacts that were identified were related to small arms ammunition contaminants, metals

like lead, antimony, copper, those were the contaminants that were primarily identified as above background and site screening levels.

There was one location of impacted groundwater, and that was in the training area, 24 Alpha. And the two contaminants there were benzene and chlorinated volatiles, which is a group of contaminants. And I've got a slide that shows those plumes, as well.

So, this is the range twenty in blue. It shows the area that was excavated for soils -- for metals contamination in soil. There were -- just to -- as a point of reference, this is the fenced area where the Fish & Wildlife facility is.

So, basically, they fired into

the side of the mountain here, and that's where the soil impacts were. There was one other location off to the southwest that was excavated, as well.

These -- this slide shows the soil impacts that were associated with other ranges. This is on the northern side of Charlie area. This was a former 81mm mortar range shown in red and a small arms firing range shown in green. And you can see the magnitude of the soil impacts are shown -- the yellow points are the individual sampling locations where soil samples were collected as part of the delineation process.

These were the small arms ranges that are just south of Bains Gap Road. This is Bains

Gap Road here.

So, again, you know, same -- same color scheme for the magnitude of the soils impacts.

One other thing to note on this slide here, the area that's shaded in light tan, that is an area that's designated by the Fish & Wildlife Service for sensitive forest managements. So, that's one of the proposed reuse for the area is dedicated for that. There is some sensitive species that are present in that location.

These are the small arms ranges that were located on the -- in the Choccolocco Corridor that are east of the North/South Ridge Road.

And then the last area of soil impacts is -- this is the Range

24 Alpha area.

And that's also the same location of the groundwater plume. You can see in purple is benzene, and that was delineated to about one -- one PPB, and the total chlorinated is about ten -- ten parts per billion. And that's shown in the light blue.

So, moving on to the previous MEC investigations that were conducted. From 1999 to 2002, was when the CWM EE/CA was conducted.

The only chemical training that was done in Charlie area was in that training area 24 Alpha. That was also where the 3X scrap removal was conducted. And basically, that consisted of excavation of the previous rounds that were used for

chemical munitions training.

And, just to note, when they did that, there was no chemical agent detected during that removal. So, the results showed that everything that they did recover was decontaminated prior to the site being decommissioned, which corresponds to the previous reports that were submitted.

And then the Charlie area wide EE/CA was initiated in 2002. Based on that, and then the supplemental work that was conducted in 2010, there were four interim removal actions -- or I'm sorry -- four interim removal action areas that were identified.

And then basically, you know, just from the vast amounts of data that was previously

collected from both the EE/CA investigations and the removal actions, we really have a good starting point to pick up with the remedial investigation now.

We've gone through the data, and a lot of it we can use, some of it we can't. But basically, from the data, we were able to identify where we have a pretty good understanding of the former impact areas or the former target areas were.

And basically, what we did was, we've identified that based on the munitions type that were found. We've categorized them into either rocket grenades -- I'm sorry, rockets or rifle grenades, mortars, projectiles, and then what we're classifying as ground-type training, which is pyrotechnics

and things of that nature.

And we can see, based on the results, that we've got significant areas where each of them are located. And I've got some slides to show you how we've outlined that to develop our approach going forward to continue the investigation.

These are the areas that have been subject to removal action. The light pink are what has been conducted so far. And then, the darker shade is the areas that are currently, you know, in the process of being cleared right now.

And then these next few slides just show the results from the previous investigations and the removal actions overlaying with the ranges and also the cleared areas.

You can see here the light blue lines and squares are where the previous investigation was conducted. So, that kind of gives you an idea for what the footprint of the previous investigation was, and then, overlaid with what was found.

And they've been categorized, based on color, based on the four types of munitions that we've identified. So, we've highlighted that.

And then the red items are where actual -- either unexploded ordnance or actually -- or discarded military munitions were encountered. And those are what's the primary concerns, because those are what is live.

Everything else is characterized as munitions

debris, meaning that it's free of an explosive hazard. So, we wanted to record that data, because the munitions debris tells us a lot about, you know, what types of munitions are located where. So, it gives us a good idea of the spatial distribution, and we can kind of back calculate, you know, where the training was conducted and what type of munitions were used in that training.

But then the -- what the real goal of the RI is to delineate where all the MEC items are, which is what presents the explosive hazard. And that's ultimately what we want to remove in the future.

So, these are the ranges that are in the northwest corner of Charlie area.

This was the former 81mm mortar range. As you can see, there's a spatially dense area of previously encountered mortar munitions in that area. So, that's the case where the results of the previous investigations correspond with the reported use of the range, and what, you know, provides a lot of information for us as to where we need to do some further investigation to decrease the spacing between some of the previous work that was done.

These were the ranges that were south of Bains Gap Road. And you can see here, there's a significant amount of clearance that has already been done in these areas.

These are on the western to southwestern portion of Charlie

area.

The other thing, too, that is not included on this slide, but one thing we've also looked at is Matrix has done clearance on Bravo area and Alpha area, which encompass the majority of the western border with Charlie area. So, we have incorporated their data, and basically characterized it into the same four munitions types, you know, as we have for Charlie area. And that's helped us to get a very good understanding because we've got all the data on the west, so we're able to use that, you know, to fill any data gaps and give us a good site-wide perspective so that we're not just focused on Charlie area, we can see, you know, where the training has crossed between

Charlie area and Alpha and Bravo areas, as well.

And this is the 24 Alpha training area. And again, you know, this was where the 3X scrap removal -- removal action was conducted for the chemical munitions. And then there were also some removal actions for conventional munitions conducted here, as well.

So basically -- so our approach going forward -- this is just a summary of all the environmental or HTRW samples that were collected to date.

Because all the previous contamination was delineated during the -- either through the site inspection or remedial investigation work, our work going forward for that is pretty limited.

One of the issues -- in looking through the data, the EPA has come out with a new analysis for explosives, and this came out through the process of when the contractor that was doing the HTRW investigations -- it came out basically through the midcourse of work. And when the EPA issued the new guidelines for the explosives analysis, there were three new compounds that were added to the list that were not included.

So, one of the things that we looked at were, you know, what are the potential data gaps associated with not analyzing for those three compounds previously.

And then, you know, based on the results of the previous

work, you know, we evaluated whether or not there were significant data gaps enough that would warrant us to go back out and collect additional samples, just to close the loop on that.

So, we looked at all fifty-four ranges, and we determined that there were three that we said we thought did warrant this additional investigation, primarily based on the dimensions of the range, the type of firing that was conducted there, the types of -- the types of small arms ammunition that was used.

And, you know, we basically decided, was there a possibility or not that the site screening level could have been exceeded for those three compounds. So,

we've recommended to ADEM that we go out and sample three more, just to collect additional data.

Just to note, of the three compounds that were added to the list, only two of the compounds were actually present in any of the munitions that were used in Charlie area. So, we're really only concerned with two. And out of that, only one, which is nitroglycerin, is present and significant enough compound -- or concentration that we thought would warrant additional investigation.

So, that's really the only other work on top of the previous SI and RI work that was done that we're going to address on the HTRW side of our RI.

And then in addition to that, what will drive additional

sampling during our investigation is if we identify another source area of potential munitions constituents contamination, which would be, you know, if we come across a target area that wasn't previously identified as one of the ranges listed on either the EBS or the ASR range inventory. You know, that would warrant additional investigation, just to make sure there is no explosives that leached out of those munitions and impacted site soil.

And then, in addition to that, when we detonate munitions items -- as we do our investigation, as we uncover munitions items, if it's live, we'll detonate it just to render it safe.

And then, what we also want to do is we want to make sure that that process doesn't present chemicals into the environment that would -- you know, that would create an issue. So, we'll do some sampling after we do our detonation to make sure that the RI process, itself, doesn't introduce any impacts to the environment.

And then, on the MEC side, this slide here shows how we've identified the potential target areas based on the four munition types.

What we've done is we've researched historical training data for the various munitions, and we've looked at what were the reported sizes of the impact areas for each of the types.

And then we've taken those

dimensions and we've aggregated the points to -- so, for example, for the mortar range, the average impact area size was about six hundred to -- by eight hundred meters.

So, we said, okay, you know, worst case scenario, we'll take each of these points where either a mortar -- where a mortar round was found, and circle -- you know, if there are any within eight hundred meters of that point, you know, that will delineate the area.

And that -- what we chose -- or what we thought from that approach would be, you know, that would be where we realistically would think an impact area would be, based on the reported size. You know, we said, that's where we need to

look, as far as identifying, you know, where all the items would be.

And these slides here show -- this includes the Matrix data. So, you know, I think it -- looking again at the mortars, you know, there is a lot found here and here. So, you know, investigating here would be reasonable to expect that we would find more in that just the pattern would continue into Charlie area.

And then the same, green is artillery. And you can see that, you know, they found a substantial amount west of Charlie area. So, you know, bounding our site to the east, we'll be able to find where the concentrated location of those items will end.

So, taking all four of those areas together, we've consolidated them and determined that that would be the preliminary investigation footprint. So, that would encompass all the potential target areas that were used.

And then the only thing on top of that that we wanted to also identify is that, you know, those results work well for what was found, but we thought, you know, what would be the -- what's the error associated with not finding something because -- not necessarily because there were no munitions items there, but it was because we don't have -- we didn't look there.

So, what we did was we looked to see, okay, what are the spatial data gaps in the

previous investigation result. So, the items in red show where munitions item was encountered previously.

In blue, that shows the density of the investigation. And then the black and gray are the data gaps. So, basically, you know, this slide shows, you know, what was found compared to where we looked for it.

And you can see areas here that are a darker shade of gray show where a high concentration of munitions items were found, but there is a low concentration of investigative coverage, so that represents a significant data gap.

And we've used this tool to determine, you know, on top of what we think is there, based on previous findings, what we think

might be there, you know, if we focus in our -- you know, how we try to find these items.

So, just overlaying the two, you know, gave us an overall footprint of where we're going to conduct the RI investigation. And that's highlighted in orange.

So, basically, that's just taking the known areas and the potential data gaps, and the results from that would be, you know, what we feel will conservatively estimate the coverage required to identify all the target areas that were previously used.

So, just getting into how we're actually going to conduct the investigation. Basically, throughout the footprint we're going to conduct a series of

geophysical transects. That will give us the subsurface information for where we think munitions will be located.

The actual spacing of the transects will be designed using statistical software that is pretty standard for the industry. It's based on confidence intervals of, you know, how narrow the transects have to be, you know, in order to achieve a certain confidence that we'll have the area sufficiently covered.

And then, basically, once we get the geophysical results, it will -- you know, we'll be able to select areas that we think are targets for investigation. And then we'll go out and dig those up.

And then, prior to starting

this, you know, we'll work with ADEM, and we'll develop that criteria so that everyone is on the same page with -- you know, we know that if it -- you know, if it meets a certain threshold, you know, that's going to qualify it for investigation. And then that way, you know, everyone will be on the same page and we'll all agree to what would be the appropriate amount of items that we'll have to dig in order to verify the results.

And then, shown on this slide here, the light blue represents areas of the site that are in excess of 40 percent slope. So, those are -- because of the terrain, those will be investigated by basically handheld instruments, which are, you know, a safer and more

effective way to determine what -- where the subsurface anomalies are.

Everything that is less than 40 percent slope will be done by digital geophysical mapping, which is basically a machine that's pulled on a cart. And that collects the readings and it provides an actual digital copy of the results.

The analogue method is basically, you know, you're relying on the operator to distinguish an audible sound. So, it's not as detailed as a method, in that you don't get the actual digital record of the results, but it's just a situation where just the terrain of the site makes it impractical to conduct a DGM over all of it.

And then, because of that,

the -- for the analogue mapping, all anomalies will be excavated regardless. So, it adds a bit of conservative measure, because it's not as precise as the DGM. There won't be a threshold for investigation like there is with the DGM. For AGM, you know, any anomaly that we identify, we'll dig it up to see what it is.

And then basically for the end-state goals, you know, what we want to do is we want to find the nature and extent of the MEC impacts in Charlie area.

The target areas that we're going to identify will be achieved at a 95 percent confidence interval that we've got the coverage required to be able to identify them. And that's based on the visual sampling plan software.

And then, as far as being able to delineate the MEC impacts, we've got a maximum of two hundred feet for the delineation.

Any MEC that's encountered will be disposed of onsite by detonation. And then all non-MEC munitions debris, basically anything that is not an explosive hazard will be properly disposed of offsite.

And then, at the end of the fieldwork, all the results will be documented into an RI report and consolidated with the previous data that was collected into a comprehensive geospatial database for the project record.

So, this is -- looking forward, this is the timeline that we've got. Right now we are in the draft work plan

phase.

We met with ADEM in February. We've basically briefed them on this approach and received some initial comments.

So, hopefully, by the end of the month, we'll be able to submit to them a draft work plan. It might be pushed out a little bit. It might be more towards May timeframe.

But basically, you know, we're looking for ultimate work plan approval some time, you know, mid to late summer. And then we expect to be able to start fieldwork some time, you know, probably late summer, early fall timeframe.

With that, fieldwork should be -- let's see -- yeah, so, fieldwork should be wrapped up then by winter timeframe. And

then, after that, we'll submit the RI report, a feasibility study report, and then the draft proposed plan. We'll conduct a public meeting for that.

And then ultimately, the end state is to get a final decision document for the site.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: How many acres was in your total study?

MR. GREG QUIMBY: I want to say it was -- about twenty-seven hundred acres was -- if I remember correctly. I want to say it was about twenty-seven hundred that was in the orange area. I'd have to double check to make sure, but it was about that.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: What's your best guess as to how long it would take Matrix or whoever to clean all that up?

MR. QUIMBY: Well --
MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: The Army will be cleaning that up.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah.
MR. GERALD HARDY: Matrix is not doing the Charlie area.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Right.
MR. Greg QUIMBY: It's -- I guess it just really depends on what we find. You know, the -- out of the twenty-seven hundred acre area --
MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: I mean, are we talking about years or decades?
MR. GREG QUIMBY: Oh, uh --
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Could be.
MR. GREG QUIMBY: Yeah --
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: And it's not meant as a flippant comment. What's going to drive that, to some degree, or to a large degree, is the funding. Okay.

So, one of the things that quite frankly that I'm hoping that Greg and company can do is basically pay for themselves, because I do think that by having a lot more coverage, a way tighter delineation and so on, that I think we'll have a very accurate picture of where things -- where munitions are, where they're not.

We already know what Fish & Wildlife Service plans to do with the areas. So, at that point, we'll kind of take what we gain from Greg, as to where everything is, we sort of overlay Fish & Wildlife's planned use for it. And that -- it's almost automatic at that point, we now know what level of cleanup that is needed to -- would have to be

conducted. Okay.

So, that kind of tells us the level of effort. And once we can establish a level of effort, at that point, now you can drive a cost estimate, a pretty good one, and get some idea as to, you know, how long it's going to take, because it's really going to be a function of the availability of funding.

Now, I think the DOD is getting kind of tired of waiting on some of this stuff, and they really want to get it done, but the issue is going to be, you know, plain and simple, you know, nobody has unlimited dollars. And that's kind of what's going on.

But the Army remains responsible for the cleanup that's inside the Fish &

Wildlife Refuge. The cleanup that Matrix, Gerald and company are doing is in the cantonment area. And that's part of the ESCA, as we call it, the environmental services cooperative agreement.

It's done by MDA, who is the landowner, as well. It is -- the funding is provided by Army, though.

So, these are both pretty substantial cleanup efforts. Could well turn out to be probably within the top three that the Army's ever conducted in the country, in all probability. I don't know if we're bigger than Ord, in terms of dollars and cents or not, so --

MR. GERALD HARDY: Let's hope we don't take as long as Ord.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Really, yeah.

So, that's -- and that's another reason -- the remedial investigation -- you know, we talk about these things kind of combined, remedial investigation, feasibility study -- but the remedial investigation piece of it is going to tell us the nature and extent, you know, what do you got and how much and where.

The feasibility study is really, following the CERCLA process, kind of presents your options. Feasibility studies are sort of a no brainer, a lot of times when we're dealing with munitions stuff, because it's a function of, you know, dig it up, blow it up, get rid of it, you know, dispose of your scrap

and so on, appropriately.

So, there's not as wide a variety of potential options that you might have like you would on more hazardous waste-type cleanups.

But, like I said, the real critical factor, I think, is going to be getting a way better handle. The approach that Greg and company have come up with, and the degree to which they're going out in conjunction with the mountains of previous data that we have, I think is going to give us a real good picture. And then, we kind of go from there.

But the timelines will all be driven by just availability of funds, quite frankly.

All right, moving along, I guess. In terms of new

business, there is really no business that we can conduct, in terms of motions or anything.

But just for everybody to, please, be aware, Jim Miller has resigned. So, we now have another opening.

Additionally, if you'll look in your board packets, the applications are in there, right, Brenda?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: If everybody would, please, be aware of -- look at the -- we've got applications on Bobby Foster and Mr. John Hall. And if everybody would take a -- at least become aware of that.

I haven't had a chance to talk to Brenda about it, but given that we don't have a quorum

here, that we do have a couple of things we need to get done, I think that we have another approach we might can use to get a vote, if you will, on members.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: And Mr. Hall is here tonight.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: He came, yes.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Okay. I should have recognized you. Apologies, John.

MR. JOHN HALL: No problem.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: So, anyway, moving on with -- if you would be aware of those, because I think we'll be in touch with you sometime in the next couple of weeks probably to remind everybody and get everybody's, maybe like a telephone vote or

something along those lines, to get approval of new members.

The other thing is there is some changes to the bylaws we need to look at, as well. Even though we haven't formally approved them, I think we'll be implementing them, particularly, the meeting frequency. So, remember, we've gone to semiannual -- I guess we're doing that by fiat, as opposed to Democratically.

Some other things for everybody to be aware of, I guess, the administrative record repository changes, the locations and so on. Brenda has put some stuff in here. It pretty well tells you basically it's at the center here at Fort McClellan.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: There

is no longer hard copies in the Anniston Library, those are all gone. We have most of our stuff online on a website. And the only other hard copy, besides back in the back in our file, is at JSU here on Fort McClellan, so --

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Which would be your best shot. Good luck trying to get into Brenda's, you know, holy of the holy sanctuary in there with the admin record, trust me.

All right, I guess we will move on to agency reports. Brandi, do you want to do -- I guess you will do ADEM for us.

MS. BRANDI LITTLE: Sure. This has been six months, so we've got about six pages or so of documents that we've received and documents that we've

reviewed. And over this time period we received about forty-two documents and we reviewed about thirty-six of them.

And I apologize, I left off one of the Army documents on here, which was the final FS for Choccolocco Corridor that I got the other day. And should have a letter back really quickly.

I'm trying to think if there were any important documents. I think we finally finished up most of the Baby Bains Gap Road, and then turned it over to MDA during this period. And we were able to finalize five different covenants for MDA during this period.

So, I don't really think I had anything else, unless anybody has any questions.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Karen, I guess you're up.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Okay.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: For the National Guard.

MS. KAREN PINSON: For the National Guard.

I included a few maps this time, just of figures to kind of show you where contaminated -- groundwater contamination is on Pelham Range. And so, the first map just shows where Pelham Range is located in Alabama and in Calhoun County, and then Pelham Range, itself, with -- divided into the training area -- the green lines mark off the training areas on Pelham Range. And so, the two areas where we are treating groundwater for contamination right now are range K and range

J.

And then the next two figures show the aerial extent of the groundwater plumes on range J and range K. So, they're not -- there's -- the plumes, as I've said before, are very -- are small and well contained within the boundaries of Pelham Range.

And what we've done is inject lactose into the groundwater there to enhance the bioremediation of the chlorinated volatile organic compounds that are in the groundwater. And the lactose provides a carbon source that -- and microbes that are naturally occurring in the soils down there and rocks, they feed on the carbon, and then chew up the volatile organic compounds.

And the sample -- and then we sample every so often. ADEM wants us to sample at least annually right now. So that's -- we've sampled four quarters -- for four quarters straight after we injected the lactose. And then we're supposed to sample annually thereafter.

And our most recent sampling was in November of 2011. And things appear to be moving in the right direction on the groundwater there. The target compounds are -- appear to be decreasing, and some of the daughter products are increasing, which means that the -- as the compounds break down, they break down, they dechlorinate, the chlorine atoms drop off, and new compounds are

formed. And so, that appears to be what's happening.

So, that's kind of where we are on that. And ADEM reviews our reports, our groundwater monitoring reports.

And then we have another area on Pelham Range -- and I didn't show it, because we're not through with the RI/FS, the remedial investigation feasibility study yet. But the other area on Pelham Range is just south of the range K. It's in -- range K is over in the western side of Pelham Range. And so, the toxic gas area is in that same -- within that same training area. The green, outlined marks are the training area.

And the area of the toxic gas that's contaminated -- I should

say the groundwater that's contaminated, is south -- is in the southern portion of that particular training area.

But we're not through with the remedial investigation feasibility study, yet, so I don't show the plume on the map. But it's -- it again, is very small in aerial extent. And we're anticipating the same type remedy, the lactose injection, and the -- and then groundwater monitoring and land use controls to prevent -- obviously, we have better control out here so people aren't going to go out and just willy-nilly drilling groundwater wells. But we don't allow use of the groundwater.

So, that's kind of where we are out there.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Any

questions?

Gerald, I guess you'll update us on McClellan Development Authority.

MR. GERALD HARDY: Yes. I think at our last meeting we've been asked to provide some updated maps. And we thought we were going to delay that to the next meeting, but we went ahead and included them to the report.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah. That was kind of mine and Brenda's doing. I guess we should have briefed you up.

We realized that you were going to go through it -- you'd already provided the maps, so we said, well, we'll just do it.

MR. GERALD HARDY: Well, I realized that as we sit in here that the HTRW maps are not -- or the sites are listed by CERFA

parcel number, as we -- doesn't really match up with my little report, which is how we refer to them. So, I apologize for that. And I don't have a crosslink to those to present to everybody.

But anyway, let's start. Since we just had the presentation on MEC work in Charlie area, we'll look at the munitions response site or the MEC map that you have here. And you can see Charlie is on the map is to the right edge.

And you can see the work that has been done basically, the -- from Bains Gap Road north is the Alpha area, and from Bains Gap south is the Bravo area. And then, of course, basically, off the ridge top over is Charlie area.

And we color coded this so you

can see what work has been completed and what work is in progress. Our ability to finish that up, as Scott mentioned, is based on the funding that we can get. It's sort of been -- we keep being asked by our MDA board how soon could we finish if we had the money. And we have a schedule that, should we get all the money, we could finish in less than two years.

But that's a significant amount of money that right now the Army hasn't provided to us. But we keep working with what we have.

And I guess one difference I need to point out, we're doing the work for MDA under RCRA authorities and not CERCLA authorities.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Which makes

-- basically, the state is the lead agent authority there, and under CERCLA it would be EPA.

MR. GERALD HARDY: But also under RCRA, we don't have to formal draft and final draft and all. We can get a document prepared and submit it. That's one of our more recent goals, is to get those -- trim the number of documents, because, as you can see from ADEM's report, how many documents flood them to be reviewed.

But most of the MRS work in my report is probably in the last -- starts at the bottom of page two, goes into page three. But the highlight -- I guess some of the highlights for you is that matches up with the northern Alpha UXO, which is at the very top up here, we

recently submitted the after-action report, which was really going to be in this next quarter -- I think in your report says we continued on it, and we've managed to finish it and submit that to ADEM.

MRS four, which is located midways of the page, adjacent to the Charlie area, the fieldwork has continued there. And I guess I need to provide a little bit of explanation of why we give fits and starts.

When we do the cleanup and begin to really get into one of the MRS areas, we do a surface sweep, which people walk through to look for anything laying on the surface of the ground. And then, once we know that that's gone, then some of these areas -- I think you saw a slide

in there where they pull a -- the digital mapping machine, EM61 is one of the common ones. Well, you can't pull it up through thick brush. So, we have to issue a contract for money to go in and grub the site. Which we look at anything probably under three or four inch trees and smaller is taken to the ground, ground up.

So, that allows then the surveyor to come in and lay off grid lines throughout this whole area that we're investigating. And then, the -- and that's staked so that the people either doing handheld or with the machine that's pulled can follow that surveyed line, because we laid the whole area out into a grid pattern.

And when they find anomalies,

either the beep through the ears or the recording with the EM61, those sites are flagged -- actual flag put in there -- to be dug up later.

But they'll go in it, and they'll digitally map the whole area for investigation, flag it. And then there is a crew that comes behind, digging those anomalies up. It can be a piece of pipe, a bucket of nails, or an unexploded mortar round.

And some of those will give you the same signal when you're doing it. It just depends on how much metal.

One of the problems out here in the entire McClellan is it's a lot of naturally occurring iron ore, which will also, since you're reading -- trying to read

that metallic signal -- will give you a lot of false readings. So, you have to learn to work through that.

So, when we try to start it's not like, okay, we will get money and do surface sweep -- now you could probably stop after surface sweep -- but once you go in and grub an area, you want to come in and map it and dig, because otherwise, if you stop spending money, it grows back up, and you're going to spend money to repeat the same thing again.

So, when we talk about funding and what we can do, it depends on our cost estimate to go through those steps and get -- make sure we've got enough money to start and finish that.

The guys out in the field, they've started wearing the snake chaps, because it's gotten warm and the snakes are out crawling. And we go through a lot of bug spray because chiggers are very prevalent out here at Fort McClellan.

But, like I said, the color coding of the MEC, munitions response sites, MRS sites, of course, the clear or white is still under investigation; red has not started; blue would be the fieldwork is complete; yellow would be in progress.

And then, we also put in there that -- because some of the discussion from the previous presentation, the areas that are circled by a red line are high density areas for -- that we found. Those will be target

impact ranges. Like, if they put out a hard target, an old tank or something and shot at it, that area is going to be concentrated.

So, you can see from the map how that work has been done. And, of course, the other that's in the gray color is really all the buildings that are out here.

But we've submitted several documents. And like I said, we've got the work -- most recent work with the money we got for this year, I think is in MRS -- doing some work in MRS five, seven, and nine. And that came from money we received in this year, FY13 budget.

Let's see, I think -- any questions about the MEC portion of that?

The other map -- that I had to

apologize, because it's in CERFA parcel numbers, and it won't match up to my report -- is the HTRW. And the reason we separated the two is because we can complete MEC or the unexploded ordnance work, and yet we haven't finished the HTRW. And that's because the funding priority for our -- what funding we get, has been -- so far has been on removing the MEC or the unexploded ordnance, because once you have that area cleaned, then it's much easier to go in and do your HTRW work, as far as putting in wells and sampling and doing other things.

So, the same color code scheme exists for the HTRW, I think, except here the green represents the work that has been completed.

And then blue represents long-term monitoring or cap maintenance, because under the HTRW sites or the landfills -- there were four legacy landfills here at McClellan. They were like non-permitted landfills that were disposal areas that were also capped.

And so, some of the work that was recently finished in the last year was to make sure that the legacy landfills and the disposal areas were properly capped and the boundaries appropriately marked for that, because we left waste in place.

I would point out one that is going to require a lot of work and that's landfill three. And luckily, it is marked landfill three on the map. It's sort of

in the top center of that picture, that's --

The reason that that one is important, it is a -- it has a groundwater plume that goes off of the McClellan site. It's in the roadway of Highway 21 and even across. And it's not been fully investigated.

There is one active landfill right to the right of that. You'll see a blue area, 81(5), which is the old landfill four. It was -- has been capped.

The 175(5) is the active landfill on the property that's -- we call that the industrial landfill. And that's the one that primarily takes -- when MDA goes in and demolishes some of the old buildings, that material goes into the industrial -- what we're calling

the industrial landfill.

It still retains a permit from ADEM. But it's not really taking waste, as you would think, but it's more construction demolition material.

One other thing I would point out that we accomplished since we last met, if you'll look at a series of red dots that are center of the page to the left, that's 70Q, 71Q, 75Q, that's called the Iron Mountain Road ranges. And that's the steep bank where they did small arms firing. They fired into the bank.

Well, there is a lot of exposed red dirt. Some of that material, when the storm water -- there is not an active excavation there -- but when the

storm water would come, the water would run off, it would pick up sediment off of this hillside.

It was combining with, at the time, water that was running off the ALDOT work on the roadway, which -- before they got grass established, and it was ending up in Cane Creek and running as muddy water through the golf course.

We -- there was some complaints filed. ALDOT looked at that. We looked at that and realized that we did have a flow of water coming off those ranges, and so we installed what is called best management practices or BMPs, which was a series of silt fences and hay bales to slow down and stop that water.

And our -- we go out every time there is a significant rain event and look at that. And we've pretty much stopped the sediment leaving from the Iron Mountain Road ranges. That's a highlight, I guess, from HTRW.

And, of course, the ones we have to do, as you'll read through here, groundwater monitoring, we continue to do that. And then we make those reports to ADEM.

I've taken too long, but if there are any questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Thank you, Gerald. We'll go through the remaining Army stuff that we haven't already talked about.

As y'all are aware, the Army cleanup, responsibility for the cleanup is in the Fish &

Wildlife Service refuge.

I guess about -- the Charlie area is about eighty-six hundred acres total. But the actual obviously munitions areas and so on are less. But it's a good chunk of the refuge, plus some of the Choccolocco Corridor.

Currently, we have got a removal action underway. It actually started 1 April. It's independent of the RI work that Greg's company is going to do.

So, come late summer, we will probably have two intrusive operations going on simultaneously. We'll have removal actions where people are digging up already known munition areas and so on, and then we'll have Greg's folks who are doing the investigation, running transects. And,

obviously, as he said, we're going to dig all anomalies period. And so -- because that way you can ground crew that you know what you've got. So, we will have both of them going.

Currently, the MEC removal area is -- originally, it was eighty-eight acres that we had funded. And we actually used last year's dollars to get that process rolling. We had enough money to fund about eighty-eight acres.

And what we decided to do with the FY13 funding is we basically just added it to that contract.

We have learned over the years that when we do one of these contracts for any kind of work, not only do we say, okay, we want you to do this many acres and do whatever it is, the

contract requires we also typically build into the contract kind of a lot of single acre pricing and so on and individual unit pricing for various activities for just this reason. We found that when you get lucky, or if you have additional funding, if you run into two fiscal years, then instead of having a lot of different administrative contract actions and so on, you just automatically execute, you know, buy you twenty more acres or whatever it is you have funding for.

So, what has happened is, that original eighty-eight acres, when we married up the FY13 funding with it, now became a 183.14 acres. The majority of it's going to be clearance to

depth, but -- to depth of detection, but there are some other areas, as well.

There are -- the fact is, they've already started -- I guess they're up there doing surface clearance as we speak, in the area that Greg was talking about, way up on the northern boundary, if you look at the map above John and Greg's head up there, kind of at the very top, that little green spot up there, as we speak, is where they are.

They're doing the surface clearance. And, again, the process is the same one that Matrix follows with their contractors. You know, you'll do your surface clearance, and you'll get in there and you'll do your brush removal. And then

you'll be able to survey it and grid it out, and away you go with your removal action. So, they're starting there and they'll be kind of working their way south.

Obviously, when you have a lot of actions going on, it takes a good bit of coordination, but it's not -- it has not been a problem. I don't anticipate any difficulties.

Our two contractors, obviously, will coordinate with each other. And we, at this point, coordinate pretty routinely with Matrix. So, make sure everybody doesn't step on each other and so on.

So, it's -- I've been very pleased. It's been a real cooperative effort.

As Greg was pointing out,

we're additionally doing an RI/FS. And, as he pointed out, the work plan is underway, and it will be submitted sometime in the very near future.

In addition to that, we have a five-year review. Any place that we've got a response that's been completed, we have a requirement under CERCLA to review it every five years. And so, now we're on our -- this is our second cycle in five-year reviews?

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Uh-huh.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: So, that's coming up, or that's underway, if you will. There's a lot of things that go on there.

That contract action was actually on the -- it was about a year and a half old. They've already done document reviews.

They've done a bunch of interviews. They've done site inspections and so on.

And we're planning a public meeting for what date in May again? I messed it up -- I forgot --

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: It's June --

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Or June, that's right.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: -- 6th.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: This one is June, okay. So, June 6th there will be a public meeting in the Anniston Meeting Center.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: We'll send out notices to everyone.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Right. There will be notices to everybody at the RAB. There'll be public notices, as well, and so on.

And what the purpose of that is, is to review all the remedies that you already have in place and the work that you've already done. And you review it and you make sure that they -- it's still working. You know, that basically the remedies are still protective of human health and the environment. So, that will be coming up, like we say, in June, and we'll be sending notices out on that.

Property transfers, we are down to -- out of our original main site -- out of forty-two thousand acres of Fort McClellan, the Army is down to owning 21.89 acres. And it would appear that these last 21.89 acres aren't going to take as long as, you know, the other

forty-two thousand took.

Twenty-one thousand of the forty-two, of course, were over at Pelham Range -- or twenty-two thousands acres, but -- so, transferred a majority of that to -- all that to the National Guard.

But here on main post we had eighteen thousand, seven hundred and fifty acres, roughly. And we've still got 21.89.

So, you can see where they line up. We have less than an acre that still needs to go, that ultimately will go to Anniston Water Works and Sewer Board. And, hopefully, Phillip will see that within his career.

And what's going on with that is it's a corner of a site that MDA is going to have to do, as far as some haz waste stuff, and

so it's kind of held hostage to that action a little bit.

And the other remaining acreage all go to ALDOT. The Iron Mountain Road addition that several of you drove over coming in, there is a ten acre chunk of that that the Army still owns.

And that deed is in the process of somewhere between Army and the Federal Highway Administration. I think the last determination was Federal Highway Administration has decided they have to write the deed and give it to ALDOT. So, they are in that process. And I'm not sure they quite share the same sense of urgency that we do, but nonetheless --

So, that -- hopefully, in the near future, that 10.7 acres will go and, you know, we'll be

down to 11. whatever, 82 or something.

The 10.8 acres at Highway 21, basically, the reason we can't transfer that is that's kind of held hostage by the landfill three work that Matrix is developing, McClellan Development Authority is doing. And once they become remedy in place, with their groundwater plume and stuff, then that's property that we can transfer to ALDOT.

They've had an easement since like 1972 on it to operate the roadway and stuff, and that's why, I mean, it was kind of one of the asides. When we first stood up this transition force and people started looking into things, we found out -- that was one of the things they first

found out that was whoops, back in the day they didn't transfer fee simple transfers of property, they just granted easements forever. And, yeah, so it turned out that the -- basically, the going from here to Jacksonville northbound lanes we still owned. So, that was one of the transfers we did. So, there is a little bit of still a strip along the road there that the Army owns.

And like I said, the Iron Mountain Road addition, we hope that that will be soon.

And so, that's all I have got. Does anybody have any questions?

New programs ideas? If someone has ideas, things that they would like to see or hear, that -- obviously related to the cleanup here, please, let Brenda

know, myself know, Lisa.

And if we have no questions or comments, then I guess we will adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 6:20 p.m.)

# C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ALABAMA)
CALHOUN COUNTY )

I, SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, CCR, 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 said time and place and was concluded without adjournment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 15th day of July 2013.

SAMANTHA E. NOBLE (ACCR 232)
Notary Public in and for
Alabama at Large

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-19-2013.