RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, CCR, Certified Court Reporter and Commissioner for Alabama at Large, at Fort McClellan, Alabama, on the 20th day of October 2015, commencing at approximately 5:00 p.m.

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

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: We'll call the meeting to order. Welcome everyone. We'll start off with calling roll. Mr. Buford?

MR. JAMES BURFORD: Here.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Dr. Cox?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: I was going to make him call you first.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Mr. Elser?

MR. JEROME ELSER: Here.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Mr. Foster? Dr. Harrington? Mr. Howard?

MR. GENE HOWARD: Here.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Dr. Kimberly is excused. Mr. Kimbrough? Mr. Hall?

MR. JOHN HALL: Hey there. Present.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Mr. Pearce is excused. Dr. Steffy is excused. Mr. Thompson is not

here. And Mr. Turner? Mr. Turner?

MR. JOHN HALL: He's excused.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Excused, yeah.

Okay, now we'll go to introduction of guests. So, could we start right here?

MR. MIKAEL SPANGBERG: My name is Mikael Spangberg with Tetra Tech, working for Zapata on the new munitions response contract.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Thank you.

MR. JASON SHIFLET: My name is Jason Shiflet, and I'm with Zapata.

MR. MICHAEL WINNINGHAM: My name is Michael Winningham. I'm also with Zapata.

MS. SARAH DYER: I'm Sarah Dyer. I'm with the Corps in Huntsville.

MR. CHASE HAMLEY: Chase

Hamley. I'm with the Corps of Engineers in Huntsville, as well.

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Greg Quimby. I'm with AECOM.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay, what we got here?

MS. JULIE ANGE: Julie Ange, ADEM.

MR. GERALD HARDY: Gerald Hardy with Matrix, representing the MDA.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Got Ms. Pinson.

MS. KAREN PINSON: Karen Pinson, National Guard.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: All right, has everyone had a chance to look over the minutes from the last meeting? Would be the April meeting.

I don't guess we can do anything with them, can we?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Why don't we just go ahead and do it, anyway, because, you know, the quorum issue is those who are present will vote.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay.

SCOTT BOLTON: Okay, so I'll move that we approve as written.

MR. JAMES BURFORD: Second.

SCOTT BOLTON: Thank God. I thought it was going to die for lack of a second.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: All those in favor?

SCOTT BOLTON: Looks like they approved, all right.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Shows no old business. Does anyone have any old business that's not reflected by the agenda?

If not, we'll move quickly to the programs. Mr. Quimby, I guess you're up.

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Well, I guess, while the presentation's getting started, my name is Greg Quimby. I was the project manager for -- or am the project manager for the remedial investigation that we conducted to delineate all the areas requiring cleanup that is going forth to the next contract.

So our fieldwork completed in May. And we're in the process now of documenting all the results and preparing the reports to follow the next CERCLA phases to keep the site going forward.

So the presentation that I have is basically just on, you know, what were the objectives of the remedial investigation, and then to present what we actually did and to cover some

of the findings to lead into, you know, how we came up with the areas that will require to be cleaned up of munitions.

The next slide is just the -- this is more or less the agenda for what I'll be covering. It basically covers all the objectives of the RI or remedial investigation. And I've got a slide or slides on each of these that I'll go through, so I'll cover them as we go.

But basically, how -- when we approach the remedial investigation, we outlined these objectives to the State, got their concurrence so that we would make sure that the data we collected would be useful for the end result in moving the site forward in the cleanup

process.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Does everybody recall what the purpose of the RI was? It's to define nature and extent of the munitions contamination, for lack of a better term, out in the --

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Next slide, please. So the first objective was to figure out where we needed to look to make sure we adequately characterized the site. So this map here shows all the former ranges on the installation.

We took all that data, we compiled it, and basically, you know, wanted to make sure we were looking in the right place so that, if there was any potential contamination out there, we were able to find it.

So, to use that -- or to develop that, we used years' worth of previous data that was collected through various investigations and cleanup actions.

We took that data and relayed it to, you know, how the former ranges were oriented to figure out, you know, where we should look, based on the constraints of the terrain and, you know, where they physically would have been firing into the area. And then we also looked at potentially previous data gaps where, you know, just because we don't think there might be something there, you know, it might have been because we just were missing key data from that.

So we kind of took all that into consideration. And these

blue lines here represent what we actually covered. They're called transects where, you know, we basically walked, it totalled to be about sixty-three miles through the site in those patterns and did the -- you know, looked to see any kind of evidence of munitions impacts. And I'll get into a little bit more of that in one of the later objectives.

But this first step was to really make sure we're looking in the right place, to make sure we actually find everything that we're supposed to or that we would want to.

Next slide. So, now this is just a high-level view of the results. It's -- the map is color coded where -- red is where there are a lot of

metallic objects that, you know, represent munitions items. And, you know, that's really what we were looking for. The green is areas where there really isn't much in the ground.

So this was -- you know, based on the investigation criteria that we had, this was sort of a once over the world of the results.

And from this we know that we were looking in the right place because we can see all of the really high dense areas where there's a lot of metal in the ground. You know, corresponds to the former ranges or areas that we knew from previous investigations or removal action that there is MEC out there. So this verified that we really did capture what we were supposed

to.

And there are some areas here where you can see where it's outside of a former range. And those areas we're able to justify because that's actually a construction and demolition debris landfill. So we've got an explanation for -- there's a lot of anomalies in that area, but we know they're not munitions related. So we're able to use this and, you know, take a step back when we were done and say, okay, you know, we did get adequate coverage and, you know, we've got a high level of confidence that, you know, we found all the impacts out there that we should have.

Next slide. So then the other objective is, you know, in using the transects, they were spaced

at a little over three hundred feet apart. And we wanted to make sure that our -- that approach to the investigation, we didn't miss anything in between. So there's statistical software that we used to come up with that design that tells us, you know, within a certain confidence level, you know, how far your transects should be apart from each other.

And using that, what we did, when we found -- when we got all the results, we looked back at the input that we used for that statistical design to say, okay, does it make sense.

One of the things that we used was the thirty-seven millimeter HE projectile. That was the smallest item that we were looking for. So that went into

the design calculation.

And the -- another key factor was a density of a hundred anomalies per acre, where we assume -- up front we assumed that anything that was less than that was probably not a target area -- not an area that we would be focused on, as having a high concentration of munitions items. So that was sort of a background number that we used at the design up front.

And then, again, similar to the first objective, when we got all results and took a look back, we wanted to validate that the input to the statistical design we used was appropriate. And based on what we found, it was.

So we know that -- it validated the approach. And we

know that there -- you know, there are no data gaps in our work, based on some inappropriate assumptions that we used to design the investigation footprint.

So, I think, yeah, the first two objectives, yeah, basically, satisfy that we looked in the right place and we looked at enough detail to find impacts, if they really are there.

Next slide. This third objective goes into -- or starts to cover how we actually did the investigation. So, basically, over those sixty some miles of transects, we put in survey points every two hundred feet that we used as guidelines so that we could follow on the path and know where we were going.

Then we cleared out some

vegetation from that path so that we would have access and, you know, wouldn't have anything that would obscure the data that we collected.

After we did that, we removed any metal debris from the surface, because what we were really looking at -- I should say, you know, we were concerned what was on the surface, but I think the items that posed the most hazard are what's underground, and that's what we were -- you know, what we wanted to focus on.

So we cleared the metal debris from the surface, and then followed up on those paths and geophysical mapping, which was what we used to put together the maps that have the anomaly densities.

So what that does is it's basically a high-speed metal detector that can tell if there is metal objects in the ground. And based on the response it gets, either tell how shallow they are or how big they are. But that was what we used to figure out, okay, you know, there's something of interest in the ground here that we know, and we want to go look to find out what that was.

So, you know, after we established a criteria for what that was, we went back out to all those points and actually dug 'em up to see, you know, what that object was in the ground that was causing that response. And, you know, from that, we're able to use the result to say, okay, you know,

if it was a munitions item, we would know. And, you know, depending on the amount that was in that area, we're able to identify what areas are impacted by munitions, what areas have scrap metal in the ground that isn't a concern, and basically know -- you know, from that statistical design, able to project the spatial areas of the munitions impacts at the site.

You know, all the items that we -- that we excavated, we took photo documentation of them. We characterized them by what type of munitions item they were, you know, what depth they were. And from that, we were able to kind of put all the pieces of the puzzle together to figure out, you know, what's really out there.

And then, because we didn't do full coverage over the entire, you know, three thousand some acres, we did rely on geostatistics to put together, you know, the area -- or I should say to define the areas where there are high concentrations of munition items. And that's what we used to define as an impact area, you know, where they would have repeatedly fired high-explosives, high-explosive ordnance into an area, you know, that would present the greatest hazard, you know, and thus require cleanup.

So then -- so all of this work was overseen -- you know, we had an internal QC program that we implemented to make sure that our work was on track. We were

also overseen by the Corps, who provided QA over our work. And then, you know, ADEM audited all the work, as well.

So, you know, all of this I'm presenting now has been thoroughly scrutinized, you know, to make sure that, you know, the results are valid, and more importantly, that we've got concurrence from all of the key stakeholders.

Next slide. So then the next -- this objective gets into the -- you know, we have the results of what was actually in the ground. And, like I mentioned before, we wanted to filter out the areas that are, you know, subsurface construction debris.

One of the things we found out there was, you know, based on

the geophysical response threshold that we used, we found a lot of areas that were just small-arms bullets, just the spent bullets from an old firing range. And those, we weren't really concerned with, because they don't have any explosive hazard.

So what we were focusing on were, you know, what areas have high-explosive munitions out there that need to be cleaned up.

So, when we filtered out the results, ran it through -- VSP is the geostatistical software. It's a visual sample plan that we used.

So, you know, when we refined the analysis, you know, that came up with nineteen areas of -- you know, that were

suspected as containing a high concentration of munitions-related anomalies. So, basically, these are the nineteen areas that will have to get cleaned up.

Now, when we looked at that, we applied some professional judgment, because, just relying purely on the math doesn't take into account things like terrain. You know, certainly we've got previous results that we could look at that we wanted to kind of make sure it made sense.

So, what we ended up doing was, we altered some of the boundaries, based on a ground truthing of the mathematical results to figure out the actual areas that we proposed for removal action.

And on the next slide, it just shows an example of one of the areas -- it's this one here -- how we did that.

The orange shaded area on this figure is the actual mathematical result of where it said is the area with the greatest concentration or with a high concentration of munitions impacts.

On here the blue represents all the anomalies that we used in our analysis. The red stars are actual MEC items that are, you know, high -- either unexploded ordnance or -- they basically represent items that still had an explosive hazard in them.

So what we did with this, as far as providing professional judgment is, we expanded the

areas out where -- you know, this was an example where we did find a MEC item. This was a mortar that had explosives in it still that was right on the boundary. So what we did was, we took -- that was a two hundred foot buffer from that item, and extended the removal action area to encompass that. That way, it's a more conservative approach where, you know, we didn't want to follow the strictly mathematical results that cut off right at the edge. We wanted to make sure that, when we do the removal action, we go a little bit beyond it, just to make sure, you know, if there are any other stragglers like that item that's out there, you know, that we've got them covered

adequately.

The other thing we did was: We took out areas that were previously cleared. So, it -- the scale of this is hard to see, but this is actually a road that was cleared back in, I think, 2004 or 2005, around there. So, obviously, that doesn't have to get cleared again. It was already done once. So, we excluded that from the boundary of it.

But, again, on this side, too, we -- there were some MEC items that were found when they did clear that road, so we pushed the boundary out just to give a little bit more buffer, you know, add a little bit more conservatism to the removal action. And, again, too, we extended it up to the northwest

here, because, when they did this removal action, they found a lot of MEC items in that area. So, we just wanted to be sure that, you know, we had it adequately covered.

So we took that kind of approach on several of the sites, some of the nineteen areas where there may have been three or four that were clustered together really closely. And what we did was we just grouped them all into one area and proposed, instead of having, you know, three small cleanup areas that are co-located, one large one that encompassed all of them.

So that was sort of the professional judgment that we used. You know, for the most part, we definitely treated it

to err on the side of being more conservative.

There were some areas, like this one is hard to see here, but it was an area where the geostatistical results came back and said that there was a high density area, but -- because it was right on the edge of the transect, that's actually a common error in that software, where it's a result of not having enough data in that one location, where it projects it out as being a high-density area.

But we justified that with the State. We explained why we didn't think it should be included, you know, and presented that, and, you know, ultimately got their concurrence.

So, you know, we -- the mathematical tool is a great tool, but, you know, we wanted to make sure that, you know, we also put a little bit of common sense into it, as well, and, ultimately, delineate the areas that will -- you know, we know will address the munitions impact at the site.

Next slide. So this is just a summary of the results. You know, the other thing we wanted to look at is not only spatially where is the contamination distributed, but also vertically, primarily to get data for the removal action.

And so this shows the distribution at depth of what we found. The graph on the left is non-hazardous munitions debris, so it was all munitions items,

but items that did not have an explosive hazard. And they're generally all within the top six to twelve inches, which kind of makes sense, when you fire an item, when it explodes in the air, you've got smaller pieces that just get scattered, you know, and they, typically, don't have the momentum to get carried too far into the ground.

Where this graph on the right are the actual items that have the explosive hazard. And they've got a wider distribution. Still, primarily, within the top two feet. You know, about 90 percent of the items that we found were within twenty-four inches of the ground surface.

But, as you expect, these -- when these don't

function as intended, you know, you've got larger items that typically tend to bury themselves when they hit the ground so, you know, that's why -- you know, the graph isn't as steep as the other.

And the deepest item we did find was at forty-eight inches. So, four feet was a one five five millimeter shrapnel round.

So, then, the last objective is, you know, once we've delineated the areas that need to be cleaned up, we need to be able to quantify the residual area and have some kind of information on, you know, what kind of hazard is outside of the areas that are the high concentration of munitions items.

So, to do this we used the

same software, geostatistical software program that's got another function that calculates, you know, what the hazard is for, you know, basically, the onesies and twosies that are, you know, where the errant shots that landed outside of the impact areas, you know, and what's the risk of encountering those, you know, in the areas that don't -- you know, that aren't subject to a removal action.

So our original objective for that was to have a 95 percent confidence that there's less than one MEC item per acre in the areas that aren't going to be cleaned up. And, based on the amount of coverage that we had and the results, we were able to get to a 99 percent

confidence level that there's less than 0.384, about, you know, 0.4 per acre. So, you know, this also shows that the areas that aren't going to get cleaned up are low enough hazard that it justifies, you know, not having to take any action in there. And then, you know, gives us a quantitative calculation for, you know, what the residual hazard is in the rest of the -- it ends up being about forty-five hundred acres, you know, that won't -- that are outside of the removal action footprint.

I think that was the last objective.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Does anyone have any very difficult questions for Greg? I think we're going to have a test on

this later.

SCOTT BOLTON: But you can cheat and look at the map above Chase and Lisa and Sarah there. And that's kind of where the cleanup areas, after all of the massaging of data and professional judgment, expanding things and so on, that's kind of what you're looking at.

The dark green would be the no-further-action areas. All the others are cleanup areas.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Thank you, Greg.

All right, moving right along. We have removal action and five-year review by Mr. Winningham.

MR. MICHAEL WINNINGHAM: Thank you, sir. And I'm going to keep mine simple, since we're just mostly introducing ourselves.

Our next one I'll do more complicated with a quiz at the end, keep in line with Chris' philosophy.

Once again, this is for the removal action and five-year review of the Charlie area. This is being administrated by the Corps of Engineers in Huntsville and Mobile.

So, as Greg said, it's been prioritized into eleven areas, based on the remedial investigation study.

And then, right now, our objective is -- hopefully, worst case, is June of 2016 we'll be starting fieldwork. But we're hoping to shift that a little bit to the left, to get out into the field just a little bit earlier is our goal.

And then, once we get that

done, we'll do all the reports and the findings and the site specific final report.

Currently, we'll be updating the land-use control implementation plan and the notice of environmental use restrictions.

And then, concurrently, we'll be doing a five-year review of their seventeen areas. And, if necessary, install signs, I think I was told, of kids dancing in a campfire.

And any rapid response, if Fish & Wildlife finds it. And then, you know, if we do, to do any type of sampling for any kind of waste that we find out there.

Next slide, please. This is just a quick little flow chart of what we've got here. Once

again, it's Corps of Engineers, Chase. And then those would be the people supporting over there. And then there's myself, and then I have two smarter people than me, I've got Mikael back there and Jason helping me. And then we got the teams out here, geophysics, we've got the quality management, site management. We're going to have, I think, up to eight geophysical teams, ten UXO teams, brush cutting, surveying. So you will see a lot of folks running around, hopefully around June, July of next year.

Next slide, please. So we'll start mobilizing. That will be a phased-in approach. We'll do -- establish our office communications. We'll take over the explosive storage from Greg.

We'll do our geophysical system verification, install our IBSs.

Once we're doing our surveying, then, like Greg said, they'll do a surface loop first to remove any metallic debris off the surface, so as not to interfere with the geophysics data. And vegetation clearance. Then we'll do the DGM. Process the data. Reacquire the targets. Intrusive (inaudible) removal. And then the whole time we'll be managing the munitions debris.

And then these will be going on. So, as we start in area one, we're going to continue on through in the prioritized area.

You know, the survey will start there. And then it'll go to the next one, the vegetation. So everybody will just be

following down there. And we'll do a nice little road chain.

Next slide, please. And then, once again, it's a better picture over here, because you can actually see it clearly, but this is the same thing. Then it just shows the areas and the acreage.

And once again, we'll just be starting up here. And one, which is the blue, is the first priority.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: That's basically to get them backed off the boundary so that, if MDA, you know, is in a position to sell, develop or whatever, or, you know, do work like, I don't know, logging and so on. Essentially, the same approach that MDA used, you know, along the roads, you know, get

yourself back off of them so that -- so that's why the blue is -- it seems kind of strange and counterintuitive, when you first look at it, but we were prescriptive about that.

It wasn't -- probably wasn't Mike's idea and choice, probably not the most efficient way to go at it, but, from the overall perspective of, you know, who kind of the neighbors are and so on, it's the same coordination, we've kind of flipped roles; when Matrix was doing the cleanup, the munitions cleanup for MDA, we used to have to coordinate our activities, you know, so you don't step on each other. And now it's kind of flipped. We're doing the munitions work, while they're doing their other haz waste

removal.

MR. WINNINGHAM: All right, next slide, please. Mikael will take it here.

MR. SPANGBERG: Again, my name is Mikael Spangberg. I'm the project manager with Tetra Tech. Tetra Tech is going to take the lead on the five-year review effort for -- under this contract.

We'll be conducting the five-year review at seventeen separate sites. Eleven of those are MEC sites, and six of them are HTRW sites.

That will involve conducting site inspections, as well as personnel interviews. We'll review and analyze the relevant data. We're going to determine whether the remedy remains protective of human health and

the environment, and then we'll document the findings, conclusions and recommendations in a five-year review report. Jason, next.

And, again, this is the five-year review sites. There's eleven sites, which is -- a copy of the map on the wall, which is a much better physical representation.

That's all I have on the five-year review. I think that's it.

MR. WINNINGHAM: That's our last slide, Scott.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: The guidance essentially requires us to -- all competed sites that have been -- everything that's been completed, you have to re-- -- that's not been cleaned to unrestricted use, you go and you

review to see if the remedy in place remains protective. And I think the guidance is all completed and underway, which is a little bit goofy to me, the underway is, but it is what it is.

And so, that's why they'll be looking -- they'll be looking at some stuff that was just really recently completed. I mean, even the final paperwork and stuff hasn't been done, but the removal action say that training area 24 Alfa that HydroGeoLogic has just recently completed, that'll be sucked up into the five-year review, too, or looked at.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Any questions for Michael or Mikael or Scott? Don't have any questions.

Don't have any questions?
MR. JOHN HALL: I'm good. Thank you.
MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: I don't suppose anybody here from ALDOT. Mr. Jones -- I don't see Mr. Jones.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: No. But I think Brenda, you talked to him, right?
MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: He sent the update that I just typed --
SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah, the --
MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: -- on there.
MR. SCOTT BOLTON: -- the update that's in the book here is -- obviously, you know, you can drive by and see their paving work.
And I guess their biggest challenge is the tie-in at 431,

you know, because they're -- you got to keep traffic moving and so on. And 21 is a real joy under there, too, at the right time of day, so -- I think we're all familiar with that, but --

MR. GENE HOWARD: Are they pretty firm on that?

SCOTT BOLTON: He seems to think, yes, by the end of this year, so we're looking, what, two more months, two and a half months it's going to be open.

MR. GENE HOWARD: I just came from that direction. It looked kind of raw up -- back there.

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: I just talked to him a week ago, just to double check and make sure --

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: They're paving a lot now. They're moving a lot.

You can see it. I'm sure the kids at night and on weekends are having a blast out there, on there, you know.

But, yeah, they -- so he seems fairly firm that it seems -- you know, that they should be able to do it by the end of the year. So that'll be good news.

Won't get run over on Iron Mountain Road anymore.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Moving right along. New business. Do we have any new business that's not reflected on the agenda?

If not, we'll move on to agency reports. ADEM, you ready?

MS. JULIE ANGE: Yeah, everybody's got our list of documents that we've reviewed and things that are in review. If anybody's got any questions

about them, I can try to field those or ask Brandi about them. She actually is the one who put this together, so I haven't seen it anymore than anybody here has.

Yeah, we're working away, as usual. So, that's about it.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay, same old thing. Ms. Pinson?

MS. KAREN PINSON: All right. Since the last meeting -- well, first, let me say that we have a new contract for our cleanup activities. And so AECOM is going to be doing the work for us there. It's currently a two-year contract.

So we kicked that off by doing the sampling at Range J and K in September of 2015. And they are preparing the annual report for that sampling right now.

We also submitted a five-year review report to ADEM in September of 2015. That was under our previous contract. And ADEM is reviewing that, and has some comments ready for us. We've been discussing it with them.

So those are the, you know, two new things since the last meeting, other than the fact that we do have a new contract. And we are going to have a kick-off meeting with ADEM and the Corps of Engineers and AECOM in November to discuss our plans for the next couple of years and what ADEM will be looking at for review during those -- during those two years, and just kind of how we're taking -- what we're going to be doing with some of these -- some of our

sites.

So, at some point, you know, we'd like to, you know, have a presentation here to kind of let you know what we're doing with some of these sites in the next couple of years.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay. Any questions for Ms. Pinson?

Mr. Hardy?

MR. GERALD HARDY: My turn. You also have a list of activities by site that's been conducted in the last six months.

I'll sort of highlight just a few of the things. And, you know, if you skimmed ahead and see anything you'd like to ask, please, feel free.

The first site on there was landfill three and the fill area northwest of Reilly Airfield.

The importance there is we've started the process for the -- it has a ground -- a contaminated groundwater plume from the old landfill three that moves in the direction of Highway 21, and then basically, from there, it hits a fault and goes north.

We've started the process. And a few months ago, some people, if you rode up Highway 21, you saw the drill rigs out there, because we were putting in a number of wells. And that landfill site is so close to the fence for Highway 21, it really limits us being able to get in there and install the wells.

And some people remember that when they were initially chasing the plume, they were in the -- there are still wells in

the median of the highway out there and some on the other side.

That was also highlighted -- our interest highlighted, when we -- they announced that they were going to complete the industrial road access all the way up to 21.

And that basically comes real close to where we're doing the groundwater remediation. And in fact, two of the wells that are currently installed would have to be removed, because they'll be in the middle of the road, once it's connected to Highway 21. So we're trying to sample those again and then get those wells properly abandoned.

So, when that activity is ongoing, some people -- people will be able to see it, because

it's not hidden back in the Fort. It's right there on the road. And so, when those activities -- because we got a number of calls, they're like, what's going on, you know.

And so that's what's going on there.

The road -- if I could -- Scott may can back me up -- but they thought they were doing a good thing getting this federal ATRIP money, that's a hundred percent federal money to finish the road. But you got to jump through a few more hoops when it's a hundred percent federal money.

They had laid out the path of the road. And then, one of the last things that was discovered that caused them to have to alter their path was a suspect

World War I historical trench warfare training area that is sort of, what you do with it's governed by the U. S. Historical Commission. And they said we couldn't go through there with the road, so now they're having to re-lay the roadway and avoid this suspect historical trench warfare area.

This falls on the heels of -- there were two old buildings right there -- if you've been into the Pappy Dunn Boulevard, there are two falling down old buildings that were initially going to be demolished for the road to go through, and they said, oh, no, they're historical buildings, you can't tear them down. So, they had to redesign the interchange there to put in basically a roundabout in order

to hit the access to start up, going towards 21. And now they'll have to sort of go to the right and a little wider to avoid the historical trench warfare area.

So there are two historical areas that are impacting the road construction.

And then we got to make sure that they avoid landfill three and the fill area northwest of Reilly when the road comes in there, because it's a tight squeeze.

So that's a few things going on with that, with landfill three.

Any questions before I move on? Jumping ahead.

I'll hit on a few things that y'all might notice. If you've come in by Summerall Road or

there by the church or where the new spur off the bypass will come in right there by the soccer fields, there's all those old barracks, thirty-two hundred barracks.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Uh-huh.

MR. GERALD HARDY: I think that's right.

The city, if you've driven by there, you notice there's a trackhoe sitting there, waiting to start tearing those down.

The City of Anniston's going to handle that demolition and will take it to the industrial landfill.

And that's probably the last major demo work to be done by MDA. When that's completed, then the industrial landfill or the open one will then begin closure of that site. So,

probably within eighteen months to two years, then we'll be looking to close that active landfill, and there won't be one out here.

A little hiccup to that is because of the age of the buildings, the city had to get a certification and ADEM approval to demolish potential asbestos that may be in the building.

So, if y'all remember back, the city tore down the apartment buildings that were just a little closer to 21, and ran into a problem because there were suspect asbestos in those buildings, and they hadn't received a proper permit from ADEM air division, so the city got a little slap. So, they are treading carefully this time before they start the demo work

there.

So that will -- to me, is one of the last eyesores out here, those old barracks that the roofs fall in. And people have been out there stealing metal and stuff out of them. Get caught all the time.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: There'll be a lot of unhappy snakes when they're gone.

MR. GERALD HARDY: The -- one real recent -- we just received it today. We've been doing -- our major lead cleanups are just south of Bains Gap Road and straddle Baby Bains Road.

And we completed phase one and got final concurrence on our corrective measures implementation report for phase one.

Phase two, which is Range

23 -- and, if you look at some of these maps, it's the area that looks like there's a lot of lines -- I don't know -- corner. But, anyway, that's Range 23.

And we just received concurrence today on our corrective measures implementation plan, which is how we'll get out there and start digging and remediating the lead contaminated soil and removing that.

And concurrently, or sort of concurrently, we'll be doing the third major phase of the Bains Gap lead cleanup, which is Range 18.

And if anybody remembered the big bang that we had this time last year, that's part -- that's on Range 18.

And so, the butt bunker that's

out there is where they actually did the demo work. And that's -- will have to be removed as part of that cleanup.

So that'll sort of dovetail into the phase two work. And we'll maybe have two contractors out here moving a lot of dirt.

We have finished the -- I think the only probably real remaining MEC work is, once that butt bunker is removed, we'll have to sweep underneath it to make sure there are no rounds that were fired in that area before they constructed the butt bunker.

But, beyond that, our previously identified areas, we've completed the fieldwork, are ramping up on the after-action reports. And we're about to swamp Julie here with a

number of papers. We're sort of killing a lot of trees, mounding it up.

So we're getting those final reports in. That will require a number of them, that weren't cleaned to depth, they were cleared to, in some areas, one foot, so they'll require an environmental covenant to place restrictions on that.

And so we're rapidly moving ahead with that. Hopefully, we will have, within the next six months or so, all the After Action Reports in. And so we can move ahead.

That's ended up with a -- I think we have four or five that have been approved so far. Anyway, I can't keep count.

MS. JULIE ANGE: Something like that.

MR. GERALD HARDY: Julie has signed off on four or five of them, so -- and we've got comments that we've responded.

And I guess, finally, we've started work on some of the HTRW sites where there's really no further activity ongoing.

We're trying -- in the original ESCA and in fact the cleanup agreement that we operate under, the MDA does, has -- calls for a final report of corrective measures. And it specifies prerequisites for environmental covenants. And then we're trying to check those off.

And, as we think some of the sites have completed that activity, we're filing final report of corrective measures and requests that ADEM concur

that we've met the prerequisites.

The final step into that is to submit a request to the Army. And we can do it by site or we can wait till the end and submit one big package.

So, that's what we're working on on the HTRW side to close out. And we're beginning to close out a number of those sites.

I've rambled longer than y'all probably wanted me to. So, if there's any questions, I'll be glad to try to answer them.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Hardy?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: It's us, huh.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Mr. Bolton?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: All right.

Well, I think you can see where we have -- the significant activities, I think, that the -- the single biggest thing -- let me kind of send some praise AECOM's way. The remedial investigation feasibility study, quite frankly, it exceeded our expectations. I'll make no bones about it.

When -- some of you have been around awhile -- and probably wish you hadn't been around that long -- I know that we used to do a different process for some of these investigations for munitions called an EE/CA, engineering evaluation cost analysis is what the acronym was. And it wasn't giving us really the degree of definition we thought that we needed and so

on. And, quite frankly, there were some difficulties with it extrapolating data and so on.

So that's why we gambled on -- we didn't really gamble, but talked to our director -- our now director, and we agreed a couple years ago to go ahead and do the remedial investigation, feasibility study. Would update everything, bring everything into kind of current risk assessments, all these other kind of things.

So, we had some good expectations. And, quite frankly, we felt like, if we could save a hundred acres of cleanup, we would pay for the RI. You know, we'd pay for the effort. So it has turned out really well.

But just the level of

precision and so on, to get a confidence level of 99 percent of less than, you know, potential probability of less than half an acre -- I mean, that's less than half an item per acre, is extraordinary.

And, particularly, I like the way -- the approach that they used, because we kind of quantitatively defined the no further action areas on the -- upfront.

So, you know, there's always some risk with that, when you define a standard as a fairly regular standard there.

So, the other thing that has worked out very, very well for us -- and we did it with the RI, and we've now done it on all subsequent actions -- is we essentially do on-board reviews

with ADEM as we go.

I'm sure Julie gets sick of some of the phone calls and so on and so forth. But, given the extent of the work that was done and the complexity of the work that was done with the RI, we started doing this because we said, there's just no way that, once we get done and compile all this data and then, you know, basically try to feed somebody with a fire hose.

So they have been very, very diligent, spent a lot of time, lot of hours on phone calls with us, meetings with us, and so on. But it really paid off, because when we did finally have a wrap-up meeting, if you will, and we brought in all the folks from ADEM, UXO Pro, their contractor and so on, as

technical experts, it went, again, beyond our wildest expectations. They were very pleased with it. We all agreed with some adjustments to make and so on.

So, it's been a real good effort. They did a good job. And I think it's -- we have a high level of confidence that it did what it was supposed to do. It has well defined the nature and extent of the contamination, and that's where we go.

So they're pretty well out of the field. They were doing some cleanup stuff, I guess, what, the last couple days. You may be done now, I guess.

And we're really kind of in the final paperwork phase of that contract. I know Greg has already put out some draft

information and so on.

That data, in turn, has fed into the contract that was just awarded to Zapata Engineering, that Mike Winningham, Mike Spangberg were talking about.

So that's essentially the final munitions contract, if you will, for Fort McClellan.

Now, the peer performance on you guys is, what, four years, right?

MR. MICHAEL WINNINGHAM: Correct, sir.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: On yours, okay.

And so, in a very real sense, you know, at least on the munitions side, the battle has been essentially won. We'll see, you know, once we get the cleanup done.

And then, you know, the mop-up

will always be messy. So, always, getting all the paperwork done, getting all the boxes checked, trust me, that won't be real fast.

But nonetheless, I mean, I think we're actually seeing, you know, kind of heading towards the end state here, on both sides of the house, too, because I know Gerald's timelines and so on are -- you guys are looking at what, '17 to '19, to be done?

MR. GERALD HARDY: Yeah.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Somewhere in that realm, still. Yeah.

So, I mean, realistically, in the next four to five years, almost all of the significant cleanup work will be done on this installation, which, quite frankly, was really the largest

closure that the Army did. So, I think that's pretty significant.

On the installation restoration program, which is our haz waste side of the house, okay, most of you are aware that we have HydroGeoLogic, who are, you know, across the ditch over here. They were awarded a contract last September, I guess, we squeaked that one in. And they have -- they had four major areas, one of -- you can kind of see 'em on this particular map over here, over in the Choccolocco corridor, the old eighty-one millimeter area, 24 Alpha and along Bains Gap Road. This is Range 20 that had been previously done.

So they're doing -- again, it's a munitions -- it's a small

arms, lead, metals cleanup and soil.

They've completed the 24 Alpha already. And they are moving on to -- they're now, you'll see -- if you go over Bains Gap Road, you'll see a whole bunch of activity in here. They partially re-delineated the Choccolocco corridor.

And then, in coordination with the Alabama Forestry Commission, we realized that they had some contracting needs or some lead times that they had to do to be sure and so forth. So we decided to shift the effort back to Bains Gap. And then they'll finish doing the boundary delineation there so the Forestry Commission can value the timber and some other things.

We just can't bring loggers into this thing. So, basically, in this case, HGL is going to have to do the tree removal and so on. And they'll then move them to a source where other loggers can pick them up and take them to market and so on. You know, we just don't want some old guys up there with their skidders, dragging contamination around.

MR. GENE HOWARD: Excuse me.

SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah, Gene.

MR. GENE HOWARD: Is there any reluctance on the loggers' part to harvest the pines?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Not -- well, I don't know what you mean by -- I mean, if they're concerned about working on our property for safety reasons --

MR. GENE HOWARD: Well --

SCOTT BOLTON: -- or anything else, the answer to that's no.

MR. GENE HOWARD: It has to do with shrapnel and bullets in wood.

SCOTT BOLTON: No. Not that we've heard of. And they certainly removed a bunch of trees out of the 24 Alpha area and so on so --

MR. GENE HOWARD: No problems with it?

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Not that we've heard of. So -- yeah, I didn't -- it's never come up as an issue, quite frankly, so -- and they've logged -- don't forget, there have been a lot of logging operations on this post, because that was one of the things the installation did through the Corps of Engineers. Their forestry management

people, for years and years and years, have conducted logging operations on installation.

So, to my knowledge, it's not -- it's just, quite frankly, never really come up before.

I guess, if you got a big enough chunk, it could mess up a mill or something, but I don't know.

MR. GERALD HARDY: They run magnets over them, so, I mean --

SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah.

MR. GERALD HARDY: -- I got a feeling, they take --

MR. GENE HOWARD: It if hit --

MR. GERALD HARDY: -- that into account.

MR. GENE HOWARD: -- it'd mess up a saw.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Yes, if it was a big enough piece, yeah, I agree. Yeah. Just like

somebody -- the old stunt that activists used to do, they'd spike a tree --

MR. GENE HOWARD: Yeah.

SCOTT BOLTON: -- yeah, so that --

MR. GERALD HARDY: We actually found an unexploded round in a tree that had stuck in there, hadn't gone -- had gone up in the air. And so we had to not only look on the ground, but we had to go back through some of these areas and look up.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Greg had something.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Greg has something.

SCOTT BOLTON: Yeah, Greg?

MR. GREG QUIMBY: Yeah. I was just going to say, I think, in a lot of the areas, when they actually were used for training,

they didn't have any trees on them.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Good point.

MR. GREG QUIMBY: A lot of what we found is, you could kind of tell where a bad area was going to be, because it was on a side of a hill, and the trees were all pretty small, which was kind of -- you could just see where they used the side of the hill as the backstop. And it's all relatively newer trees.

So, yeah, I don't know how -- you know, site-wide, how much that applies, but I think in a lot of the areas that were the bad areas, you know, back when they used were -- were just open field.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: No, I think it's a valid point. And, of course, when you go site-wide,

you know, don't forget Fort McClellan's been used for literally a hundred years. You know, there's information Camp Shipp, Spanish-American War, the place was used.

So, when you have that kind of a history, you know, you can have a hundred year old tree out there that is now grown -- you know, a substantial tree, obviously, in a place that had been, you know, looked like a strip mine, you know, when it first came up, so -- but I think it's a good question. I've just never heard of it, you know, being an issue. But I understand the point. So, it's interesting.

But, anyway -- so those are the -- I think, the most significant things. The -- like

I said, the same model, though, that we used with the RI, particularly with the regulators and other stakeholders, Corps of Engineers and so on, you know, we're all on the phone weekly on all the projects now, and have everybody -- because it has worked -- it has really smoothed things. I think the process works very smoothly now. And it probably relates to efficiency.

It's hard to measure, you know. You know, you can't -- let's do it screwed up, and now let's do it the other way and see if one's better. You know, you don't have that option, so you're stuck with the process that you've got.

But it seems to have worked. It worked very, very well with the RI and it seems to be

working with everything else, as well. So we're real happy with that. And I -- same, real optimistic.

So that's about it. Like I say, the significance is, we have kind of the final two removal contracts in place that'll complete the -- at least on the Fish & Wildlife Refuge side, you know, active Army side of things, should complete in the next four years. The fieldwork will complete before then.

We should have final reports on both of those efforts in the next four years. And there'll be probably several years thereafter. So you're not looking at least at being unemployed any time soon.

MS. LISA HOLSTEIN: Thank God.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Which is, I'm sure, near and dear to her heart.

But, if anybody has any other questions, we'd be happy to try to address them. Going once. Going twice.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Upcoming programs, any ideas for upcoming programs?

Your band want to play?

MR. JOHN HALL: Y'all want to listen?

SCOTT BOLTON: Well, I guess, as always, if you have an idea or a question or need, you know, call Brenda.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay. Any comments from the audience? Any questions? Comments? Et cetera? Et cetera?

MS. BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: I have one. If you're a guest or

contractor, would you make sure you sign the book out here so I can give it to Samantha so she can get your name?

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay. I guess the only thing left is adjournment. Any objections to adjournment?

MR. JOHN HALL: I make a motion to adjourn.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Second it, yeah.

MR. PHILLIP BURGETT: All those in favor? We're adjourned.

MR. SCOTT BOLTON: Thank you for attending, those who attended. I guess we'll see everybody in April.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 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 as noted and was concluded without adjournment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal at Anniston, Alabama, on this the 14th day December 2015.

_____

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-6-2017.