

RESTORATION ADVISOR BOARD

FOR MCCLELLAN

* * * * *

Taken before Robert Keith
Kennedy, CCR, Certified Court
Reporter and Commissioner for
Alabama at Large, at Fort
McClellan, Alabama, on the 18th
day of October 2016, commencing
at approximately 5:00 p.m.

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

CAPTION SHEET	1
REPORTER'S INDEX	2
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD . . .	3-71
CERTIFICATE.	72

MR. BOLTON: Ed Turner, the Community Chair, is going to be a little bit late. So we'll go ahead and start without him.

We'll do the role call.

MR. BOLTON: Mr. Buford?

MR. BUFORD: Here.

MR. BOLTON: Phillip Burgett?

MR. BURGETT: Here.

MR. BOLTON: Doctor Cox is excused.

Mr. Elser is excused.

Mr. Foster, no response.

Mr. Hall is excused.

Doctor Harrington.

Mr. Howard.

Doctor Kimberly is excused.

Mr. Kimbrough?

MR. KIMBROUGH: Here.

MR. BOLTON: Mr. Pearce is excused.

Doctor Steffy is excused.

Mr. Thompson.

And we have Karen Pinson.

Are you here, Karen?

MS. PINSON: Uh-huh
(affirmative response).

MR. BOLTON: From National
Guard.

Gerald Hardy from Matrix. I
saw you.

And Brandi Little from ADEM is
excused, will not be here.

And so we'll go around the
room real quickly and introduce
guests.

Before I do that, we do have a
new semi-permanent member of the
-- of the RAB. Keith Westlake
from Fish and Wildlife Service
is now our new permanent refuge
manager. We've had a series of
temporary refuge managers after
Sarah moved on. And so Keith is
now here for the duration.

I guess, Chase, you want to

introduce yourself to the group and we'll just kind of come around the horn.

MR. HAMLICK: Easy enough.

Chase Hamlick, the Project Manager for the Army Corp of Engineers.

MR. BOLTON: Vicki?

MS. RYSTROM: Vicki Rystrom, the project geophysics and data base manager for Zapata.

MS. HOLSTEIN: Lisa Holstein, Environment Research Group. I am here to support to Zapata.

KENT TIBBITTS: Kent Tibbits for Zapata, Inc.

MR. WESTLAKE: Keith Westlake, refuge manager for Mount Longleaf National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. BOGLE: Frank Bogle with Tetrattech with Zapata.

MR. SPANGBERG: Mike

Spangberg, Project Manager for Tetrattech in support of Zapata.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Michael Winningham, Project Manager for Zapata.

MR. FORSYTH: Mike Forsyth, site manager for HydroGeoLogic.

MR. TARR: Jeff Tarr, site manager for CDI working for with HGO.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Brenda Cunningham, Environmental Research Group, here to support Scott.

MR. BOLTON: And I'm Scott Bolton. I'm the BRAC site manager for the Army here at Fort McClellan.

Okay. Next item on the agenda is going to be approval of minutes. If you'll look there in the packet.

Do we have a motion to approve

the minutes?

MR. BUFORD: So moved.

MR. BOLTON: How about a second?

MR. BURGETT: Second.

MR. BOLTON: All those in favor.

(Aye) .

MR. BOLTON: All right. It carries even though we lack a quorum.

Item 4 -- excuse me, old business?

We don't have any old business. We'll move on -- we'll move on to Item 5, the programs. We have a couple of -- we have a number of updates today.

The first one is going to be on our munitions removal action and the five-year review that's being conducted by Zapata.

And so, I guess, Mike, we'll turn it over to you as soon as Brenda has got it up and going.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Next slide, please. The two areas we're going to talk about is the removal action. And then Mr. Spangberg will talk about the five-year review. So next slide, please.

So the removal action we have been concentrating south of Bains Gap Road where the controlled burn has been accomplished. So all of our efforts to date have been done in those areas, 1-Charlie, 1-D, 1-E, Area 7, 9, 10 and we'll go through each one of those on where we are at on each area.

So next slide, please, Brenda.

So we started 1-Charlie, this area, to try to get ahead so HGO

can -- you know they'll do their remediation. So to date, and it's this just south of Bains Gap Road, there's a little slice above Bains Gap Road that's not been done, but we are completing the surface sweep of 1-Charlie. Vegetation removal is complete. This is as of Friday 92% complete with the PGM of that area. Approximately 80% has been reacquired. It could be a little more today.

Chris is going to be starting in and around those creek grids on Monday, the 24th, and no grids have been QA'd or QC'd. And then, once, again, we're just doing everything south of Bains Gap.

Once the controlled burn happens north Bains Gap, then we'll finish that once section

of 1-C to the north. It's looks like possibly 7A and B.

The next slide I will show you what we've been done. I know it's hard to see from the -- but you can see everything has been surface swept, vegetation removed.

DGM in the dark red are the areas where that we have done reacquire.

And I believe, as of today, Vicki, if I'm correct, all those grids up to the top are almost reacquired also; correct, in and round that creek bed?

MS. RYSTROM: Yes.

MR. BOLTON: Does everybody know what we're talking about DGM and all this kind of stuff?

I realize most everybody is, you know, veterans of many years on this. But if you don't,

raise your hand and we'll make sure everybody understands.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Yes. And if you need me to explain what the acronym is I will do it.

Next slide, please.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: You might want to go on and go through it.

MR. BOLTON: Just go ahead and go through it.

MR. WINNINGHAM: So The next area, which runs adjacent to 1-Charlies, is Area 7. There the surface sweep is about 74%. We've had 11 MEC items as of Friday. Vegetation removal has not started there yet. The analog and geophysics mapping has not been started or the digital geophysics map has not been started, AGM and EGM.

No intrusive. And then no grids QC'd or QA'd.

Next slide, please. Area 7, as you see, is next to the area 1-Charlie. And the little red stars are the areas where we found munitions and explosives of concern.

The yellow is AGM grids, which is the 40% slope or higher.

And then the green -- I'm sorry, the green is AGM and is also 40% and they'll both be AGM.

MR. TIBBITTS: One has been surveyed.

MR. WINNINGHAM: One has been surveyed. Thank you, Kent.

Next slide.

That was Kent Tibbitts.

MR. WINNINGHAM: The next area we're dealing with -- talking about is Area 1D. It's 65 and it's changed acres. And it's been surfaced swept almost 89%.

It is along the road, which you'll see here in a second. We found, as of Friday, just on the surface, 85 MEC items in the range of 37mm projectiles, 60mm projectiles and 75mm projectiles.

Vegetation is 43.6% complete of about 36 acres. ADEM just started in there last week, about 2.5 acres. And then once, again, no intrusive yet or QC or QA.

Next slide, please.

And then you can see once again the red circles where all the MEC items have been found.

And then start up at the north a little bit and the gray has been surveyed in.

Next slide, please.

The next area is Area 9. It's

approximately 68 acres. Surface sweep is about 88% complete, approximately 59 and a half acres. We found 38 MEC items there as of Friday. 37mm projectiles, 60mm mortars and 75mm projectiles. Just started doing some brush clearing in there about 2% or about two acres. Once, again, no AGM, DGM, intrusive or QC or QA yet.

Next slide, please.

And then once, again, you can see it is five to 1D, which we suspected, and we were correct that there is initial items right next to where we were before.

Next slide, please.

The next area is 1E. It's further to the south. The surface is a hundred percent complete. It's about 19 acres.

We found one MEC item on the surface, 85mm projectile.

And then no vegetation removal has been started yet, AGM or DGM, intrusive and/or QC QA.

Next slide, please.

And then you can see a little MEC item was found down there at the bottom of 1-3 -- sorry, 1-Echo.

Next slide, please.

The last area is Area 10. It's about a hundred and seventy acres. As of Friday, we were about 6% done, about 10.2 acres. No vegetation removal yet. No AGM or DGM, intrusive or QC QA.

Next slide, please.

And then we see this rather larger area. And then we're started close 1-Tango was at and working our way east and then started down here along the

boundary of Area 10.

Next slide, please.

Next, we were going to talk about the five-year review and I will turn it over to Mr. Spangberg and he will present.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Can I ask a question?

MR. WINNINGHAM: Sure can, sir. Fire away.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Were those -- any of those, were they designated ranges or is that just -- I know in some of the historical records during World War II and some of those they just fired into the mountain.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Right. These are part of the designated ranges. And then that was also validated through the RIFS process or Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study.

That was done to delineate these areas.

So these areas that have identified have been done through the RI through forensic evidence where the ranges use to be. And then they have bounded them to the acreage right now. And then the stuff outside of that is no further action areas.

MR. KIMBROUGH: No further action?

MR. WINNINGHAM: Correct.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Okay.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah, those are all impact areas. You know, they do this Archival Search Report that shows the old range bands. And then you use your remedial investigation to kind of bound the nature and extent of the contamination. So where are the impact areas, where are

the areas. And then these guys go in and do the clearance of them and all that good stuff. That's where we're at now.

MR. KIMBROUGH: I know at one time they said that some of the ranges were not charged, that they were used during World War II -- World War I era. If I remember right when we originally started the cleanup they showed us pictures of them firing the mortars outside of their tents up into the mountains. And so I just wondered if -- if that was the result of or if these were -- if all of these were designated ranges?

MR. BOLTON: Yes. For the most part, yeah. I don't know of any -- there may have been some -- some areas that were

found that -- that weren't in the ASR or something, but I don't -- not off the top of my head.

I think that these were all part -- you know, these were all designated ranges. Not much surprise when you find an impact area. You know, the densities that they're talking about where they're finding all these munition items, it's -- there's no surprise.

And on the other side of the boundary, you know, to the west, Matrix did their cleanups there and they were -- you know, they were impact areas.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Right.

MR. BOLTON: So we -- you know, we knew that that's where we're looking at.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Those are all

above where the rifle ranges were; right, going up the mountain?

MR. BOLTON: Kind of south.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Yeah.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Any other questions?

(No response).

MR. WINNINGHAM: Thank you.
Mike.

MR. SPANGBERG: Thank you.
Okay. We've covered the five-year review in the past with the last RAB as well. But Tetrtech is completing a five-year review of 18 sites that -- for which remedies are already in place. There is a much larger map up on the wall for those of you that want to take a look at that. This is a lot legible.

Next side, please.

So of the 18 sites 11 of them are MEC sites. And I won't go through each -- these individually, we covered those previously. So we can go to the next slide.

MR. BOLTON: The briefing packets are in your stuff.

MR. SPANGBERG: And then we have eight -- eight sites that are HTRW sites. The status updates for those of you that were here the last time, we did a site inspection in October of 2015 and also in March of 2015.

There was a public meeting that was held in May of 2016 at the Anniston City Community Center.

And today for review of the findings the five-year reviews. The construction of the eastern bypass has been completed.

Logging activities have occurred in the Y Area.

Field work for remediate metals-contaminated soil at four sites is underway.

There are no incidents of MEC being discovered -- have been reported.

The conclusion is that remedies remain protective of human health, safety and the environment.

And we're currently in the -- preparing the report working closely with Defense or the Army at Fort McClellan.

Any questions?

MR. BURGETT: How much longer have we got of this whole process?

Of course -- let's see. We're coming up on two decades now. So how much longer before we

pack up our teepee?

MR. SPANGBERG: Well, a five-year review, you know, that's -- that's something that has to happen every five years for as long as -- you know, once the remedies are in place to the that they remain protected. So there's no really end date to the five-year process.

MR. BOLTON: Are you talking about the overall work here or are you talking about field work?

MR. BURGETT: Yeah.

MR. BOLTON: The five-year review is, like Mike said, will be ongoing indefinitely. Okay. That's a requirement.

Any time --

MR. BURGETT: What about the remediation?

MR. BOLTON: Let's see. Y'all

are looking at a couple years,
another year and a half?

MR. SPANGBERG: Yeah.

MR. BOLTON: And then how much
-- I don't know -- what's --
what's your master schedule
show?

MR. WINNINGHAM: Well, it was
a two-year field window. And,
basically, we've been out in the
field for just a little over a
month.

MR. BOLTON: Right. And then
you figure six months to a year
thereafter.

But the -- the bottom line is
you're looking at field work
probably finishing up in two
years.

Figure six months to a year
thereafter, more than that,
probably a year, year and a half
by the time you get all the

final documentation, get everything through the regulatory approval process and all that good stuff.

MR. KIMBROUGH: What percentage of the property have you got sign-off on?

Has ADEM and everybody signed off on it and it's clear?

MR. BOLTON: Well, any of the remedies, anywhere we do remedial work, Matrix, ADEM obviously signs off on it.

It's -- right now none of what we're doing is underway, obviously, has been signed off on.

We do have some of the previous removal actions that we've done. And then Gerald can speak to where they've got concurrence and approval from ADEM on their -- on their part

of the work.

MR. KIMBROUGH: I'm familiar with that.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah. So we're probably -- probably at the 50% stage or maybe thereabouts, maybe not in total -- in terms of total acreage.

MR. KIMBROUGH: That's been signed off on?

MR. BOLTON: Yeah -- well, no, it would be less than that, I'm sorry, because our previous removal actions won't -- won't tally up to the same acreage that we've got underway right now.

So the field work is generally speaking one of the faster pieces of it. Where -- where it seems to take all your time is the remedial investigations, the feasibility studies, you know,

define the nature and extent, finding where everything is, what are you going to do about it.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Right.

MR. BOLTON: Those things really take the time.

MR. KIMBROUGH: But you're saying two and a half years?

MR. BOLTON: Probably.

MR. KIMBROUGH: And then y'all's end will be clear?

MR. BOLTON: Gerald, has got something.

MR. HARDY: That's provided you don't have groundwater contamination.

MR. BOLTON: Right.

MR. HARDY: Because on some of these sites, on the MDA portion, you will probably go beyond 2037. 2037 is when the ESCA that funds the work runs out,

the current ESCA.

But when you're talking about groundwater contamination to achieve the performance standards we may go beyond 2037.

MR. BURGETT: I'll be 65 so I'll be retired.

MR. HARDY: Just say that we can finish field work, soil remediation, picking it up, moving it in three or four, five years, but if it -- if you've got contamination, it's still migrated into the groundwater, that's kind of unusual particularly out here where we have fractured flow in the bedrock and the contamination is down into in that zone.

MR. BOLTON: Basically anything that's above unrestricted use, unlimited exposure -- I get them backwards

anyway. The -- and so whether there's residual contamination of any type left over you're going to have land use controls. So you'll have some sort of monitoring, five-year review or periodic review.

So even when all the work is done here and who knows what you'll still continue to have these periodic reviews.

MR. BURGETT: So how long does the RAB last?

MR. BOLTON: That will be -- actually, will be a discussion we'll probably have in April.

We can disband the RAB anytime you want to do it, but I would suggest --

MR. BURGETT: Do I hear a motion?

MR. BOLTON: -- I would suggest that, you know, we get

the field work done, you get the final reports at least up to that point.

So I would suspect that the RAB has got about the same life span.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another question about this slide.

Is that March 1, 2016?

MR. SPANBERG: Correct.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah.

MR. SPANBERG: That's a typo.

MR. WINNINGHAM: Just making sure you were pay attention, Michael.

MR. BOLTON: That's right. See, I didn't have flip the light on.

MR. SPANBERG: Any other questions on the five-year review?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: All right. Well,

next up is going to be
HydroGeoLogic and CBI, Chicago
Bridge and Infrastructure.

Mike, Jeff, whatever.

And, again, I guess I'm
assuming y'all have -- everybody
should have handouts in their
packets.

MR. FORSYTH: I'm Mike Forsyth
and this is Jeff Tarr our team
partner.

The first slide is basically
just introduces who we are and
what we're doing here.

Go to the next slide, please.

And today we're providing
status update of our project at
Fort McClellan to perform
remedial action at four sites.
Started in the 2014 and -- with
planning and are currently in
the active remediation phase.
We'll start by showing the

locations of the sites, then proceed with a brief update of status at each and then close with a summary.

Next slide, please.

This slide is -- shows the location of each of the four sites. Three of the sites, T-24 Alpha, Bains Gap Road Ranges and 81mm are currently on fish and wildlife owned property.

And the fourth site is on the Alabama Forestry Commission property.

Next slide, please.

Our objectives at T-24 Alpha was to excavate, stabilize and dispose of metals-contaminated soils, primarily lead and zinc and also -- and chromium copper.

The second objective was to install new wells and perform groundwater monitoring of

benzene and carbon tetrachloride.

To date, we've completed all required excavation and restored the site and we are now monitoring.

In addition, we installed three new wells, abandoned many unneeded wells, and have just completed the one-year quarterly groundwater monitoring.

We'll continue performing groundwater monitoring annually through the remainder of the contract.

Next slides.

The next two picture show some of the work we did at 24 Alpha.

Go to the next slide, please.

The former 81mm mortar ranges. Are our main objective is that 81mm is similar to the T-24 Alpha, just excavate, stabilize

and dispose of
metals-contaminated soils.

To date, we've completed all
the excavations and restored the
site and are now monitoring. In
addition, we abandoned several
unneeded wells.

Go to the next slide, please.

It's just a picture of
vegetating one of the -- one of
the areas of the 81mm.

Next slide, please.

The main objective of Bains
Gap, similar to the previous
sites, is to excavate, stabilize
and dispose of
metals-contaminated soils.

Those are remediations --
remediating sediments and
portions of Cane Creek on the
site and immediately downstream.

Using an engineering -- an
engineered drain and pump

approach to clean each segment, working from upstream to downstream. To date, we've completed all excavation in the soil segments. And we have also abandoned multiple, unneeded wells at the site.

Go to the next slide, please.

This photo shows some of the clearing activity at Bains Gap needed to enable the excavations.

Next slide.

This map is to provide some orientation of the six sections of Cane Creek that are being remediated as I noted before. We're working from upstream to the east, to downstream to the west.

Next slide, please.

This photo shows a small stretch of Cane Creek

remediation area where we drained it, remediated the sediment and began restoring the stream bed and adjacent banks.

Next slide, please.

The -- our main objective at the Choccolocco Corridor Ranges is similar to the other sites, which is to excavate, stabilize and dispose of metals of contaminated soils.

Additionally we were tasked to removing various range-related debris, including old targets and related materials.

To date, we're in the process of excavation and disposal and we are restoring areas as we proceed. We have removed a number of unneeded monitoring wells and are planning removal of range-related debris in the fall.

Next slide, please.

This is a picture of some excavation process in some of the steeper areas of Choccolocco Corridor Ranges.

Next slide, please.

In closing, we have successfully worked closely with all stakeholders and completed activities to date. We're anticipating completing all main field work activities by the next summer or fall.

As note for the groundwater monitoring at 24 Alpha, as well as vegetation inspection, monitoring at all sites through the end of the contract in 2019.

Thanks for your time.

Does anybody have any questions?

MR. KIMBROUGH: Will anybody monitoring those after 2019?

MR. BOLTON: Yes.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Who -- will that --

MR. BOLTON: Yeah, that is -- it's -- it's just -- 2019 is just when their contract expires.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Whose responsibility will it be to monitor those, will it be DOD or will it go over to the owner of the property?

MR. BOLTON: Well, the owner of the property is going to Fish and Wildlife Service. So it will be the government in some fashion or another.

Whether the Army actually does it, whether they pay Fish and Wildlife or whatever I really don't know. I don't have the answer to that.

My suspicion is it will still

-- still be DOD in some fashion.

MR. KIMBROUGH: And on the other end of it, will the other end like what MDA is doing, will that go over to the local government or whoever?

MR. BOLTON: Well, their contract, the ESCA if you will, expires, as Gerald said, in 2037.

If there's sites, which I think there will be, particularly the groundwater sites, which will require ongoing monitoring, natural continuation and so on, there will be some kind of -- there will have to be some sort of contract in place or something along those lines, some agreement.

Mr. KIMBROUGH: So what I'm saying, will that go over to

Anniston?

MR. BOLTON: I don't know to be honest with you whether -- again, whether the Army will fund it and hand it off to somebody or whether they would suddenly take back over or if they're going to do regional stuff.

I mean, to be honest with you, that far down the road it's a little bit -- you know, to predict, it's a little difficult.

MR. HARDY: The language of ESCA says that the recipient is responsible following completion of the period of ESCA, but there can be mechanisms to extend funding, add funding to that based on if there are some unknown conditions that are discovered.

MR. KIMBROUGH: I know we had discussed on the other end the clauses and the deeds in which if construction was taking place and you exhale or something who -- who would be responsible?

MR. BOLTON: Right. You'd have construction support there.

MR. KIMBROUGH: Right. And that would still be like from a government agency?

MR. BOLTON: Right.

Any other questions?

So I guess we're moving into new business.

Agency reports. I don't think -- did we get anything in from --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We did get from Brandi. It's in your packet.

MR. BOLTON: So the ADEM report is in the packet.

Karen, do you want to give us an update on National Guard?

MS. PINSON: We're continuing our groundwater sampling at Ranges J and K out on the Pelham Range. And we did a sampling at the end of September 2016. I mean -- yeah, September 2016.

We prepared a new sampling analysis brand for the sampling events in -- in 2016 and September 2015. We've got ADEM approval on that, on that work plan.

We are also in the process of sampling all the wells on Pelham Range, which includes all of the Range J wells, the Range K wells. They're -- and then wells in the toxic, what we call the call the toxic gas area. I'll get to that in a few minutes.

But it's just a site -- it's just a -- it's just a broad sampling event, groundwater sampling event, the wells out there to kind of -- we want to see if we can abandon some of those wells and maybe we need some new wells. So this is -- this project, it's in progress right now.

On Ranges J and -- back to Ranges J and K. We submitted a five-year review report in September of 2015 to ADEM and they have accepted the report and we've had a public commentary report and we did -- let's see. We advertised that in the *Anniston Star* September 18th, 2016. So that 30 day public comment is up. We did not receive any comments.

For the toxic gas area at

Pelham Range we are -- we've done the remedial investigation site and we've -- we've had an extensive process with ADEM on comments and responses back and forth between ADEM and the National Guard. And we -- we have just received ADEM concurrence with our -- with the last of the comments on the -- on the existing RI report, that we are going to prepare a new RI Report, essentially a new RI report after we finish doing the sampling, groundwater sampling that we will be doing out there.

We did one round of extensive groundwater sampling in May, June 2016 and we will do another round in November, December.

And then following the -- once we get all the data compiled we will prepare a new RI report for

that -- for the toxic gas area.

Let's see. We have some munition response sites. We are wrapping those up. Those are included in the enclave area of the National Guard, which is -- which is -- occupies about 300 acres of the former main post.

The two sites we had were -- one was the Hannah Avenue Patriot Road site. And there was a mortar round found there in 1999. And so we've wrapped up our remedial investigation of that site. We determined that there was -- it was a no further action, just a review site.

And for this -- what we call the 600 Area Motor Pool site, which is where our ready center is now currently located. We have determined that lane use controls are required at that

site.

So we've advertised a -- put a proposed plan for public comment and we did not receive any public comments on that.

And we also offered the remedial investigation for -- for public review for the Hannah Avenue Patriot site -- road site, but a no action -- for a no action recommendation at that site.

We did not receive any public comments on either of those documents.

And we have submitted a no action record decision to ADEM for the Hannah Avenue Patriot Road site. And we are preparing a record of decision for the 600 Area Motor Pool site.

We've also opened up an additional investigation at what

we call the former trap and skeet range. And this was used in 19 -- just a short time prior to 1984 for -- for just a recreational trap and skeet.

And we're conducting a remedial investigation at that site just to determine the extent of contamination of the clay pigeons and the shot. And we -- that site extends on McClellan-Bell Authority property, but we are -- so we are working on our property -- but the National Guard property as well as their property.

We will be sampling soils and groundwater. We have actually started field work a few weeks ago flagging sites, you know, doing some soil cuts, some soil investigation out there this week. And we will prepare an RI

report for that site.

So that's about all I have.

MR. BOLTON: Any questions?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Gerald Hardy with the McClellan Development Authority.

MR. HARDY: A summary of activity is in your handout. I'll sort of go down through them as labeled.

The first one is Landfill 3 and Fill Area Northwest of Reilly Airfield. I think at a previous meeting I'd discussed this somewhat.

We -- that's an area that you can -- that's real adjacent to the fence northwest corner of the McClellan property. It comprises two of the former solid waste disposal sites. There's documented groundwater

contamination, primarily with chlorinated salts, released from these old, unlined landfills operated in the '50's and the '60's.

The groundwater flow is west, northwest from these areas, close off site, we discussed before. I think that's the section of Highway 21 the Army still owns, the right-of-way in there. There are actually some groundwater monitoring wells in the median.

There's also a geologic feature in there, the Jacksonville Fault, pretty much runs right there where Highway 21 and the northwest corner of the fence. So the contamination, the groundwater flow is towards the fault line and then it almost makes a 90

degree turn and flows north along the fault.

So our planned remediation out there is underground injection control. We're going to inject emulsifying vegetable oil that will cause degradation of the contaminants. We've submitted that permit to ADEM, the application to ADEM for injection, UIC permit.

MR. BURGETT: This chlorinated solvents, is TCE one of them?

MR. HARDY: Yeah. The Army bought that by the trainload and used it. That's the number of our groundwater sites that are TCE. And that's also from the Anniston Army Depot, I believe, that flows towards Cold Water Springs.

Going down the list there that we mentioned, chlorinated salts,

small weapons repair shops, where they took rifles and handguns and cleaned them using the salt, TCE that was poured out back and we're investigating and remediating that.

T-6 is another one, an area where they cleaned larger equipment with their favorite solvent, TCE. That was up on top of the hill. It sort of flowed out across the concrete pad and into the ground. And we had tried several -- a couple of different remediation techniques.

The most recent one is another underground injection developed for remediation. We had to submit a mod request because we needed to expand and looked into another couple of wells to -- to possibly do some more

injections, but we have seen some good progress with -- to date with the work at T-6.

MR. BURGETT: You said when the flow got to the Jacksonville Fault it flowed north.

How do you know that?

MR. HARDY: That's -- we've done a lot of studies out there and it -- it hits that fault line and you can check the flow, centromeric surface of the groundwater, where it intersects and then we can -- we've got a number of wells going north along the Highway 21.

MR. BURGETT: So you're sure it doesn't flow south?

MR. HARDY: It doesn't flow south, it flows north.

The most recent landfill idea was Landfill -- what's referred to as Landfill 4 on the second

page.

One area within the Landfill 4 boundary is called the industrial landfill where the JPA and now the MDA disposed of demolition debris when they tore down buildings here on the post. Most of that work has been completed. And so we're beginning the process to put on a permanent cap over a portion of that industrial landfill.

The fill area, since the JPA, MDA has been in operation. It's been about 11 acres. The first phase will be eight acres that we will permanently cap.

And then the other three acres we will hold out. We've got, we know, one more demolition project due to a later remediation site. And then there being no further need for

demolition of buildings, then we'll cap that remaining three areas.

The Baby Bains Gap Road ranges, we divided that into three phases. Phase 1 was the area just south of Bains Gap Road. That one was completed and we've received concurrence from ADEM.

Phase 2 was a little further south. Focused on Range 23. That field work has been done. And we have -- in the process of submitting our final corrective measures, implementation report to ADEM.

Phase 3, which is Range 18, and if anybody participated in the Big Bang Celebration for the last UXO, that -- that was done on Range 18. And where the explosions actually occurred is

the butt bunker for those small arms range there. And that concrete will be one of the last projects we'll do for demolition to take to the landfill.

So we're close to going out with an RFP for the -- you know, we have received a concurrence on the CMIP. And so we're trying to negotiate, get our final contractor in to complete that work. So we hope to be underway in early 2017 with that lead remediation site that's Phase 3.

Yahou Lake. Let me touch base. That's on page 3 there. The MDA elected to -- let me back up.

Yahou Lake had an overflow pipe that had rusted off and the lake level had dropped, significantly, it wouldn't go

dry, but it was down. And the way the lake was also constructed, the dam was too steep to get tractors or equipment to keep it mowed.

So the MDA elected to repair the dam, increasing or decreasing the slope so that it would accommodate the tractors, equipment to mow it. Also to replace the overflow pipe. That work has been completed.

And, of course, I think they'll need a little rain to fill the lake back up.

It will also require four wells that were installed as part of our investigation of the former Vietnam Loc village that was there on the shores of the lake. Because of the lake level being down, we were able to put four wells in the old lake bed,

but they'll now be covered up when the lake rises back to it's new -- restored level. So we're having to abandon those wells in the lake bed.

And we've received concurrence on a few of the MRS, munitions response sites for the court reporter. We received final concurrences on the After Action Report, one of those is MSR-4. That's at the bottom of page 3.

And the other one on page 4 is MRS-10 and 11. And that was a very large portion, almost a thousand acres. And right -- with the new bypass it's east of the new bypass and north of the Old Industrial Road that goes into the post. So we received concurrence from ADEM on that, completion of that work.

And unless you have any

questions about the rest of it I'll leave that to your reading enjoyment.

MR. BURGETT: Has there been any sampling for TCE going south despite the fact that you think the flow is north?

MR. HARDY: To determine that, we had to put in a series of wells, both across Highway 21 and to extend south. So that's where it bounded, where the plume was headed, and that's why we've now focused remediation efforts.

But, yes, it was -- you had to determine the extent of that plume.

MR. BOLTON: Any other questions?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Okay. Then I'll give the Army's update as far as

our areas.

Everyone knows we -- we do our work in what's now the fish and wildlife refuge, Mount Longleaf National Refuge. We refer to it as the Charlie area because not all of the refuge is impacted. And also there's some former state property, the Choccolocco corridor.

Obviously, there's been no changes with these interim removal actions that happened a dozen or so years ago.

And kind of back to Ed's question, you know, we had -- munitions wise we'd done just under 400 acres with those cleanups. However, the -- and then if you throw in the bypass and so on that was done, you know, you're looking at a ball park of just under a thousand

acres.

The current munitions cleanup that's underway, we did the remedial investigation and feasibility study. Those final reports are in a -- in process.

What we did do, though, was we took that data -- we got with ADEM early on and we took that data so that we could move out basically so we could execute contracts when we had money.

And so the Zapata contract for the munitions and so on is -- is based on the data. The final reports and so on are in the process for the remedial investigation, which defines the nature and extent, but we knew what that was. We sat down with multiple meetings with ADEM along the way and then we had a big final meeting. So we're

looking at 1250 acres of cleanup there. And that's why I was kind of saying, ah, we're getting close to 50%. So that's their -- the amount of cleanup that they're going to have to do.

On the hazardous waste site. Of course, you heard a report from HydroGeoLogic. And that will be all. We had the four hazardous waste sites, T-24 Alpha which is completed, Bain Gaps Road and the creek -- Cane Creek is over 50% there.

The 81mm range, which is on the northern most end of the property, I'll show you a slide in a second, that is complete. And so the Choccolocco Corridor, of course, which is out on the west side of the -- of the hill out there in the state forest

area. That's underway as well.

Now, something we do need to -- if you'll flip our slide on and I guess you can give me that pointer we can -- something we do need to apprise. As y'all are probably aware, I'm sure you'll mark your calendars way in advance, that the last RAB we had was in April. And since that time we have had an event occur that we need to bring to the RAB's attention.

The reason I bring this up is this is the northern boundary of the installation and now the Fish and Wildlife Refuge. This area here (indicating), if you look at these maps over here you're looking right up in this area. So that's what you're looking at.

And what occurred -- well,

what has gone go on, these yellow areas, if you will, are the old 81mm sites. And those are metals excavations. Lead is the primary driver.

So -- and the reason I bring this up, unfortunately, our GIS didn't extend our topo features across this far north, but if you'll look at this, I want you to look at those contour lines and this will give you some idea of -- of how steep this property is.

You saw -- you may reflect back to some of the pictures you saw that Mike was showing on their haz-waste areas and so on. You can see that these are pretty steep and those are not even the steepest.

So to the point at hand here. The property immediately north

of our boundary is Scott and Penn McDaniels, and I guess his mother as well, is -- owns a portion of the property. They have approximately a hundred and twenty acres just north. And it runs along the boundary installation.

So on 1 May there was a major rain event, even though we all don't know what those are anymore. And it exceeded -- the normal design standard that we have for erosion controls and these kind of things is what they call a two-year, 24-hour storm. In other words, your -- your -- your setup should be able to withstand a once every two years, 24-hour event and NOA publishes these things. They've got these fancy tables and so on.

Well, what we got hit with was a -- was literally a one hour 10 to 25-year storm. So you can look up, you know, a 4% probability, something like that. That's what those things really mean.

And as a result of that the erosion control features and so on were just flat overrun.

And, like I say, if you look at those of contour intervals, that dark blob there and so on. Most of the sites there had just had clean backfill and stuff and some topsoil and so on in there. All the hydroseeding had not been completed when this thing hit. And so we had a lot of soil wash down and washed off installation.

Now, the cleanup in this area was done to -- was done to 500

parts per million, which is not unrestricted use. So there were soils underlying the clean fill that had residual contamination.

And so, basically, what happened was we had soil that washed off following this creek line here. And most of the heavier stuff was deposited in this general area right in here, but some very, very fine, lightweight clays and so on went all the way down the creek and made it all the way into Mr. McDaniel's pond.

And I guess if you'll show the second one. Here's an idea.

Now, this is a week later, this picture of the creek I just showed. So you can see that it was still a good bit of turbidity, a good bit of sediments still in suspension.

And these are these real fine things. This area here (indicating) is a little bit downstream where you saw the thing.

Now, I'll show you the pond. So a week later you can still see how the pond is. And the problem you've got is that these were -- the things that made it that far down, if you will, the sediment that made it that far, the particles that made it that far down are very, very fine clays, very, very lightweight. And guess what, the lead likes to affix itself to those.

So, as a result of this, Mr. McDaniel notified everybody and we came out and looked and said, "Uh-oh." We did some sampling. And what we found on May 24th when we did the sampling -- and

it took weeks and weeks for this to settle out because these are so fine, they were just staying in suspension.

When we did the sampling we found that when you sample what we call total water, in other words, we just sampled it the way it looks right there with all of the silt and whatnot in -- in suspension. The total water sample exceeded what's a maximum -- which would be a maximum contamination level for drinking water for lead. Granted, that's not a drinking water source.

MR. TURNER: What was the parts per million?

MR. BOLTON: I don't -- I can get it for you. I didn't -- I didn't write it down.

MR. BURGETT: 15, more than

15.

MR. TURNER: More than 15?

MR. BOLTON: Well, 15 -- no, more than 15, yeah, yeah, as far as -- if that's what you're asking about, the MCL, is, yeah, yeah.

MR. TURNER: I know what the MCL is, I was just wondering what it was.

MR. BOLTON: It wasn't super high, but it exceeded. So, as a result of that, we said, okay, well, obviously, we're going to have to take an action.

Now, on June 6th we went in, did some additional samples -- well, now, having said that the dissolved sample, the total sample with the silt and so on. So if you were to drink the silty water you would have -- it would be an exceedance.

The dissolved sample, the filtered sample, if you will, where you get the silt out of there, was clean, which makes sense, lead doesn't dissolve in water, but nonetheless.

So that was good news in that we knew then that the lead was obviously affixed to these real fine clays. The problem is we literally waited weeks and weeks and weeks for these clays to settle out. However, I did -- it did -- before it got locked down.

Now, on June 6th we sampled again and there were no MCL exceedances in total or dissolved. So that was good news.

However, nonetheless, we know that we discharged approximately 300 cubic yards of soil,

material, you know, offsite installation and so on. So we are going to have to take an action. And, basically, almost -- it almost doesn't matter whether it was clean or not. You know, we put 300 yards worth of dirt in Mr. McDaniel's stream and pond and so on and we're going to have to get it out. So we will be taking an action.

One of the interesting things that's happened is that when -- you know, when we sample for things we do it -- and the -- the values, if you will, the risk values, face values are all a function of the media. So soil, water, sediment, they can all have different values.

So right now the risk values aren't showing, but we know that, obviously, we -- we did

put stuff in there.

MR. BURGETT: So who's named in the lawsuit and who's the plaintiff?

MR. BOLTON: Well, he -- he'll -- there will be a claim action, I'm assuming, for the government. I mean, that certainly -- that -- that certainly opens the door.

You know, obviously, Mr. McDaniel as kind of a sideline, raised catfish, but not this year.

And even more to the point, he's -- he's been -- they've been really good to work with. They're -- they're squared away folks. And so more to the point, you know, they've lost the use of the pond. Some grand kids swim in it and so on into the night or did and so forth.

So where we're at this point it's interesting, it has some real technical challenges.

So one of the things that we're doing right now -- while it's look straight, the issues are pretty straightforward. Okay. We put it in there, we've got to get it out.

It gets -- it can get interesting because of the location of the property and how we can be least disruptive to the community and so on into the night.

So one of the things that -- what's happened is the Army is decided we'll do an ECA, as they call it, we're going to do an on time critical removal action, we will do a removal action. We'll do what's called an ECA, an engineering evaluation/cost

analysis. It's analogous to the remedial investigations we've talked about before where you're kind of defining nature and extent of contamination, although the real issue here is more of a, okay, how are we going to do it?

Do you drain the pond and go dig up what's left?

Do you get dredges in there and dredge the pond?

Do you -- and that's going to be -- all of these kind of things we'll come out of that process of the ECA process. And that's where we're at now.

So -- yes, Charles?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you had this rain event occur, did the water exit the pond and go down?

MR. BOLTON: Not too much.

There was some -- we sampled the data -- the outfall and so on and we didn't have any issues there. So that was the good news.

MR. BURGETT: That's what I'd say.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah, yeah, because there's -- yeah, we sure -- no, we did because there's other ponds downstream and we want to make sure. And that will be one of the issues that you deal with when we -- when we going looking at -- at what -- what our options are, you know.

It's probably -- the pond itself is approximately an acre, maybe a little less. Average depth is probably, at this point, is probably somewhere around eight feet we think.

Based on what Scott McDaniel

has said, you know, he's had it silt up over the years and how many years ago it was he had clean it out and so on.

Back then it just breached the dam. I don't remember if they did it intentionally or not, but that's not -- so all of those are -- that's why the ECA, that's why we decided to go and do something with the ECA because we get a lot more definitive information and, you know, make the best determination there. That is where it is at, you know.

And, obviously, we've, you know, subsequently gone in and -- and, you know, reinforced all the erosion controls again. They've got the final hydroseeding and so on in place and so forth, but more to

follow, no doubt, at the next RAB.

MR. KIMBROUGH: What will the fund that?

Will it take -- be taken out of the funds that you get or will there be a special appropriation for it?

MR. BOLTON: Well, I mean, there's not a special fenced bucket of money for it, but it will come out of the Army's environmental fund chest.

MR. KIMBROUGH: What I'm saying, it won't take away from what you're doing?

MR. BOLTON: No. What we -- what we have underway is already under contract. It's already -- that money is set aside and it's there. So we'll -- we'll be looking at what funding we have available. We may have, you

know, some down at Mobile or something. And we'll take a hard a look at it and we determine what the costs are going to be and we'll just, you know, go and they'll have to fill up the tank if you will.

So there are -- you know, the DOD has got some various mechanisms up there and that will be -- you know, which one will be chosen and how we get the money, to be honest with you, I really don't know. We really don't care as long as we get the money. So that's going to be kind of the bottom line.

So, anyway, that's where things are at right now is the good old fashioned study phase so to speak.

We want to get some more information about the pond,

about the bottom of the pond, some other things along those lines.

Right now, if you want to swim in there, as long as you don't stir up a bunch of sediment or eat any sediment you'll be okay.

So, anyway, that's our -- that's the last of our -- you know, of our excitement. We have spent a lot of, you know, time on that.

Anybody got any other questions?

MR. KIMBROUGH: I've got -- relating to, is my favorite question nearly every year, how is the funding -- as far as your project, how -- how is the funding?

MR. BOLTON: Well, I think we're in pretty good shape in that that one of the reasons you

heard you mentioned earlier that even though remedial investigation and the feasibility study weren't in their final form, we knew that the Army had money in 2015 and they weren't going to have as much in 2016, and we were figuring we weren't going to have any in 2017, which is coming to be true.

And so what we did was we got permission to kind of get ahead of the power curve and that's why we did what we did. And that's why -- and ADEM worked very cooperatively with us. We had them literally every step of the way with us on it.

So when we got to the final data analysis and so on that's going -- that's in the remedial investigation, then they were on

board with us. We had a big meeting with them and their consultants and so forth and when through it all and they concurred and so on. And we used that as the basis for Zapata Tetrattech contract with the -- for the munitions removal.

And we had already had the delineation done on remedial investigations for the four sites that HydroGeoLogic did in their year -- the contract was awarded, what, '14 and y'all started work '15?

MR. FORSYTH: Yeah.

MR. BOLTON: And so -- and their contract was awarded late '15. I mean, it was, you know, it was an interesting process there trying to get it all done and they started work in '16 --

field work in '16.

So I think we're in pretty good shape. The ESCA was fully funded. There may be some tweaks down the road, but -- so we're fortunate in that regard is that we're able -- we're able to keep working, keep working without any interruption.

Do we have any other questions?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Do we have any -- any other new business?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Any ideas, requests for programs, anything along those lines?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Obviously we'll probably -- since we only meet every six months now, we'll probably do some form of update

on most of these items, some of which may be done.

MR. HARDY: Now, we had the incident with the magnet fisherman and did y'all ever do a sweep?

MR. BOLTON: Yeah, they did a MEC recon and I'm waiting on the report. And that was kind of my bad to be honest with you. I had some stuff that -- they had requested some additional information and I just dropped the ball, didn't get it to them real quick. I got it to them the other day.

MR. HARDY: There was a gentleman that would wade the creeks out here and he had a big magnet and he would look for stuff in the creek and he posted his video, he'd video it and post it on YouTube.

MR. BOLTON: This guy is a real genius.

MR. HARDY: And in the area of the community garden he --

MR. BURGETT: Is the one that found that --

MR. HARDY: Round.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah, he found a 75 somewhere in that area or says he found it.

MR. HARDY: Said he found it.

MR. BOLTON: Said he found it, yeah. The area he found it in it's on -- I just can't imagine getting enough load of a 75, but that's neither here nor there, it is what it is.

MR. BURGETT: We ought to pay him and take out insurance on him.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah. I think -- it's my understanding that he's seen the light.

MR. HARDY: But it gets back to a question you raised about on site support.

MR. BOLTON: Right.

MR. HARDY: And that the contact or the Anniston Police Department who are the ones we need -- since most of the active release from the MDA standpoint, the active field remediation is over. So you call 911 if you find something that's suspect.

The Anniston Police Department, you know, sort of went whoa.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah. So that's the -- and that's on the radar to --

MR. HARDY: They had to contact Corbin and --

MR. BOLTON: Right. And that's kind of standard. Typically most places, where

there have been former military properties and so on and ranges, the usual procedure is law -- is the law enforcement have a link to the explosive ordinance people. Generally, it's military. The FBI has some as well. And so they have a link there.

And what you do is you call 911, get the local enforcement involved, and they will contact the appropriate folks and then you'll get DOD response. That's exactly what happened there.

MR. HARDY: It turned out to be a good training exercise.

MR. BOLTON: And that's on the radar -- I know Rob and Scott and I have talk.

Ed about it, and along with Ken Joiner, and we'll probably try to get together and get that

-- particularly as we start to get towards the end game. It's not a bid deal as long as we've got people from MDA on site, that we're on site and so on. But we probably need at some point, over the next year or two to, you know, reinforce that and get, maybe, a little more formalized procedure so everybody knows what to do.

MR. BURGETT: I'm waiting for the day that we dig a trench trying to find a water line and we find something --

MR. TURNER: No, no, no, don't say that.

MR. BURGETT: -- not that it would explode, but just find it.

MR. BOLTON: It could happen. But if that happens, you just call 911. Get construction support when you go on.

MR. TURNER: We're digging out there right now. I hope you didn't wish this up.

MR. BOLTON: Where are y'all digging?

MR. TURNER: Pappy Dunn.

MR. BOLTON: What?

MR. TURNER: Pappy Dunn.

MR. BOLTON: It shouldn't be a problem.

Some of the other issues they've had -- you know, that have been found were a function of the stuff got imported inadvertently.

In others words, somebody goes out to what they think is a quote, "Fill area," because they didn't want to drive as far to the designated one, for whatever reason, and then you would have that. And so they'd bring in fill and they'd put it, you

know, from an area that they shouldn't have. So, you know, it happens.

Any other questions?

(No response).

MR. BOLTON: Anybody have a motion to adjourn?

MR. KIMBROUGH: So moved.

MR. BOLTON: Second.

MR. BUFORD: Second.

MR. BOLTON: We are adjourned.

END OF PROCEEDINGS

C E R T I F I C A T E
STATE OF ALABAMA)
SHELBY COUNTY)

I, ROBERT KEITH KENNEDY,
Notary Public for the State of
Alabama at Large, hereby certify
that I am the Certified Court
Reporter who made machine
shorthand notes of the foregoing
proceedings at the time and
place stated in the Caption
thereof; that I later reduced my
shorthand notes into
typewriting; that the foregoing
pages numbered 1 through 91,
both inclusive, contain a full,
true, and correct transcript of
proceedings had on said
occasion.

I further certify that these
proceedings were given before me
and that I am in no way related
to nor employed by any of the

parties, the witnesses or
counsel, and that I have no
interest in the outcome of this
matter.

Given under my hand and seal
this the 16th day of November
2016.

Robert Keith Kennedy
CCR License No. 318

My Commission Expires
September 4, 2018