

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

FORT McCLELLAN, ALABAMA

\* \* \* \* \*

Taken before SAMANTHA E. NOBLE, CCR,  
Certified Court Reporter and Commissioner  
for Alabama at Large, at JSU McClellan  
Higher Education Consortium, 100 Gamecock  
Drive, Anniston, Alabama, on the 18th day  
of October 2022, 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 . . . .	3-69
CERTIFICATE. . . . .	70-71

JOHN HALL: It's approximately 5:12. We'll call the meeting to order. Like to begin with roll call.

Ms. Holstein is here. I am here.

Mr. James Burford?  
Mr. Phillip Burgett?

PHILLIP BURGETT: Here.

JOHN HALL: Dr. Barry Cox?

DR. BARRY COX: Present.

JOHN HALL: Mr. Jerome Elser?

JERRY ELSER: Here.

JOHN HALL: Mr. Bobby Foster?

BOBBY FOSTER: Here.

JOHN HALL: Dr. Mary Harrington?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I'm here.

JOHN HALL: Mr. Ed Kimbrough?  
Mr. John Pearce? Dr. David Steffy? Mr. Tony Thompson?

Mr. Ed Turner?

ED TURNER: Present.

JOHN HALL: Bradley Curvin,  
National Guard?

BRADLEY CURVIN: Here.

JOHN HALL: Gerald Hardy?

GERALD HARDY: Present.

JOHN HALL: Brandi Little of  
ADEM is excused.

Like for the -- at this time,  
for the guests to introduce  
themselves, please.

Do we have any guests?

BRADLEY CURVIN: I brought one  
with me. This is one of my  
flight unit folks with the  
Guard.

ADRIEN LALLEY: Adrien Lalley.

BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: Brenda  
Cunningham.

GERALD HARDY: And we have  
another member --

DAVID ABERNATHY: David

Abernathy with Matrix.

JOHN HALL: At this time, if you would, take a moment to review the minutes from October of 2019.

Has everyone had a chance to review the minutes yet? All right, would someone like to make a motion to approve the minutes?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I move for approval of the minutes from October 2019 as presented.

JOHN HALL: Thank you very much. Do I have a second?

BOBBY FOSTER: Second.

JOHN HALL: All those in favor? Motion carries. Thank you.

Old business. Do we have any old business that we need to go over?

LISA HOLSTEIN: No old

business.

JOHN HALL: No old business. Anything from the floor? Very good.

Moving along. Programs?

LISA HOLSTEIN: No program tonight.

JOHN HALL: No programs tonight. Onto new business.

At this time, I'm gonna pass around a list of all the board members. If you would, please, look at it and make adjustments to it, as you need.

If you don't have a e-mail address that you -- on there, if you could provide one, please, do. Make sure everything is up to date.

At this time, we need to take a vote to ascend the vice-chair to chair position. All those in favor? Opposed?

Motion carries.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Motion carries.

JOHN HALL: Motion carries.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: The vote carries, but the motion didn't carry because we didn't make one. You've got to follow (inaudible) in the house.

JOHN HALL: Very good.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I move that we ascend the vice-chair to the chair.

DR. BARRY COX: Second.

JOHN HALL: All those in favor? Motion carries.

Thank you. Got to be kept on track. I'm a little rusty on this.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: That's all right. We gonna help you.

JOHN HALL: Discuss the RAB membership. As we can see,

Dr. Kimberly has recently passed.

LISA HOLSTEIN: No, wait. We got to vote for a new vice-chair.

JOHN HALL: Oh, man. Okay. See, told you you've got to keep me on track here now.

Vote for new vice-chair.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Do we need some nominations?

ED TURNER: I would like to nominate Dr. Mary Harrington.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Let me decline. And I say that because I thought I was gonna be late today -- remember. I serve on the Anniston City School Board.

ED TURNER: Yes, ma'am.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I was busy trying to ask him if he would take it.

ED TURNER: And I blind sided



you with it, didn't I?

JOHN HALL: Any other --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Can I nominate anybody? I can't vote, I know that.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Well, I would like to nominate Mr. Ed Turner.

LISA HOLSTEIN: That's what I was fixing to do.

ED TURNER: Dr. Harrington, is that really a good idea?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I think so.

ED TURNER: I've already served in that capacity, and I'm not sure I did a good job with --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Well, you have time to get it right, if you didn't. Good time to get it right. Don't play a joker.

ED TURNER: Dr. Harrington, I

don't think I really have a choice, do I?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: No.

ED TURNER: Thank you.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Thank you for accepting.

JOHN HALL: So, I have a nomination on the floor for Mr. Ed Turner.

MR. JEROME ELSE: Second.

LISA HOLSTEIN: No, you got to have a motion, right?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: No. No. No. We got a nomination. Okay, he said that. And we want to know is there anymore nominations two more times. And if nobody is nominated, it's gonna be Mr. Ed Turner. Isn't that right?

JOHN HALL: You're good. Maybe Ed --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Don't you have

to have a motion and a second?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: No.  
We're not making motions. The nomination is over.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: And he was nominated. And it takes three nominations to close it -- when I say -- not necessarily.

Are there any more nominations? Are there any more nominations? Are there any more nominations?

ED TURNER: No, you have to say that.

JOHN HALL: Got you.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: And that's it.

JOHN HALL: Thank you very much. Are there any more nominations?

PHILLIP BURGETT: Can we

nominate Ed Turner again?

JOHN HALL: Are there any more nominations? Are there any nominations?

Can I get a motion?

LISA HOLSTEIN: No, you don't have to have a motion.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Don't have to do nothing now. It's Ed Turner.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Ed Turner, new vice chair.

JOHN HALL: That's a good thing, because I'm fouling this all up.

ED TURNER: That would be very good.

JOHN HALL: Move on and discuss the RAB membership at this time. Dr. Kimberly recently passed away. And Dr. David Steffy has not attended a meeting since July 2008.

ED TURNER: Oh, wow.

JOHN HALL: Wow.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: '08 or '18?

BRENDA CUNNINGHAM: '08.

JOHN HALL: So, the regular members may be removed by affirmative vote. Our options are to solicit membership applications/reduce membership and revise the bylaws.

LISA HOLSTEIN: So, do we -- y'all need to vote to remove Dr. Steffy first.

ED TURNER: Do we need a motion?

LISA HOLSTEIN: Do we need a motion?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Yes.

ED TURNER: I make a motion to remove Dr. Steffy.

BOBBY FOSTER: Second.

JOHN HALL: All those in

favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

So, the options are to solicit applications or reduce the membership and revise the bylaws.

ED TURNER: I'd like to make a motion to reduce membership and revise the bylaws.

BOBBY FOSTER: Second.

LISA HOLSTEIN: So, we're gonna reduce the membership to twelve? It's currently at fourteen. Are we gonna reduce it to twelve?

ED TURNER: Yes, ma'am.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay. You'll have to vote on that.

ED TURNER: Okay. Got a motion and a second.

JOHN HALL: Have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

(None opposed.)

Now, we need to --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Determine interest in decreasing the frequency of the meetings from semiannual to once a year.

ED TURNER: I make a motion that we meet once a year.

BOBBY FOSTER: Second.

JOHN HALL: All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Do y'all prefer those meetings to be in October or in April?

ED TURNER: I make a motion to make 'em in April.

LISA HOLSTEIN: April?

BOBBY FOSTER: Second.

DR. BARRY COX: Well, does that mean we will meet the coming April then?

ED TURNER: Yes.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay. So, it will be just six months this time.

ED TURNER: It will be a six month.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

ED TURNER: But October is really bad, getting tough.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Yes, it is.

JOHN HALL: All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

So, all that's handled now, right?

LISA HOLSTEIN: Yeah, all the business is done.

JOHN HALL: Good. Good. Agency reports. Ms. Brandi Little isn't here.

LISA HOLSTEIN: But she --

JOHN HALL: She sent something?



LISA HOLSTEIN: She sent something that's included in your packet.

JOHN HALL: Does anyone need anymore time to review ADEM's portion of the packet?

It's on you, sir.

BRAD CURVIN: This is my first one with this particular group. We have a -- I didn't actually know I was coming to this until about three days ago.

We have a report here. I can read it to you guys or you can read amongst yourselves. Which would you prefer?

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We can read it. Unless you've just got something specifically you need to tell us.

BRAD CURVIN: No, ma'am, I don't. I'll be happy to attempt to answer any questions.

PHILLIP BURGETT: In all your different type of monitoring that y'all do, have y'all done any testing of the new family of contaminants known as PFOS (phonetic)?

ED TURNER: Here.

BRAD CURVIN: Yes.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay. Where is that?

ED TURNER: Were there any kind of detects on PFOS (phonetic)?

BRAD CURVIN: Not that I'm aware of on post, no. Our -- we've been also conducting investigations at a number of sites. But, to my knowledge, PFAS (phonetic) is not an issue on these sites.

I was trying to see. You said -- you said you see PFAS in this report?

MR. ED TURNER: Fort McClellan restoration, Army actions, is that you?

LISA HOLSTEIN: That's me.

ED TURNER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm looking at the wrong one.

BRAD CURVIN: No. It's the National Guard one.

ED TURNER: I got it. National Guard. Excuse me.

But you are testing for PFOS (phonetic), too?

BRAD CURVIN: We have done testing for it but only in our flight facilities throughout the state or places that have known spills or releases. That does, to our knowledge, does not include anything on -- on post at this time.

ED TURNER: So, you -- in other areas, but not the National Guard area --

BRAD CURVIN: Other areas --  
ED TURNER: -- here on the  
Fort?

BRAD CURVIN: -- but not here.  
If we're given information that  
was linked to that, we can, but  
we're not (inaudible) --

ED TURNER: I think it would  
be good, if we got the test  
results, if you did test.

BRAD CURVIN: Yeah.

LISA HOLSTEIN: From what I  
understand, y'all did a  
preliminary assessment, right,  
for --

BRAD CURVIN: We did a  
preliminary assessment on the --  
both the range and the enclave.  
Primarily, that's just  
interviews and/or historical  
document review.

At that time, we were only  
moving forward with known

releases of AFFF, which is the firefighting foams that have been used for fuel spills essentially in aircraft.

We were not -- we do not have any determination of previous releases on Pelham Range or the enclave.

At that -- during that same investigation, we also investigated three additional sites where we had flight operations. We did have results there. But nothing that we had here that could actually -- that would actually lead us towards needing to do -- perform sampling.

And I will also remind you at this time these levels are advisory levels. We're currently still trying to figure out what we -- if we do clean

up, what we would even clean up to.

ED TURNER: Well, as it stands now, the advisory level is below what they can detect, anyway. So, it becomes a very slippery slope.

I actually sat through a presentation on PFOS (phonetic) from ADEM on the clean water and drinking water site --

BRAD CURVIN: Uh-huh.

ED TURNER: -- and, if I heard that word once, I heard it a hundred times. It's going to be a hot topic.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Yeah.

ED TURNER: Just to kind of -- I don't think it's a matter of if, it's a matter of when.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: When, yes.

ED TURNER: Location. Because it's everywhere. And what they said, it's in everything.

BRAD CURVIN: Yes, sir.  
It's --

ED TURNER: And fortunately -- I will say this, we were required to do testing the first two quarters of this year in our water and we had no detect.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Good.

ED TURNER: But that's, again, testing to what level they can test.

BRAD CURVIN: Yes, sir.

ED TURNER: That's all I got.

BRAD CURVIN: That was one of the issues we've had that (inaudible) --

SAMANTHA NOBLE: Can you speak up for me just a little?

BRAD CURVIN: Sorry.

That is one of the issues

we've had in our investigation of the PFAS situation is, one, we're hitting -- we're trying to hit a moving target and two, we're trying to decide what levels we actually want to go to. There is quite a bit of thought out there that the current level that EPA put out will end up going to litigation before they get to -- we'll actually work on.

ED TURNER: They're supposed to release the MCL before the end of this year.

BRAD CURVIN: Yes, sir. That doesn't prevent anybody from challenging it, so -- right now.

ED TURNER: It's EPA --

BRAD CURVIN: Yeah. But, to answer your original question, no, ma'am, there -- we have not had any results of A PFAS on



site or on these locations.

LISA HOLSTEIN: So, you have sampled -- you've taken samples on --

BRAD CURVIN: Not here. We didn't have --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay. Just --

SAMANTHA NOBLE: I need y'all to speak one at a time for me, please. Y'all were on top of each other and I just totally lost you.

(Whereupon, there was discussion held off the record.)

BRAD CURVIN: To answer your question: No, ma'am, we have not taken any samples from McClellan or Pelham Range.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay. Do you have sites on Pelham or Fort McClellan that are gonna require an investigation?

BRAD CURVIN: No, not at this

time. We have already investigated, and we could find no -- our initial investigation only moved forward if we could find any kind of either paperwork --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay.

BRAD CURVIN: -- or historical knowledge of a release of some type. At this time, we don't have that.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay.

BRAD CURVIN: So, that ceased on that investigation, and we moved forward at other locations to the best use of our resources.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Thank you.

PHILLIP BURGETT: I think it would be prudent for the -- for there at least to be some sampling on the Fort for that, even if you don't have any cause

of -- I think it would be prudent to go ahead and sample for it.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay. Well, since we're on this topic, I'll go ahead and give you my portion of the PFAS Army summary.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay.

LISA HOLSTEIN: So, in March of this year the Army initiated a preliminary assessment. They came down, looked at several sites, did a record search.

We've got one site, the former fire training pit, that was used annually to train firefighters. We don't know if they used the AFFF, the foam at that site, but it's going to be recommended -- we don't have a report yet -- but that particular site will probably be recommended for some sampling.

I think there is a couple other sites on Fort McClellan that are probably going to be recommended. I don't know what they are, yet.

That report is gonna come out -- well, it's up in environmental law division getting reviewed right now. Hopefully, by April we'll have a report that we can give you the results --

PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay.

LISA HOLSTEIN: -- preliminary assessment. But I suspect there's gonna be a couple of sites that are going to require some invest- -- some sampling.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Okay.  
That's good.

But from a utility standpoint, ADEM, with a broad brush -- well, ADEM and EPA,

with a broad brush, basically, told every utility, you've got to sample.

So, we -- you know, it didn't matter whether we had cause to believe that PFOS (phonetic) was in the water, every utility had to sample.

And so I think it's only fair that the U. S. Government, you know, sample the groundwater just like the utilities had to do. You know, the utilities didn't have any reason to believe that their water had PFOS in it, but they had to go through the expense of sampling for it, anyway.

I think, at the very least, the government should have to do that, too.

LISA HOLSTEIN: All that will come out in the preliminary

assessment.

I suspect the former fire training pit, being one of them, will have soil sampling and groundwater sampling.

ED TURNER: And there were utilities in the area that had to sample in the first two quarters like everybody else did that had a detect. So, they're close to this facility.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Correct. Okay.

ED TURNER: And that is cause for concern.

DR. BARRY COX: Well, what are you actually sampling for? I mean, what is the test or what are they running?

PHILLIP BURGETT: It's a large family of chemical contaminants known as PFOS.

DR. BARRY COX: As what?

PHILLIP BURGETT: PFAS, P-F-A-S. They're perfluorinated and polyfluorinated compounds.

DR. BARRY COX: Oh, so they're fluorocarbons, is that basically --

PHILLIP BURGETT: Well, they're fluorinated carbon compounds.

DR. BARRY COX: That's what I say, fluorinated carbons.

PHILLIP BURGETT: That's right. Per and poly. And there is a number of them.

LISA HOLSTEIN: There's like four thousand different chemicals.

PHILLIP BURGETT: A long list.

LISA HOLSTEIN: It's a large group.

PHILLIP BURGETT: And depending on the number of carbon atoms they have with it,

the more likely they are to sustain in the environment. They do not break down. They remain.

It's kind of like -- it's kind of like the PCBs were twenty years ago. You know, they're very resilient.

And so -- I remember one presentation on PFAS that I heard where the guy stated that you could test anybody's blood in this room -- and talking about the room, presentation room at the time -- you could test anybody's blood in the room and you could find a trace of PFAS in their blood. These things, they remain.

And so, you know, they're -- the thing that's most concerning to water utilities about them is the -- these



health advisories that have come out and the potential MCL that may follow is very, very small, such that there may be some water utilities that have to treat for this stuff and have to treat at a level that's lower than the current capability of testing for the stuff. Talking about very, very small, minute concentrations that are deemed safe.

ED TURNER: The day they showed at the presentation it was four parts per quadrillion.

DR. BARRY COX: So, I'm just -- I guess I'm -- being a chemist, just curious. Are you testing for the fluor unit or --

PHILLIP BURGETT: No, they actually have test methods.

DR. BARRY COX: They have what?

PHILLIP BURGETT: They're trying to come up with a method that will test for all of 'em together.

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

PHILLIP BURGETT: A family of them --

DR. BARRY COX: Okay.

PHILLIP BURGETT: -- together, and come up with a number, because that would be easier than testing for 'em individually.

So, if that happens, then it may be a little bit easier to test for this stuff and will be a little bit cheaper.

He may have more information on it than I do.

BRAD CURVIN: I feel like you just set me up.

All right, is there a question? I'm not just talking

indiscriminately about it. Is there anything in particular I can answer?

I will tell you, with regards to your question about should the military sample for PFAS, I will tell you that for the Guard's work, we're doing that investigation in conjunction with ADEM. Everything we've done, they're reviewing and signing off on.

So, I mean, if they see cause for us to actually sample, I'm sure they will recommend that. We're doing that work in conjunction with them, just like we would any other CERCLA (inaudible) --

SAMANTHA NOBLE: I'm sorry. Any other CERCLA --

BRAD CURVIN: We started conducting that operation. Each

branch of the DOD is going through it. That's why you were talking about having big Army.

I don't know, what else would you like to know?

We've also been through quite a bit of training on this. It's a very -- they're very persistent compounds.

Currently, we're only testing for four of the compounds, the -- the ones that the Army has deemed to be the most dangerous and also the ones we can test for the best.

You're talking about the (inaudible) health advisory. That was, I want to say, like three orders of magnitude lower than the previous one. It's -- they're all over the board. Every state potentially is handling things differently.

The EPA is actually a little behind. There are several other states that have just unilaterally declared their MCLs already (inaudible) before EPA's action.

The last I had spoken with ADEM, they were kind of waiting to let the EPA take the driver's seat and using their information.

You pretty much discussed the compound pretty well. Is there any questions anybody has?

BOBBY FOSTER: You said there have been detections on the Fort or --

ED TURNER: Other utilities that are close to the Fort had detect in their water when they had it tested the first two quarters of this year.

LISA HOLSTEIN: These

compounds are in -- if you've eaten out of a Teflon skillet, they're in Teflon. If you've used Scotch Guard on your couch or your carpet, they're in that. If you've eaten a McDonald's hamburger, they're in the wrapper. They're everywhere.

ED TURNER: Pizza boxes.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Yeah. They're everywhere.

BRAD CURVIN: Literally, every one of us in this meeting has PFAS compound on their body right now from some type of clothing or use --

JOHN HALL: McDonald's today.

PHILLIP BURGETT: But, apparently, they only have two company sources of 3M and Dupont, I believe.

ED TURNER: That is right.

PHILLIP BURGETT: Two

companies that --

DR. BARRY COX: Say that again, please.

PHILLIP BURGETT: 3M and Dupont. So, if anybody has PFOS on them or it's in the water or anything, it originated from 3M or Dupont.

JOHN HALL: Mr. Hardy?

GERALD HARDY: EPA -- to just follow along -- released its intent to list the PFOS family of compounds as a hazardous substance under CERCLA. And they're working on that process, as we speak. It will be slow.

But if that comes out and stands, that will drastically dictate how everybody treats these compounds following on because it would then be a CERCLA hazardous substance, subject to the CERCLA rules and

requirements at that point.

There was some debate whether the EPA was gonna go down the RCRA hazardous waste distinction or the CERCLA hazardous substance.

CERCLA hazardous substance, of course, there is no time limit on it. It goes back to when things started, so --

LISA HOLSTEIN: 1940s is when they started producing the chemicals.

GERALD HARDY: So, having been around when some of the first discussions of that happened, you know, a lot of the data that all the agencies have used are based on the impacts to the white lab rat or mouse and what happens to them, and so that's dictated the actions of a number of the agencies is -- is the old



expression, you can feed enough of anything to a white lab rat and it will --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Kill you.

GERALD HARDY: -- whatever ailments you want it to develop, it will develop.

But most of that, particularly in the PFOS contents, P-F-O-S, are related to reproductive issues. Of course, that would be PFAS compounds.

But there are -- correct, there is a whole litany of -- the term we used to use in discussing PCBs were Aroclors and all the different ones and what term they used --

BRAD CURVIN: They call them GenX (inaudible) now. Is it PFAS GenX (inaudible) -- like -- it's some kind of weird --

they've got a new term for it, but it's basically the derivatives.

GERALD HARDY: But I think ADEM went -- because of the issues, one of the sites in Alabama, that early on used a lot of the PFAS, PFOS compounds. 3M had a facility in Decatur, Alabama, and released it and that -- when the first -- this is several years ago -- when the issues came out about PFAS and PFOS compounds -- they were just looking at those two, the water plant, water treatment system in Decatur had to shut down and provide people bottled water because they had detectable levels in their treatment at -- even following treatment because they weren't treating for PFAS or PFOS compounds. And

so they had to issue an advisory and alert and furnish people bottled water.

So, because the water systems distribute water that may contain this, that's why I believe ADEM went to sample, causing the utilities to sample.

ED TURNER: Well, here is one other thing that I was told: Your bottled water is controlled by the FDA and they don't test for PFOS in the bottled water.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Oh, really?

ED TURNER: Yeah. Just to kind of let you know that.

LISA HOLSTEIN: Oh.

ED TURNER: That was brought to my attention today.

GERALD HARDY: I'll be, because, if you read, all --

ED TURNER: So, if you --

GERALD HARDY: -- the bottled

water --

ED TURNER: -- feed them bottled water that has probably more in it than what's in their tap water and you think that they're salvaged --

And there's also, my understanding, a class action lawsuit in Mobile. So, this is getting ugly.

GERALD HARDY: I wouldn't doubt it --

BRAD CURVIN: I think Dupont lost one, didn't they? I believe there was a lawsuit against Dupont, also, as a part of that thing in Decatur.

GERALD HARDY: Just stay tuned. I mean, once it -- if it is -- makes it to listing as a hazardous substance under CERCLA, then a parade of lawsuits and the other issues

will --

ED TURNER: Absolutely --

GERALD HARDY: -- explode.

ED TURNER: -- gonna  
accelerate.

BRAD CURVIN: I can tell you  
one big thing that we have a  
problem with in the military  
side is currently our  
firefighting foam, which is our  
biggest contributor,  
it's basically a liquid. When  
it hits the air, it turns into  
like a, I don't know,  
marshmallow, you know, a big  
thing of foam and it suffocates  
the fire.

Well, the problem is those  
are -- those parameters that we  
used to make that stuff, they  
have to put the fire out at a  
certain -- like, a certain  
temperature fire has to be put

out within like thirty seconds using whatever compound we use.

Well, the problem is the military can't find anything that works better than what we got right now. So, we're somewhat limited here on the front end of, yeah, we can address old issues or old releases, but, as of right now, the Air Force is close, but we have not come up with any substitute that we can use in place of that firefighting foam. And, obviously, the health of our soldiers comes first. So, we're still using it.

And you're gonna find that that's gonna be a problem, as this issue moves forward, that's gonna be a problem with lots of industry.

PHILLIP BURGETT: And here's

the thing about that is that makes it heat resistant. So, you can't even destroy the stuff easily, because, even if you try to heat it and destroy it, it requires a huge temperature.

JOHN HALL: Anyone else?

LISA HOLSTEIN: More to come.

JOHN HALL: Thank you, sir.

Well, Mr. Hardy, we could have just continued on with you, sir.

GERALD HARDY: All right. I decided to add a few color photos to y'all's report.

JOHN HALL: I see that.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: We appreciate it.

GERALD HARDY: The MDA board has asked for a while, I guess, since we last met to -- if I could provide some color photos for what's going on.

And we, you know, deal with a

number of sites, but I'll probably just focus on two or three of the main ones. One of 'em here on the first page you'll see is titled landfill three and the fill area northwest of Reilly Airfield.

For those who may remember, this is the site that's up in the northwest corner of the former Fort McClellan where the new Iron Mountain Road north comes into Highway 21. It's the stretch that the Army still owns the median right-a-way, I believe --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Uh-huh.

GERALD HARDY: -- because of the contamination plume that underlies the roadway there.

Generally, how Highway 21 flows in a northwest direction, there is a geologic term, there



is a fault line that sort of runs right along the way Highway 21 sits.

And so the contamination plume from landfill three and FANWRA, as we call fill area northwest of Reilly, flows in a northwesterly direction, so it moves off post, off the old post into the highway.

Our contention and our discovery and investigation is we contended that the fault line, which is not a straight line like a pencil, but it's fractured rock and everything, and so, when the groundwater hits that fractured zone, it intercepts it, and so it sort of makes it turn and go north. And so it sort of goes -- flows north along Highway 21.

And we had contended that, in

doing our evaluation of the groundwater, ADEM and we have done a treatment there where we've done injection into the plume of contamination that's some several hundred feet below the surface, and injected this bioremediation that reacts with the organic compounds to break them down.

These are chlorinated compounds. And so, you see it -- their daughter products when you have the degradation. One of them being vinyl chloride is a daughter product, but vinyl chloride can also be a contaminant that you look for, so -- I don't want to digress.

But, anyway, we had contended that we had sort of defined the plume that it did intercept by the Jacksonville fault and was

flowing north. And so, we did not need to do further investigation west, too far west of Highway 21.

ADEM asked if we could put wells down in the same depth below ground surface that we had done the treatment on the east side of Highway 21 to confirm our contention. We did.

And so, you see some pictures here. We put in two temporary wells at the location that we do monitoring at two other wells. We put that down to the depth of the contaminant plume east of Highway 21, and we had no detections of the contamination.

And so, we then, because we didn't want to leave an open conduit that contamination from some other source may get to the groundwater, we then had to

properly abandon those wells. And you see the photos on the front page where we had to pull the well casing out and then grout it with a cement bentonite clay solution to fill that hole up.

And so, the positive news is, contamination was not further west of the Jacksonville fault. And so our monitoring plan, and how we're treating and dealing with that, we can continue on. Although, we haven't received final concurrence of that from ADEM, yet.

So, when you look at ADEM's report, one of those in there, that report that's still under review, so --

And I won't take up too much of our time going through all of these -- a number of these other

sites.

So, one positive thing on page two, you see down about a third of the way from the bottom, we have parcels 100Q and 101Q. Lisa, I know we had pointed out, we had a little impact area where they did a firing line, the Army shot into the hillside. And there was about a rectangular 3.3 acre side of the hill where they shot all the small arms rounds into. And we had to clean that up.

We had to wait until the unexploded ordnance, artillery shell remediation was cleaned up before we could do this work.

There was some paperwork that was lost for some fifteen, sixteen years because it went to the Army from EPA and ADEM but never made it to the JPA and

MDA. We finally got that. Saw the comments and have addressed it.

And in September of this year we submitted -- I believe it was September -- RCRA facility investigation report, which was the summary of all that.

We went back out and resampled the soil to confirm, because it had been so long since the Army's work had been done back in 2002, 2003, and a lot of that occurred when the site transitioned from Army remediation to the JPA remediation is how it sort of got lost.

Anyway, the report summarizing our findings, combining the previous work and the current work, went into ADEM and the RFI report. For the intended use

that was designated for that area, which was industrial or passive recreation, the numbers do not warrant further remediation, as long as it's kept as either industrial or passive recreation.

And so we submitted a corrective measures implementation plan, CMIP, that basically said that, that we would establish land use controls limiting, restricting it to no use of the groundwater and for industrial or recreational use only.

So, that was a milestone. I guess it was a pretty hefty report to document all that data from several decades. But it is now in ADEM's hands. And I saw that under their report it was another one that was in review.

On page three, at the top, we have a range thirty impact area. That was another large -- fairly large soil remediation project where we had small arms overlaying -- when I say small arms, just rifle and, you know, machine gun, that type thing.

If you've traveled the new bypass and you look off to your left, when you make that first big curve and you saw the green hillside -- now I think it's turned when the dry weather hit, but at one point this year it was green up there. That's where we had to remove the top foot of soil and treat -- and haul it off to subtitle D landfill as part of our soil remediation project to remove the RCRA metals contaminated soil.



That site has been -- gone through its remediation. We have turned in all our reports to ADEM. Waiting on their final -- they've submitted some comments, but we had to go through a one-year period to get vegetation established on the hillside, so that's why it didn't look green.

Last deer season there were a lot of other people that wanted to hunt the very large green field that we created up there.

But, anyway, that's -- it's stable. We're just waiting on confirmation from ADEM that everything is correct.

The next set of photos, the other site was -- is also in that northwest area. It's adjacent to landfill three, but it was called landfill four.

And the Army had converted a portion of the unused space to -- from a municipal solid waste landfill to a demolition landfill. We put construction and demolition waste, the Army did.

And then, after the base was closed in '99, the JPA and then the MDA, as they tore down buildings on the post, all those old building demolition waste went into the landfill that we renamed the Butler Green Industrial Landfill on his passing because he had been the manager of that landfill for a number of years.

And so you see, we had to fill it, bring it up to grade, cap it. And you can see some photos here where we had to work on establishing the vegetation on

top of the closed landfill.

That one is -- we're in the midst of our one-year warranty period, trying to get -- make sure we get the grass established there. And then we've had to replace erosion rills that occurred.

And, although it may look flat, the water's got to flow somewhere. And when it does, it eroded some of the topsoil.

The cap on these landfills consisted of eighteen inches of compacted clay and then six inches of topsoil to grow vegetation, grass. And it -- the erosion usually occurs in that six inches of topsoil.

So, you can just see some photos of what we did there.

On page five, you can see some photos that we extracted from

ADEM's last inspection they performed out there, where they noticed our gate shut and the stand of the vegetation. But you'll see in the bottom right corner, where it said shrubs, we have to mow these frequently or we'll have the good, common plants like sweet gums and others that will grow anywhere, that will pop up and cap, and we have to keep those mowed because one of the regulatory requirements is no deep rooted vegetation on a landfill cap.

And then you can look at -- on page six, that is a picture of the entire landfill that we capped right after it was mowed to get the grass back in manageable level. You can see what the cap looks like now.

And on page seven and eight,

one of the requirements -- we had finished the unexploded ordnance investigation and removal and remediation back in 2018. And some folks may remember the big bang celebration that we had out here when we finished the last work.

One of the requirements with -- to close that out is to submit a final, what's termed an after-action report, to the Department of Defense. That report, when the initial work was started, required us to post signage around the site. It never was defined what signage should be. But it -- we were nevertheless required to post signage in order to close out the site.

So, on page seven, we've made the decision that the major

entrances to active areas of former McClellan, such as where the horse trails are now, where the bike trails will be, where Yahoo Lake entrance now that they've opened that up for fishing. And so, we've identified fix or six major points that we will put a fairly large sign -- and I say fairly large, four by five, four by six, that will be like the one you see at the bottom of that page. And that will be posted there to warn people that you're entering a former potential unexploded ordnance.

And then, as you travel -- or anybody that's traveled Iron Mountain Road know there is a lot of little turnoff roads that are gated or chained or shut. And we'll have a larger number

of signs that are on page eight, which is the do not dig, and these will be more like your speed limit type signs that will be on the post, warning people.

So, that's our plan. MDA has approved that and we'll be working on that here in this next year.

JOHN HALL: Very good. Any questions of Mr. Hardy before we move on?

Moving right along. Ms. Holstein?

LISA HOLSTEIN: Okay. Last time we met three years ago we were out in the field removing unexploded ordnance in the Charlie area. MRS1. It was about eight hundred and forty acres.

We completed that removal action back in March of 2020.

And ever since then, we've been working on the report with ADEM.

We've sent 'em a draft. Got comments. Responded to comments. We've submitted a final in March of this year, so we're hoping to see a concurrence letter on that and wrap that removal action up here shortly.

In MRS1, we still have five hundred and twenty-eight acres to do a clearance on. We've been told we're not gonna see any funding for that this year. Hopefully, we'll see some next year, but that's -- there's no guarantees. So, we're just waiting on funding for that MEC removal action.

In MRS3 we -- let's see, this is -- this green part is Charlie area. The orange part is



Charlie area, MRS1. So, we've done a MEC removal on all of the orange area except for this one here, area three and area eight. That's the five hundred acres we've got left to clear.

And MRS3 is the purple area. That didn't require any -- any clearance, any -- had no MEC in those areas. But we did put these -- we put kiosks, seven of them, out in the Choccolocco corridor. And it gives you a little background on the area, shows you some pictures of ordnance, and tells you to call 911, you know, if you find something. So, we installed those May of 2021, I think.

And that's really all we've got left is the five hundred and twenty -- twenty-eight acres in the Charlie area to clean up.

And we're waiting on funding.

We're also doing groundwater monitoring at 24 Alfa, where we had benzene and carbon tet in the groundwater. We started sampling quarterly for the first year and then we went to annual sampling for the following three years.

We completed a biannual sampling event in January 2021. We're gonna go do our next sampling event in this coming January 2023.

After that we're gonna -- and the concentrations of benzene and carbon tet continue to decrease, so we're gonna switch to sampling once every five years. So, groundwater monitoring every five years, and waiting on funding for the five hundred thirty acres. And

that's all we've got left here at Fort McClellan.

GERALD HARDY: Has ADEM agreed to your once every five years --

LISA HOLSTEIN: Yes.

GERALD HARDY: -- groundwater sampling?

LISA HOLSTEIN: Yeah.

We are also doing the preliminary assessment for the PFAS, which we've --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Talked about.

LISA HOLSTEIN: -- already talked about.

And the other thing we're doing is the five-year review on -- we have eighteen sites where we implemented response actions. Most of those have land use controls that we're monitoring.

We just completed -- well,

we're about to complete the five-year review. We have a public meeting at the Anniston Meeting Center, if you're interested, this Thursday. Starts at 5:00 o'clock to 6:30. It's just gonna be a poster board presentation. And people can walk in and ask questions.

There were no issues discovered during the five-year review, so -- that's all we got.

JOHN HALL: Any questions?

LISA HOLSTEIN: Any questions?

JOHN HALL: All right. New program ideas and upcoming programs. Anything from the floor?

At this time, I would like to open up the floor for comments. Any comments?

We'll move on to adjournment. Would anyone like --

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: Got to have a motion.

JOHN HALL: That's what I was about to say: Would anyone like to make a motion that we adjourn?

JERRY ELSE: I motion that we adjourn the meeting.

JOHN HALL: All right, sir.

DR. MARY HARRINGTON: I second.

JOHN HALL: All those in favor? Oh, we don't have to do that part, do we? Very good.

Thank everyone for coming. Looks like the next meeting is set for April the 18th of next year.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded.)

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 23rd day January 2023.

---

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

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 11-6-2025.