

**CAMP CROFT RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

**PLACE:** Marriott Renaissance Hotel  
Spartanburg, South Carolina

**DATE AND TIME:** Tuesday, February 4, 2016  
6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

**REPRESENTATIVES :** Ray Livermore, Government Co-Chair and  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Wilmington District

Julie Hiscox  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Savannah District

Spencer O'Neal  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Huntsville District

Heather Kirlin  
Patrick Shirley  
Arcadis  
30 Patewood Drive  
Suite 155  
Greenville, South Carolina 29615  
Pika-Pirnie, Joint Venture

Jason Shiflet  
Zapata Engineering, P.A.  
6402 Fairview Road, Suite 600  
Charlotte, North Carolina 29210

**BOARD MEMBERS  
PRESENT:** Ray Livermore  
James Herzog  
John Moon  
Gary Hayes  
Col. John Gossett

## INDEX

Welcome by Mr. Livermore.....	3
<b>New Business:</b>	
Introduction of the new RAB.....	3
New Meeting Schedule.....	3
RAB Bylaws Updates.....	4
FUDS Boundary.....	7
Feasibility Study Update.....	10
Property Owner Reimbursement.....	63
Update.....	70
Old Business.....	76
RAB New Business Topics.....	76
Adjourn.....	79
Certificate of Reporter.....	80

**REPORTED BY:** Marla J. O'Brien, CVR-M, ACR  
 Freelance Reporting Services  
 Post Office Box 170637  
 Spartanburg, South Carolina 29301  
[freelancerpt@charter.net](mailto:freelancerpt@charter.net)  
 (864) 587-7050

1 MR. HAYES:

2 I want to welcome everybody out tonight. We've got pretty good weather  
3 today, so there wasn't any problems anybody getting here. So that's a good  
4 thing. But this is the first meeting we've had since March. And we've got a  
5 lot to do tonight, so we'll try to move on. But is this the first time  
6 anybody's been here? Okay, so everybody's aware of what the RAB's about.  
7 So now I'd like to turn it over to the Corps of Engineers and let them  
8 introduce the new RAB.

9 MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Okay. I'd like to go ahead and welcome everybody to the Camp Croft  
11 formerly used Defense site and the Restoration Advisory Board. As Mr.  
12 Hayes said, our last meeting was March of last year. And in that time, we  
13 had the tenure of the previous RAB members that expired. So we had  
14 applications out for folks to submit at the last meeting, and we had four  
15 folks that you see up here at the table that had applied to be RAB members.  
16 And asked all four RAB members to submit in writing who they voted for  
17 the community co-chair, and Mr. Hayes was elected to be the co-chair. So  
18 I'd like to go ahead and welcome all of your RAB members. And the term  
19 in the bylaws is two years, so thanks again for participating in the  
20 Restoration Advisory Board.

21 On the agenda, the next item is the new meeting schedule. I talked  
22 with the RAB members about the rotation, and we settled on the first  
23 Thursday, as you see on the meeting agenda, the first Thursday, the second  
24 month of each quarter. So the rotation will be February -- I'm sorry, yeah,  
25 March -- let me get my months straight here -- February, May, and then so

1       forth, every third month after that.

2               The next update I want to bring up was the RAB Bylaws update. And  
3 I had noticed that there were several administrative things that needed to be  
4 changed. And we can bring up the RAB laws if y'all wanted to see them on  
5 the projector. They were purely administrative changes that had specified  
6 Charleston District in there for the Corps of Engineers. And we've gone to  
7 a, sort of a more regional approach as far as management of the FUDS  
8 Projects within the Carolinas and in Georgia. So there were just several  
9 instances throughout the RAB Bylaws that we're going to -- I'm proposing  
10 to RAB to basically make that change, as far as eliminating Charleston  
11 District and just leaving it the US Army Corps of Engineers throughout the  
12 Bylaws.

13              The only other change that I was proposing was on the first page.  
14 Heather, if you can just scroll back up to the -- I think it's on the  
15 introduction. There's some references to the community relations  
16 supervisory handbook. And I noticed that was dated June '88, both of those  
17 references there in that first paragraph there. And I searched to see if there  
18 was any update to those documents, and did, indeed, find that there was a  
19 more recent version. It appears that they maybe even update the community  
20 relations handbook every year. So there's a 2016 version that we can change  
21 that reference to.

22              And then, the second item there, I found on the EPA's website there  
23 is an actual link to resources for community involvement throughout the  
24 process. And I figured that would probably be a better item to have on the  
25 Bylaws, an actual link where community members can go to get resources

1 online as opposed to this particular document, which appears, again, may be  
2 outdated, just by looking at the dates. So those are the changes I had  
3 proposed making to the Bylaws, and I just wanted to run that by the RAB to  
4 make sure that, you know, everybody was okay with making those changes  
5 to the Bylaws. Again, they were, you know, purely administrative at this  
6 point.

7 MR. HAYES:

8 So everything else stayed the same?

9 MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Yes.

11 MR. HAYES:

12 What -- is it in there, does it say about sending out notices for the -- do you  
13 have that on there, Heather?

14 MR. LIVERMORE:

15 I believe that information is in the Bylaws. I don't know it specifically --

16 MR. HAYES:

17 Did we go by that this time?

18 MR. LIVERMORE:

19 Yes. As a matter of fact, we do that for every RAB meeting. We follow the  
20 -- it's on page 1 of 9, it looks like, Heather, it looks like, hold regularly  
21 scheduled meetings on designated day, publicly announced by 15 days prior  
22 and one day prior to the meeting date.

23 MR. HAYES:

24 Is that the public notices in the paper?

25 MS. KIRLIN:.

1 Yes.

2 MR. HAYES:

3 And then we do a mailing, too?

4 MS. KIRLIN:

5 One mailing a month before the meeting date.

6 MR. HAYES:

7 Yeah. Okay, so is the mailing on this? Does it say anything about the  
8 mailing on the Bylaws, or just the public notice? If not, I think we ought to  
9 put in there about the mailing. There's no big thing.

10 MR. LIVERMORE:

11 We can -- I'll review it and see if it's in there. And if it's not, we can  
12 certainly add to it. There is some information here on page 5 of 7 for the  
13 Army facilitator, it does mention maintaining a mailing list of people  
14 interested in restoration activity, but that doesn't specifically talk about the  
15 mailing. So that is something we can certainly add.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 How many addresses do we have on the mailing list now?

18 MS. KIRLIN:

19 There's about 590.

20 MR. HAYES:

21 That's a pretty good mailing.

22 MS. KIRLIN:

23 And if I get returns, I'll take folks off the list if they don't give a forwarding  
24 address, so I try to keep up with it. It's mostly people just moving around,  
25 or if, I mean, they move to another state, I'll take them off, obviously. But--

1 MR. HAYES:

2 Yeah.

3 MS. KIRLIN:

4 -- I do try to keep up with the returns that we get back.

5 MR. HAYES:

6 Well, sometimes -- do you keep a return list?

7 MS. KIRLIN:

8 I really work off a Microsoft Access database. So I'm just keeping up with  
9 that.

10 MR. HAYES:

11 Yeah, okay. Because we might know some of these people, and if the  
12 address isn't right, we might try to find out what it is, because if they had an  
13 interest one time, they might still have interest, or know whether they're a  
14 landowner or not.

15 MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Okay, if there's no more questions about the Bylaws, we'll move on to the  
17 next topic.

18 The next topic was the FUDS boundary. This is a discussion that we  
19 had at the last meeting that Col. Gossett had brought to me prior to the  
20 meeting in regards to, primarily, the southern boundary for Camp Croft,  
21 Formerly Used Defense Site. And I had actually done some research on my  
22 own, and found that we had put the boundary in the wrong place. I had  
23 looked at one of our archived search report document, and found where we  
24 actually had the boundary in two different locations in two different figures  
25 in that document. And for some reason, we carried forward the incorrect

1 location.

2 So Heather, if you want to bring up the figure here. I think the  
3 biggest thing to note -- I believe this is the earlier version, you see October  
4 2014. These are figures from the RI report. And this was the earlier  
5 version. You can see the southern boundary, where it is. And then on the  
6 next figure, which would be the 2015 figure, I think -- I think it's the  
7 revised, the third one down, Heather. The revised figure there. And you  
8 can see we moved -- the boundary has moved up.

9 And I think the biggest features that I noticed when I was doing the  
10 research was that the boundary, the parcel boundary from the real estate  
11 information in our historical documents showed that the boundary followed,  
12 I believe it's Shiloh Church Road and Roselynn Road there. And in that  
13 previous figure, it was further south, probably about 2,000 -- 2- to 3,000  
14 feet, I believe.

15 So once I noticed that there was an inaccuracy that we had in the  
16 document, I forwarded that to our real estate folks, and they were able to get  
17 it fixed. And since we've rectified that, I forwarded that to the Zapata folks  
18 that had done the RI, and they've revised the figures that were in there to  
19 reflect the correct boundary for the FUDS.

20 MR. HAYES:

21 But it follows Shiloh Church for a while.

22 MR. LIVERMORE:

23 Right, right. And then, I think on the southeastern side there, I want to say,  
24 is it Glenn Springs Road, I think, is where it pretty much follows the route  
25 of that road on the southeastern --



1 COL. GOSSETT:

2 The original one that was shown about a year ago, last fall, or something, it  
3 showed it being southwest of Shiloh Church Road, and it should have been  
4 northeast. And that over there, we've looked at it, and it's real close. I've  
5 got all the backup information right here. Whoever did it, if you did it or  
6 whoever, has made a big correction. And me having grown up right there in  
7 the house, when I looked at it last fall, I realized that I was inside of Camp  
8 Croft all this time. And my dad being the post engineer, I knew it wasn't  
9 right. But I appreciate you doing that.

10 MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Sure. I'm glad that we corrected it. I'm glad that, obviously, you brought it  
12 up, and we were able to find that it was incorrect in documents, and we got  
13 it rectified. So we've got it, obviously, in the right location now.

14 COL. GOSSETT:

15 And there's a couple other landowners involved in it, too, other than me.  
16 When I say other landowners, the joint landowners. And I'm sure they  
17 appreciate it, too. And Jerry's got land involved in it, too. And then Dr.  
18 McClure's got some, and one other one there. I'm sure that everybody  
19 appreciates it being done.

20 MR. LIVERMORE:

21 All right. Okay, that's the only thing I had on the FUDS boundaries. So if  
22 there aren't any other questions or discussion about it, we can --

23 MR. HAYES:

24 I heard from Dr. McClure he's not going to be here tonight. He's down in  
25 Dominican Republic with his church group.

1 MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Okay. Does he own property there on the southern boundary?

3 MR. HAYES:

4 Yeah. He was here last meeting.

5 MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Okay.

7 MR. HERZOG:

8 And he joins his property.

9 MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Okay. All right. Well, these figures, obviously, they're in the RI document  
11 now, the updated one, so, you know, if he needs to look at them, obviously,  
12 the presentation will be on the project website, so if he needs to look at it,  
13 or if he wants to talk to me about it, he's certainly welcome to.

14 Okay. All right, let's move on to the next topic. Obviously, this is  
15 the one that we've been waiting for. Obviously, we had to postpone the  
16 meeting several times, and this is the Feasibility Study report. And  
17 basically, this is the phase that we've been in after the remedial  
18 investigation that looks at alternatives for remedial actions at the site. And  
19 Jason Shiflet, who's the project manager with Zapata, is going to provide us  
20 with a presentation update on the feasibility study.

21 ZAPATA POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 Okay, so you'll have to excuse the compression there. I'm not sure why it's  
24 doing that. But at any rate, what I want to just take a few minutes to chat  
25 about tonight is our findings from the -- or to present our results from the

1 feasibility study.

2 So, the first thing that I want to talk about is just the legal  
3 framework, just to give everyone a reminder about the CERCLA process and  
4 sort of why we're doing what we're doing. I will touch very briefly on the  
5 RI results, just to, again, to remind folks of some of the highlights that we  
6 have from that work. And then we'll focus a little more specifically on the  
7 Feasibility Study itself, the purpose and objective of a Feasibility Study, a  
8 summary of that report with our findings, and then, just to note that the  
9 document is in the information repository at the library, if you're interested  
10 in reading it in detail. And then we'll take questions at the end.

11 The CERCLA process is long and winding, but what I'll highlight is  
12 that if you look down at the bottom, there are two gray boxes. One is the RI  
13 investigation, which we finished, and now the Feasibility Study, which we  
14 finished. The yellow cell, if you will, is the proposed plan, which we're  
15 crafting right now. We actually finished an internal draft and given that to  
16 the board to look at. So it is not too far in the future, we'll be ready for you  
17 guys to see, for the public to see. And then the conclusion, the concluding  
18 document, the last document will be the Decision Document. And I will  
19 cover those things over the course of this discussion.

20 Just a reminder, the decision makers are, for a project like this, stakeholder  
21 involvement is very important. The Corps of Engineers is obviously  
22 involved, giving their expertise. The state is involved in this process from  
23 start to finish. This RAB is involved. And then, the public is involved.

24 The public has a right to contribute information and to make their decision  
25 known.

1 So, what you can't see because, for some reason, this is weird, that there is,  
2 at the moment, a tentative proposed planned public meeting is scheduled for  
3 March of this year. Late March. So, RI summary. Approximately 77  
4 percent of the greater than 10,000 acres that were investigated contained  
5 only small arms or low quantity of MD. So most of the area was either  
6 small arms, or very low quantities of MD. However, eight areas contained  
7 MEC and/or high concentrations of MD.

8 So when we see a lot of MD, a lot of frag, that is indicative of the potential  
9 for MEC and makes us a little more wary. So eight areas contained those,  
10 one of those two scenarios. No munitions constituents -- think of these as  
11 explosives in soil, or metals in soil. No munitions constituent risks were  
12 identified. So, 14 areas were investigated, eight areas were retained to be  
13 covered in the FS.

14 This is just a summary of the categories of items that we found across the  
15 site. It's really just as a reminder we're talking about grenades, land mines,  
16 mortars, projectiles, that sort of thing. Really, so this is an investigation  
17 summary, a table that shows of the 14 areas we investigated, there are  
18 acreages, there are -- what we have is their new designation, their new  
19 name. Those names will now correlate to the poster that you see to the  
20 right. What you can't see, but is really not that important, it's just so much  
21 is that the comment field, which is whether or not MEC was observed or not  
22 observed, and the type of MEC that we observed or didn't. You can look at  
23 these rows, and the red text indicates areas where we actually found MEC.

24 This is part one of the table, and part two of the table is this.

25 MR. HAYES:

1           Would you define MEC for them?

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3           Yes. MEC is an item with an explosive hazard. That's what it is.

4 MR. HAYES:

5           And MD is what?

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7           MD does not have an explosive hazard. MD would be fragments of a casing

8           of some sort, or a tail fin, you know, of a rocket, or something like that. It

9           doesn't have any explosive hazard.

10 MR. LIVERMORE:

11          The full term, for anybody that's not familiar with it, is munitions and

12          explosives of concern, is the full term for MEC. And then, MD is munitions

13          debris.

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15          Right. Thank you.

16 MR. HAYES:

17          I just want to be clarify, in case somebody's reading this later on --

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19          Sure.

20 MR. HAYES:

21          -- in the minutes.

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23          So, again, it's the same type of information here. This table was too large

24          for one slide. So one more site, the grenade maneuver area, is a place where

25          we found MEC.

1           Following, or as part of the RI, and this is -- this helps the Army  
2 Corps of Engineers, and how they managed this data internally. We do  
3 what's called a MEC hazard assessment, the munitions and explosives of  
4 concern, a hazard assessment. And it's a long form, it's all provided in the  
5 RI. And it's in the information repository. But we basically, it allows us to  
6 rank a site and assign it some hazard level. And an assignment or a score of  
7 one is -- indicates the highest hazard level; and four is the lowest.

8           What you're missing on the right-hand side of the screen there is the  
9 actual score, which is really not important. What's most important is the  
10 hazard level category for the sites where MEC was found. A MEC hazard  
11 assessment can only be performed at a site where MEC is found. So if one  
12 of these areas that we investigated, we did not find MEC, we can't do what's  
13 called a MEC HA, a hazard assessment. But, in the places where we found  
14 MEC, we were able to score them and calculate, or indicate their hazard  
15 level. And you can see there are four of those locations that have a hazard  
16 level of one, and two have a hazard level of two, and one has a hazard level  
17 of three.

18           Okay, so area disposition. This one, I wish you could see the last  
19 column, but I'll just cover what's there. Basically, we took what we call a  
20 pre-RI designation. This is what the area was called when we got the scope  
21 to begin our work. And then, the pre-RI acreage, what that acreage looked  
22 like. And then our revised designation, what we're now calling the area, and  
23 the revised acreage, because in some cases it was adjusted slightly. And --  
24 in some cases, not slightly, but it was adjusted.

25           And then, in the last column, what you can't see is the

1 recommendation. And I'll make it a little bit simple. If you see a line in  
2 red, it was included in the FS. So the site was included in the FS.

3 MS. O'NEAL:

4 Jason, why don't we take about 30 seconds to see if we can get that to full  
5 screen. Maybe we can transfer the file to Heather?

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7 If we can find a USB key, we can do that. I'll tell you what; let me try  
8 something.

9 (Break in Proceedings)

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Well, it's still compressed, but at least we can see it. All right. Who knew  
12 that I could do that? Lucky guess.

13 All right, so, continuing on. As you look down the recommendation  
14 column, you know, we love acronyms, and there are a few acronyms over  
15 there. So let's talk about those.

16 If you look at MRS 1, for instance, NFA, address, and DD. So what  
17 that means is that that site, the recommendation is that no further action be  
18 conducted at MRS 1, and that that is formalized in the Decision Document.  
19 So we think that site is done.

20 MRS 2, we have that recommended for RI FS pending right of entry  
21 allowance. We didn't get right-of-entry to the site, we couldn't investigate  
22 it, so it's as if nothing happened.

23 The next series of lines, you can see all of the former MRS 3 but  
24 their revised designations are included in the FS, and we'll cover those.

25 And then you'll see a series of sites that we refer to as areas of

1 potential interest. Those are all NFA, address, and DD. So basically, we  
2 didn't find anything.

3 And then, the last is grouping is included in the FS. Okay. So, the  
4 purpose of an FS is to develop -- and I'm going to read this because it's  
5 written very specifically -- develop and evaluate potential response  
6 alternatives to manage the MEC or MC hazards and risks to human health  
7 and the environment due to historical DOD usage. So, develop and evaluate  
8 are key terms, we'll talk about that. And response alternatives, think of that  
9 as what's going to happen to this site. What is government going to do at  
10 this site? That's a response alternative.

11 And then, the objective of the FS, though, is to provide the decision-  
12 makers, us, or you, the information you need to support that determination  
13 of what that response alternative is going to be. So this is supposed to give  
14 you the information you need to make up your mind what should happen at  
15 a site going forward. That's an FS in a nutshell.

16 Just to highlight what we mean when we talk about risk. Each one of  
17 -- this is a classic Venn diagram. The exposure pathway is a bubble. MEC,  
18 or the hazard, is a bubble. And we are receptors. And where all of those  
19 things overlap is where we have our risk. So in other words, if there is an  
20 exposure pathway, which might be, you know, digging in your garden or  
21 whatever, that's a pathway. And having a receptor come together, so a  
22 person digging in the garden but there's no MEC, there's no risk. So  
23 likewise, if the receptor is there and the MEC is there, but there's no  
24 pathway to get to it, then there's no risk. So that's what we mean when we  
25 talk about risk.



1           The generalized FS process, how this plays out, is that we take the  
2           RI, information that we have in the RI, including the risk assessment  
3           component of it, we begin to establish what we call remedial objectives. In  
4           other words, what is the objective of -- what are we trying to achieve at a  
5           site. And in looking at that, we develop a broad range of possible  
6           responses. These are called alternatives -- well, the alternatives are actually  
7           built on something called general response actions. So think of a response  
8           as, you could do nothing, you could inform the community by educational  
9           methods, you could build a fence, you could dig, you could excavate with  
10          heavy equipment. Those are all general response actions. And you take  
11          those, and you build them and combine them into something called a  
12          response alternative. So alternative is the key word. And then you evaluate  
13          those alternatives.

14                 And there's two evaluation processes. You first have to screen them.  
15          This sort of weeds out the simple ones, the ones that aren't going to really  
16          work at a site. And then you evaluate them in detail. And we'll talk about  
17          what that detail looks like. But essentially, CERCLA says that there are  
18          nine evaluation criteria, and I will share with you what those are.

19 MR. HERZOG:

20                 Quick question.

21 MR. SHIFLET:

22                 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

23 MR. HERZOG:

24                 Could you flip back to that list?

25 MR. SHIFLET:

1 Yes, sir.

2 MR. HERZOG:

3 Screening of possible alternatives where it gets to relative cost, are you  
4 provided with a budget figure? Are you quoting this?

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 No. What we do, and what's required of an FS is, the first step -- I'm glad  
7 you mentioned this. The first step of the screening process is you really just  
8 are trying to evaluate is this particular alternative, is it effective? Is it  
9 going to work? Is it something that can be implemented? And what's the  
10 relative cost? If it's just ridiculously inexpensive [sic] and just not going to  
11 happen because the technology is cost prohibitive, it might get screened out.  
12 Now, that would be a really high bar, trust me, because some of the things  
13 that we look at in more detail are not necessarily cheap. So that screening  
14 of the possible alternatives is really just a sort of thumbnail evaluation. But  
15 once you go to the detailed evaluation for the alternatives that are retained,  
16 one of the nine criteria are cost. And eventually, we -- we actually estimate  
17 cost to do the work.

18 MR. HAYES:

19 Have you already done it?

20 MR. SHIFLET:

21 That's part of the FS. Already done.

22 MR. HAYES:

23 So I've seen.

24 MR. SHIFLET:

25 It's already been estimated. I will say that CERCLA allows a range in your

1 estimate of minus 30 to plus 50 percent. You don't have to be exact. It's  
2 just a ballpark. And we've done that.

3 COL. GOSSETT:

4 Does that cost estimate include rendering the land to where it's usable with  
5 no restraints?

6 MR. SHIFLET;

7 We'll get there. That's one of the alternatives. Absolutely. You evaluate  
8 that cost for multiple alternatives. And we'll talk about that. That's a good  
9 question.

10 So, for this site, we have as a remedial action objective to reduce the  
11 human health risk from exposure to potential surface and subsurface MEC  
12 by preventing residents, landowners, workers, recreational users, and the  
13 general public from contacting MEC and thus minimizing the potential for  
14 direct exposure. That's our objective. And our preliminary goal,  
15 remediation goal, is to manage that risk through a combination of removal  
16 actions, administrative controls, public education, thus rendering the site  
17 safe, as safe as reasonably possible to humans and the environment, and  
18 conducive to anticipated future land use. There's a lot buried in this  
19 paragraph. I get that. Each word has meaning, so we can kind of dissect  
20 this and then I can answer questions when they come up. So...

21 COL. GOSSETT:

22 Flip back over there one minute, please. There's two words up there has a  
23 lot of meaning in it. And each meaning to different people.

24 MR. SHIFLET:

25 Well --

1 COL. GOSSETT:

2 Administrative controls. That's the scary one up there.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 Of course.

5 COL. GOSSETT:

6 Okay.

7 MR. SHIFLET:

8 Well, if I could just say, too, keep in mind this is the beginning of the  
9 negotiation of the decision. That's kind of what the FS is. This is where we  
10 start to talk about real things that might happen at these sites, real costs,  
11 potentially, real administrative controls, or not. Because it's not my  
12 decision. It's y'all's.

13 COL. GOSSETT:

14 The reason I raise that is for the benefit of anybody out there that's a  
15 landowner.

16 MR. SHIFLET:

17 Correct.

18 COL. GOSSETT:

19 Or stakeholder.

20 MR. SHIFLET:

21 Correct. Okay.

22 So, recommended RAO's specific to the areas were covered in the  
23 FS. You can see the area listed in the left column, the penetration depth.  
24 That is the greatest depth that we found MEC at each one of these areas.  
25 The next column to the right is the potential receptor. Not the only, but the

1 potential receptor. And the depth, an estimated depth that that receptor may  
2 use the site. Just an estimate. And then a recommended depth for --  
3 remedial action objective depth.

4 And what you'll note fairly quickly in a lot of cases is that, you know  
5 -- take the top line, for instance. The 105 millimeter area, we found -- a  
6 MEC item was found there at two feet below ground surface. And I'm sorry  
7 the asterisks didn't carry over from my report in the FS. But that the  
8 conservative receptor that we have there is a resident, and they could  
9 theoretically, fairly easily dig in their land, if you will, two feet deep --  
10 could be more -- and so the recommended RAO there is three feet, which is  
11 a foot beyond. A one foot safety factor. And this is just the preliminary.

12 MR. STRANGE:

13 How deep are y'all able to go with your radar or whatever, your subsurface  
14 detection equipment now?

15 MR. SHIFLET:

16 It depends on a lot of factors. A rough estimate is three to four feet. But it  
17 depends on the size of the item or location of the item, the substrate it's in,  
18 whether it's a iron-bearing clay or a clean sand. It depends on the detector.  
19 There are a lot of factors that govern that.

20 MR. STRANGE:

21 I just was wondering that because I've got a situation where I've had to put  
22 this thing off, and I don't know which direction to go in in my foundation.  
23 And I know I'm going to have to go probably, eight, nine feet in places. I  
24 know there's equipment out there now that could go 30 feet.

25 MR. SHIFLET:

1 Right. I mean, if there are --

2 MR. STRANGE:

3 I didn't know if y'all had upgraded --

4 MR. SHIFLET:

5 Well, there are geophysical sensors that can certainly see into the subsurface  
6 deeper than 30 feet, but not when you're looking for metal, and trying to  
7 identify -- I mean, you can see, now, deeper than a few feet. But for  
8 instance, GPR. GPR easily goes -- I mean, if you're looking for a utility  
9 line or whatever. But it's different geophysical principle than what would  
10 be employed during a removal action.

11 MR. STRANGE:

12 Well --

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 It's a little different.

15 MR. STRANGE:

16 -- but you would certainly be able to see if there was some unusual  
17 formation.

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 GPR could tell you if there was a change in the substrate, in other words, if  
20 there was natural, native soil that had been disturbed. And you would be  
21 able to see that demarcation between the two. But you're less likely to be  
22 able to see an item, you know, a shell, a mortar or whatever, buried six or  
23 eight feet deep using GPR. It just doesn't -- it doesn't work like that.

24 LT. DYAS:

25 We've used it looking for bodies. And you're right, you can go down -- it's

1 not going to tell you it's a body, it's going to show you a change in the soil,  
2 is what it actually does. We have them come up from USC and help us with  
3 it, they brought their (indiscernible). But you could see there was anomaly  
4 in the soil. So they would go down and look, and take the time to go down  
5 there, especially looking for a body or something like that. It's not going to  
6 tell you what it is. It's going to certainly show you there's something in that  
7 soil that's changed. That's really what it does.

8 MR. STRANGE:

9 I appreciate that. So what you're saying to me is you can tell the difference  
10 between fill and residual soil conditions?

11 LT. DYAS:

12 Yeah.

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 Yeah. The GPR really measures --

15 MR. STRANGE:

16 At deep depths?

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 -- I mean, I'm not a geophysicist. I know enough to be dangerous. But it  
19 really measures a change in the velocity of the waves being projected into  
20 the subsurface and the reflection of that. And that change can happen  
21 because it contacts something that's metal, it contacts water, it's a difference  
22 -- you know, the materials are loose and then packed, there's a change in the  
23 velocity of the wave. That's what it's really measuring.

24 MR. STRANGE:

25 That would take care of my situation, if we knew the profile of the soil

1       where you went to a residual, and transferred from the fill condition to  
2       residual condition.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4       GPR is generally not really employed anymore for conditions -- removal  
5       actions. There are much better instruments that are used these days. It's not  
6       something that we would even recommend for this site. In fact, we  
7       wouldn't. It's a tool. I mean, you know, it's a geophysical tool that you see  
8       utility locators using sometimes. I mean, you know, it has a purpose, but we  
9       wouldn't really include it in our recommendation for use.

10 MR. STRANGE:

11       Well, I mean, I hope you understand my dilemma, because if I get some  
12       contractor in there digging nine-foot pier columns, and they blow sky-high,  
13       you know --

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15       Right.

16 MR. STRANGE:

17       -- or whatever, I don't know if there are PCB involved or anything like that.  
18       You know, not knowing what's in -- I live in the lowest area, in the  
19       immediate area that I live in.

20 MR. SHIFLET:

21       Okay, so you live in one of the orange areas?

22 MR. STRANGE:

23       Help me, Jimmy. Do I?

24 MR. TOBIAS:

25       He lives at Wedgewood, around the golf course.



1 MR. SHIFLET:

2 Oh, okay.

3 MR. TOBIAS:

4 He's got foundation problems, because he probably built a house maybe on  
5 fill.

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7 Sure.

8 MR. STRANGE:

9 I personally think -- I was kind of in the business at one time when I first  
10 moved in, I went to -- myself with just hand augers in some areas, and tried  
11 to define where residual and fill -- fill stopped and residual began. And I  
12 think I'm going to be doing a lot more digging than I was planning initially.  
13 And that's what concerns me.

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 Right. Yeah. Well, you will see that the Wedgewood community falls into  
16 an area where we are really recommending land use controls, which means a  
17 lot of things. So don't get too hung up over the word "control." It's not -- I  
18 mean, it actually has been cleaned. The majority of that neighborhood has  
19 had a removal action.

20 And we feel like, in our work, when we look at that community, we  
21 actually put -- what we did was we put a buffer around an area that had been  
22 cleaned, based on the size of the items that had been there, grenades. And  
23 in that buffer is where we really wanted to do our investigation. We did not  
24 get access to that property. Except for a couple of residences along the very  
25 eastern border of that. We didn't really find anything. So --

1 MR. STRANGE:

2 Yeah, but y'all were unable to go under foundations.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 That's true. So I guess what I'm saying is that, based on what you're saying  
5 to me, there is always a possibility, because you live close to a former  
6 grenade range. It seems relatively lower risk. But, you live near former  
7 grenade range.

8 MR. STRANGE:

9 What happens if somebody gets hurt?

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Well, I'll let the Corps answer that question.

12 MR. HAYES:

13 Is some of the Wedgewood property in the Feasibility Study?

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 It is -- it's really not in the Feasibility Study.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 It's not a hazard area?

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 Well, we couldn't really investigate. I mean, it is, but it's not -- we see it -  
20 - at least, it is our feeling -- our, being the Corps and others -- feeling that  
21 there is a generally lower risk around that Wedgewood community,  
22 especially in the neighborhood where the removal action is done. It's  
23 theoretically low there, because the removal action has been done. But  
24 we're talking about the far buffer around that neighborhood.

25 Okay. So, range of alternatives. What are alternatives that we

1 considered for the FS. Here is the list. And they vary from everything from  
2 no action which is required by CERCLA. That is our baseline that we have  
3 to compare everything against. And it gradationally gets more advanced and  
4 challenging and technological, if you will, at the bottom where we consider  
5 what's called advanced classifications, coupled with subsurface and surface  
6 MEC removal to support unlimited use, unrestricted exposure.

7 So it's a little difficult to see, but you can see that four of them are  
8 bolded. So all of these were evaluated in the screening process, and the  
9 four that are bolded were retained and evaluated in detail.

10 So these nine criteria that we used to do the detailed evaluation  
11 include things like -- and I really don't intend to read all this, so if you want  
12 to read quickly what's below it, you can see it afterwards. But basically,  
13 overall protection of the human health and the environment. There is a very  
14 challenging criteria called compliance with ARARs, and I can explain that  
15 in a second. And then, the long-term effectiveness and permanence. These  
16 are the first three of the nine.

17 Compliance with ARARs. Think of ARARs as a law that you have to  
18 follow. An example of that might be an endangered species. If one of these  
19 sites had a nesting bald eagle, you have to understand that there is a  
20 endangered species act that comes into play for that site. You just can't  
21 ignore it. So, think of that as an ARAR. At Croft, at the former Camp  
22 Croft, we do not have any identified ARARs.

23 Okay, continuing on down evaluation criteria, we have logically, the  
24 reduction of the toxicity, mobility, or volume with treatment. The short-  
25 term effectiveness of the alternative and the implement ability. And then,

1 lastly, cost, state acceptance, state regulatory acceptance, and community  
2 acceptance. And this is where you guys should see something very  
3 important. It is the community's responsibility to be involved in the FS  
4 proposed plan process so that when the Decision Document is finalized,  
5 everyone understands what's been discussed about each one of these sites  
6 and agreed upon by everybody. You have an opportunity to comment on the  
7 FS and the proposed plan. And it's your responsibility to do it.

8 MR. MOON:

9 Jason, when you went -- go back to that, I don't know how many slides you  
10 passed. One more. Yeah. The ARARs or whatever. Is that where you're  
11 saying there's no cleanup necessarily needs to be done near a bald eagle  
12 nesting site? Or -- because there are --

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 Well, to use that example, what it means is if you're going to do something  
15 at a site like that --

16 MR. MOON:

17 Right.

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 -- you have to take into account that law.

20 MR. MOON:

21 That's what I'm asking, because we do have nesting bald eagles at the park.  
22 That's why, when you said there were none in the former Camp Croft,  
23 there's one in the park.

24 MR. SHIFLET:

25 There's a nesting bald eagle?

1 MR. MOON:

2 That's correct.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 That's news to me.

5 MR. MOON:

6 Yeah.

7 MR. SHIFLET:

8 No idea. Okay. So, it depends on where it is, and it depends on how close

9 it is to an area that would be -- where there might be some need to cut brush

10 or whatever.

11 MR. MOON:

12 Right.

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 They have this buffer around.

15 MR. MOON:

16 Right.

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 If they're in one of the remaining land areas where we're talking about

19 potentially just land use controls, they wouldn't matter.

20 MR. MOON:

21 I think it's 300 feet. I think the buffer on nesting bald eagles.

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 Okay. That sounds right. Okay. So, you obviously might not want to

24 broadcast where that is, but you would want to tell --

25 MR. MOON:

1 Right.

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3 -- the Corps or the state --

4 MR. MOON:

5 Right.

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7 -- so that we can, you know, account for that. Wow.

8 MR. HERZOG:

9 They're migrating in here. I've seen one in Union, and here in Spartanburg  
10 County, too.

11 MR. SHIFLET:

12 Okay. So for the four alternatives that were retained for the detailed  
13 analysis, this table has those listed in columns from left to right. And the  
14 nine EPA criteria, or CERCLA criteria, are, in the first column on the left.  
15 And this table essentially summarizes that evaluation, and allows you to sort  
16 of quickly compare one to the other.

17 So just looking at the first row, overall protectiveness, no action is,  
18 of course, not protective. All the others are protective. The level of  
19 protection is different, but they are generally protective.

20 We'll skip over ARARs since we have learned about a bald eagle.

21 The long-term effectiveness and permanence. That symbol in the  
22 first column indicates relatively low to none. You're not doing anything,  
23 there's no action, so there's no long-term effectiveness. But as you move to  
24 the right across that row, each one of those alternatives is progressively  
25 more effective at the long term, because they are progressively more effort

1 in removal.

2 You can follow the logic down to each one of those rows in the chart,  
3 all the way down to the bottom, which I will point out, state and community  
4 acceptance are asterisked. And they're asterisked because those can't really  
5 be evaluated as part of the FS until the community and the state weigh in on  
6 the FS and the proposed plan. Once that information is received, this  
7 comparative analysis can be revised. And this really is, the FS -- not so  
8 much the FS, but the proposed plan is interactive. This is where we get  
9 feedback and make changes. All right.

10 And then, I'll explain this cost summary. What we did to calculate  
11 our cost is we took a generic site of 100 acres, and I went through the effort  
12 of calculating what a removal action would cost, or what -- I'm sorry, go  
13 ahead.

14 MR. MOON:

15 I just wanted -- another quick question.

16 MR. SHIFLET:

17 This one or the last one?

18 MR. MOON:

19 You can leave it where it's at. I mean, how did you all get -- how did you  
20 all come across that information? I mean, you know, who did you ask as to  
21 whether or not there was a nesting bald eagle on Gary's property, or Col.  
22 Gossett's, or the park? Do y'all put that out there to ask those landowners if  
23 they think there maybe, there may could possibly be? I'm just curious. I  
24 mean, I never was asked, and I would have certainly shared that  
25 information.

1 MR. SHIFLET:

2 Yeah.

3 MR. MOON:

4 Because they've been there for a long time. They didn't just show up.

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 The short and not so good answer is that during the RI, that's one of the  
7 things that I looked at, and I thought I recalled seeing that they weren't in  
8 the area. So it was a bad assumption on my part, frankly.

9 But I think, John, I mean, that's part of the process. That's something  
10 we can certainly -- I wrote a note down to determine whether we need to  
11 include that in our proposed plan. Certainly, our Decision Document, which  
12 comes after the public reviews the proposed plan is that you take into  
13 account those type of items that need to be considered when you're doing  
14 any type of cleanup action. And that would certainly be -- would factor in  
15 as far as actually getting to the site and doing some type of cleanup action,  
16 considering those things, to not impact or minimize the impact through  
17 there. So that's something I definitely have written down as far as do we  
18 need to address this plan, or at least sometime down the road, does it need  
19 to be considered when we implement remedial actions, say, on the state  
20 park.

21 MR. MOON:

22 Gotcha.

23 MR. SHIFLET:

24 And I will confess, ARARs are -- of everything in an FS, it's like, to me, the  
25 most complicated thing. And attorneys are always involved. It just, the



1 Corps attorney will advise, you know, whoever. And I mean -- so  
2 sometimes, I just have to let those folks work it out and come to some  
3 resolution, and then we capture it.

4 MR. LIVERMORE:

5 I'll say this; to me, at least, my experience has been that the ARARs  
6 definitely, I think, are geared towards chemical contamination. When you  
7 think about a site that's had groundwater contamination from an industrial  
8 site or something like that, the one type of ARAR that Jason had up there --  
9 there were three of them -- one of them was action ARAR which talks about  
10 some type of cleanup standards for groundwater, for instance, like drinking  
11 water standards, if somebody has a well and they use the groundwater.  
12 There are specific standards for a specific contaminant, like Benzene, or  
13 those type of compounds that, from a risk perspective, the contamination  
14 should be below that level. So those things are -- that's what's considered  
15 when you think about action type ARARs, when a cleanup is -- as far as  
16 looking at the risk and making sure the cleanup reduces the risk below those  
17 type of health-based numbers.

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 Yeah, that's a great point. And so, to dovetail that, one thing I could say is  
20 if I were to pose a question at one of these sites, we're going to do a  
21 removal action and remove MEC, what threshold do we use to decide that  
22 we've gotten all of it? Because with a contaminant like PCE, for instance,  
23 there's a number. If the number is below this, the concentration of that  
24 contaminated groundwater is below that number, then you're below it. But  
25 that doesn't really exist for MEC. So how do you answer that question, how

1 clean is clean? And frankly, that's what has to be worked out. And why it's  
2 so challenging for these kinds of jobs.

3 MR. O'NEAL:

4 And too, what we've done, I've seen some things for frag, we're working on  
5 a brand new range. I mean, it's supposed to be the most up-to-date, pristine  
6 aerial range that -- passing ARARs but where we've had a Venus fly trap in  
7 the middle of a existing range, where we're doing for this new technical  
8 range. We've had to redesign it around the Venus fly trap in order to make  
9 sure that that piece of it was taken care of. So the ARARs does work. I  
10 mean, it's a little bit more work for us, but, you know. We do what we have  
11 to do when we're protecting the environment. Or red-cockaded  
12 woodpeckers, or long nose bats.

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 The long eared bat, that are everywhere.

15 MR. O'NEAL:

16 So, we do take those into consideration, and we do change designs or  
17 whatever we need to make sure we take the environment into consideration.

18 COL. GOSSETT:

19 What's going to happen when the Decision Document comes out and all  
20 these agencies supposedly sign off on it, and they sign off on it, and nobody  
21 funds it?

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 Well, I don't know. I don't -- that's above my pay grade.

24 COL. GOSSETT:

25 Because, you know, there's a lot of money up there to do any of it.

1 MR. SHIFLET:

2 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

3 COL. GOSSETT:

4 And unless the federal government is going to come up with it...

5 MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Well, that -- Mr. Gossett, that's the process that we had to go through to get  
7 approval to do the work. The Decision Document will take into account any  
8 comments that are made during the public meeting. We go forward with  
9 what we're recommending, if nothing's changed, then this is what we will be  
10 recommending, the Decision Document. We have to submit that through our  
11 -- the dollar value that we're looking at, we're probably talking headquarters  
12 Army to get approval for it. So we're going to go through that process, and  
13 we'll have to get headquarters Army to, basically, approve these cleanup  
14 actions.

15 Now, the next stage beyond that is obviously going to Congress and  
16 getting the funding to do that work. So those are, you know, those are long  
17 processes that we have to go through. And I won't lie to you, that's, you  
18 know, that's just, that's the process that we have to go through to get  
19 approval for the funding to do the work.

20 COL. GOSSETT:

21 The difference is people are still living on the land and using the land, and  
22 yet, you know, the Decision Document says you've got these hazards. Is  
23 something going to force the people to not use it while all of this is going  
24 on? Or the state going to have to -- the county, or the taxpayers, if we have  
25 to go through the headquarters Department of the Army, we know what

1           that's going to take. And Congress is even longer. And most people in this  
2           room are going to be dead by then.

3 MR. HERZOG:

4           Well, if you started today, you wouldn't -- that funding source would be two  
5           years from now, wouldn't it? At least?

6 COL. GOSSETT:

7           You wouldn't get to the Corps Department of the Army in two years.

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9           I won't lie to you, it's a long process that we go through. And I think you're  
10          speaking more towards the -- the concern now, as far as what people do with  
11          their land now.

12 COL. GOSSETT:

13          Like the guy talking about he's built on something. But if you wanted to  
14          build a house somewhere or you already live there and you're using it, this  
15          document comes out and says this and this and this, well, all of a sudden,  
16          people get concerned, what do they do while they're waiting on the funding  
17          to do something? Do they just continue doing like they've been doing the  
18          last 50 years, or better pick up and move?

19 MR. LIVERMORE:

20          Well, I think this gets to -- and we've probably had some of these  
21          discussions before as far as private property and what can be done, what  
22          can't be done. Obviously, it's private property. The Army can't tell anybody  
23          what to do. So obviously, you know, if you want to build something or do  
24          something on the property to do some kind of construction, we can't prevent  
25          you from doing that.

1           The only, I guess, recommendation that we would have right now  
2           would be basically to, what we call the three Rs, basically implement the  
3           three Rs; recognize that the area was a former range site, if you encounter  
4           something that looks suspicious -- obviously, in construction, you may come  
5           across something that looks suspicious, recognize its potential unexploded  
6           ordnance, and then report it to the local authorities and let them handle it.

7           And that's -- there are a thousand sites across the country, FUDS  
8           sites like Camp Croft that they have very similar to this, and obviously,  
9           they're all in the -- you know, in the queue as far as trying to get them  
10          through headquarters Army, get funding, and get some type of cleanup  
11          action. And you guys mentioned it tonight as far as how long that process  
12          is, and how limited the funding is. It's just what we have to work through.

13          And like I said, what we stress in the interim is to utilize those three  
14          Rs, you know, obviously, if you do encounter something that looks  
15          suspicious, then call the local authorities and, you know, let them handle it.

16 COL. GOSSETT:

17          If the Decision Document is a bad case in some areas and not in others,  
18          those people in those areas is going to be limited to some degree of what  
19          they can reasonably do while this waiting process of getting funding...

20 MR. LIVERMORE:

21          I will say this, the slide that we had up about the MEC HA, the hazard  
22          assessment that was done, those levels, the ones, twos, and threes, those are  
23          considered, along with another scoring that's not included here, the Army  
24          uses a -- and you'll see the Feasibility Study, it's a -- MRSPP is a  
25          prioritization protocol, it's a scoring that's done based on the type of

1 munitions that were at the site, the type of land use, exposure, things like  
2 that, how accessible it is to the public. And those scores are submitted to --  
3 through the Army to basically identify what are the most, you know, more  
4 hazardous sites. So those would get better, higher consideration for  
5 funding. So they're elevated to get funding a quicker --

6 COL. GOSSETT:

7 Might do it piecemeal.

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Right, right. So -- and like I said, the intention of the Army and Congress, I  
10 think, when they created this protocol, was to basically compare these sites  
11 that are more risky than others, and again, obviously, so we can address  
12 those sites in a quicker manner that have a higher score.

13 MR. HAYES:

14 How many of these MRS areas are in the state park?

15 MR. LIVERMORE:

16 In the state park? Jason?

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 One, two -- two and a piece of a third. The Newburg (phonetic) area is  
19 within the state park. The rocket grenade maneuver area is in the southern -  
20 -

21 That's private property.

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 The northern tip might be in the southern part of the state park. No? It's  
24 right there, it falls in the middle circle. I just can't see how far it extends up  
25 north. But I don't think crosses that creek, so maybe it's not in the state

1 park. That creek is about the boundary of it.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

3 Southern power line crosses -- goes through.

4 MR. SHIFLET:

5 Yeah. Okay, so that's not. And then, the 60/81 millimeter mortar area, part  
6 of that might be in the state park. I believe it is. Okay? So I don't want to  
7 get too hung up on the cost summary. But basically, what I did was I took a  
8 generic site and then scaled it up for each one of these alternatives for each  
9 of the areas, based on their size. And then I had what I call a MEC factor.  
10 The generic site that I built had MEC on it, so if the site didn't have MEC, I  
11 weighted it a little bit less.

12 Okay. So finally, upcoming schedule, tentative dates. March '16, so  
13 next month, we're looking at having a proposed plan ready. It's going to  
14 suggest the preferred alternatives. So the FS narrows it down to a smaller  
15 group of alternatives, and then the proposed plan recommends an  
16 alternative. And that gets to be debated.

17 Yes?

18 MR. HERZOG:

19 When and where?

20 MR. SHIFLET:

21 Late --

22 MR. HERZOG:

23 Is that for us to determine?

24 MR. SHIFLET:

25 Well, at the moment, just based on my schedule and the documents that I'm

1 generating, it's, like, March 24th. But that's not set in stone. It's plausible.

2 MR. LIVERMORE:

3 And there's obviously many requirements that we have to follow as far as  
4 getting the public notification out in the newspaper and letting the public  
5 know when the meeting is so they can attend it.

6 MR. HERZOG:

7 Would it be here?

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Possible -- this will probably be the location, yes.

10 MR. HERZOG:

11 Okay.

12 MR. SHIFLET:

13 It'll be like the public meeting we had November '11, similar to that. We'll  
14 present a lot of information and answer a lot of questions.

15 MR. HAYES:

16 A lot bigger room.

17

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 Yeah. And then, so, but again, what's important to understand is that the  
20 proposed plan puts forward the preferred or the alternative that we would  
21 recommend, the one alternative we would recommend for each area, and  
22 then the Decision Document that comes right on the heels of that is, okay,  
23 we've heard from the public, this is the actual decision. And that drives  
24 what happens in the future. So if you decide to do a removal action for an  
25 area, and that's documented in the Decision Document, that's the plan.



1 MR. HERZOG:

2 Who makes that determination, the Corps?

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 That's part of the proposed plan process.

5 MR. LIVERMORE:

6 I didn't hear that. What was the question?

7 MR. HERZOG:

8 Who makes the final determination?

9 MR. LIVERMORE:

10 As far as what alternative is selected?

11 MR. HERZOG:

12 Yeah.

13 MR. LIVERMORE:

14 Yes, the Corps is the lead agency for this. And as Jason was saying, public

15 input, that's the whole point of doing the proposed plan, having the public

16 meeting --

17 MR. HERZOG:

18 Correct.

19 MR. LIVERMORE:

20 -- is to gather input from the public.

21 MR. HERZOG:

22 We just advise you, or just take the information? We're going to make a

23 recommendation.

24 MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Correct.

1 MR. HERZOG:

2 But we have no authority to --

3 MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Part --

5 MR. HERZOG:

6 -- do a particular plan.

7 MR. LIVERMORE:

8 Correct. Correct. And part of the Decision Document, there's a section  
9 called the responsiveness summary, which is any major comments that come  
10 from the public meeting, the Corps has to address those comments, and  
11 they'll be in that portion of the Decision Document.

12 MR. HERZOG:

13 Okay.

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 Okay? And then, finally, just as a reminder, since Ray mentioned it, the  
16 three Rs; recognize, retreat, and report. And I will be happy to take any  
17 questions.

18 I will say that poster that I have here has essentially three colors  
19 within the FUDS boundary. There's white, which indicates that either  
20 historical research or investigation or a removal action has been conducted.  
21 And those areas are no longer considered impacted.

22 There's a yellow, which will, at the moment, we're considering it's  
23 probably going to be the alternative to, which is land use controls and long-  
24 term management. That's education, things like that.

25 And then, the areas that are in orange are thought that probably the

1 best alternative at this point is alternative four, which is the advanced  
2 classification removal action. Surface and subsurface removal.

3 COL. GOSSETT:

4 And when the final report's made, does that end the original contract?

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 When the Corps accepts our Decision Document, the final Decision  
7 Document for these areas, our contract is over.

8 COL. GOSSETT:

9 Whether anything is...

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Our past order is over, I should say.

12 COL. GOSSETT:

13 Whether anything is done or not?

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 Oh, yeah. I mean, at that point, those sites go in the queue like we talked  
16 about, and that's for the next consultant, contractor to bid on, and that's time  
17 to do that work.

18 COL. GOSSETT:

19 And another pot of money.

20 MR. LIVERMORE:

21 The flow chart that was up there as far as the CERCLA process, yes, we're  
22 getting -- once you get beyond the Decision Document, we get into what's  
23 called the remedial design, the remedial action phase, where you're actually  
24 going to do some type of excavation of the site. So yeah, you have to go  
25 through that process of getting the funding, submitting the funding request

1 to Army headquarters and, obviously, through Congress to get funding for to  
2 do those cleanup actions in subsequent years.

3 MR. HAYES:

4 Now, this Feasibility Study is part of the RI money?

5 MR. LIVERMORE:

6 It's part of that contract the Corps has.

7 MR. HAYES:

8 So this is part of the three million dollars?

9 MR. SHIFLET:

10 This is from the very beginning, work plans, in 2010, or whenever that was,  
11 all the way through the Decision Document.

12 MR. HAYES:

13 All the field work and everything.

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 All the field work, everything. Yeah.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 Grids.

18 MR. KRIEG:

19 Jason, were you planning on just a brief touching on different alternatives  
20 that they're going to do at the proposed planning?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

22 Yeah, that'd be beneficial.

23 MR. SHIFLET:

24 Yeah, I can go back and just chat about those real quick.

25 MR. KRIEG:

1       And I'm Kent Krieg, I'm with the State of South Carolina DHEC. I'm the  
2       FUDS project manager.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4       So, the four in bold there are no action, as I said, which is required. And  
5       then land use controls and long-term management. There is sort of a  
6       generic thought about land use controls and long-term management when  
7       you think about projects like this. Most people think of educational  
8       brochures, signage, potentially fencing, maybe not. Potentially deed stamps  
9       or something like that, maybe not. So those kind of things, though, in  
10      general, that can all be narrowed down. But for purposes of, you know,  
11      putting together this FS, we're assuming educational material, signage,  
12      things like that.

13 MR. LIVERMORE:

14      Jason, there's one portion of that, too, that I don't think we've mentioned,  
15      which is called five-year reviews. For any of these sites that don't fit the  
16      unlimited use, unrestricted exposure on the bottom alternative, basically,  
17      we're required by CERCLA, by this law, for these sites, to come back every  
18      five years to revisit it, to look and see whether the remedial action that we  
19      chose and put in place for that particular MRS is sufficient in addressing  
20      any potential hazards to folks. And look at, if anything has changed. Has  
21      the land use changed since we were here in the last five years, did it go  
22      from, say, industrial or residential, where you may have more exposure? So  
23      those things. Has anything been found in the last five years that would  
24      indicate this is a higher risk than what we thought initially?

25                So those are the things, and like I said initially, we're required in five

1 years to come back and reevaluate that and determine is a different  
2 alternative or is some other type of action required to address these changes.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 Thank you for mentioning that. That is going to happen site-wide already.  
5 That's basically, in our discussions with the state, something that they're -- I  
6 mean, that's what the state is going to basically mandate. We're going to  
7 have to have education for this entire site, and review. And that five-year  
8 review is not like what Zapata did in this investigation. It's a much smaller  
9 version. It really is just to see has anything been found, has the land use  
10 changed, it's, you know, kind of -- it's just a check.

11 MR. HAYES:

12 Even if it's been cleaned up?

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 Even if it's been cleaned up, in some cases, yes.

15 MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Well, I think, specifically, some of these other alternatives that aren't  
17 bolded, for instance, say, the analog surface, subsurface MBC removal  
18 LUCs, enhanced, and the LTM. Anywhere where you see these LTM,  
19 basically, that's an alternative action where it's not available for unrestricted  
20 use. Basically, there's some type of thought or feeling about that that we  
21 didn't -- it wasn't cleaned up to where we don't feel like there's nothing  
22 there at the site. So where you have to come back and do some type of five-  
23 year review associated with those alternatives.

24 COL. GOSSETT:

25 What agency is the state responsible in this?

1 MR. KRIEG:

2 I'm sorry, say it again?

3 COL. GOSSETT:

4 What agency of the state is --

5 MR. KRIEG:

6 The Department of Health and Environmental Control.

7 COL. GOSSETT:

8 The what?

9 MR. KRIEG:

10 DHEC. It's the Department of Health and Environmental Control.

11 COL. GOSSETT:

12 I know who they are.

13 MR. KRIEG:

14 Okay. And I'm based in Columbia.

15 COL. GOSSETT:

16 Okay. I'm just wondering.

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 So, when you see the term "land use controls" or "LUCs", enhanced,  
19 enhanced is the, sort of the further step of, maybe we're talking about  
20 potentially deed stamps or something like that. And we didn't feel like,  
21 based on our understanding of this community, that that was going to fly.  
22 So we didn't even retain it. We think something that would be appropriate  
23 would be education, and signage, and things like that. By education, I  
24 mean, you know, whether you put brochures on the car, or you send flyers to  
25 folks in the mail, or, you know, whatever. Things like that. That generally

1 is accepted most places.

2 COL. GOSSETT:

3 Is there any thought to those impact zones, areas, being purchased by the

4 state and fenced? Are you still lumping everything --

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 I'm not going to speak for the state, but I could guess that there's no way the

7 state's going to have money for that.

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Well, that's probably not a state question, it's more a federal government --

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Yeah. Right.

12 MR. LIVERMORE:

13 -- government do that.

14 MR. HAYES:

15 The state already owns some of them, in the park.

16 MR. SHIFLET:

17 Right, the park, right.

18 MR. LIVERMORE:

19 I can speak at least to the projects that I've been involved with, and I have

20 not seen anywhere where the Department of Defense has offered to purchase

21 property as a result of, you know, working with these munitions sites.

22 COL. GOSSETT:

23 I just wondered if somebody had one of those, which I know there's a guy

24 over there that's got them, and I heard that he's probably like to have some

25 relief.



1 MR. LIVERMORE:

2       Yeah, I -- Julie, I can't think of any instances. I mean, I know I haven't been  
3       involved with any projects where that has occurred.

4 MS. HISCOX:

5       No, and the government pays for the cleanup of the property. It's just  
6       unfortunate for the (indiscernible).

7 COL. GOSSETT:

8       It's a pity it don't go on national forest, because they can get money.

9 MR. SHIFLET:

10       If I could just continue on and explain a little further.

11               When you see the term "analog" surface and subsurface, the term  
12       "analog" is these handheld sensors that you've probably seen or may heard  
13       of us, you've seen pictures of us, studies before, which is different than  
14       digital data collection where we actually go out with instruments and we  
15       survey and area and collect data and analyze it and process it, and then  
16       select targets for -- or select anomalies for investigation. So those are kind  
17       of two different processes.

18               And you might think that an analog clearance is maybe cheaper than  
19       a digital clearance, but it turns out that analog clearances often -- you end  
20       up digging a lot of things like nails, like we were talking about earlier, nails  
21       and things that don't need to be -- that have no hazard, but it's detected by  
22       the instrument, so you have to investigate it.

23               The difference is when you get into this digital processing of data,  
24       that you can start to screen some of that out. And the reason, where we  
25       really -- one of the main reasons we landed on advanced classification is

1       because in the world of munitions remediation, it's becoming more and more  
2       accepted, even by the state and others, and it really, significantly reduces  
3       those extraneous digs for nails and things. Without getting overly technical,  
4       it -- you collect data across a site, and there are folks who are trained to  
5       scan those data and narrow down only those anomalies that really look like  
6       they might be a munitions item, and then you go dig that. And then there's a  
7       feedback loop to make sure that they're doing that correctly without making  
8       too many mistakes.

9               And so, that actually looks to us to be, you know, projecting forward  
10       several years when this work actually happens, it's probably something  
11       that's more realistic and a cost savings, ultimately.

12              So, the FS, if you read that in detail, will lay out that information.  
13       Just keep in mind, it's a very complicated document, and you've seen 20  
14       slides to summarize it all. So, there's a lot there.

15 MR. HAYES:

16       But that digital, that's what they did over there next to Cedar Springs, right  
17       behind the ball field?

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19       Yes. Yes, they did. They collected DG in there. Yeah.

20 MR. HAYES:

21       And didn't find anything?

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23       Nothing MEC.

24 MR. HAYES:

25       But they got a lot of hits.

1 MR. SHIFLET:

2 Right. That's a good example. I mean, they could tell, you know, this looks  
3 like it might be something small, buried shallow. Or, hmm, this looks just  
4 like this other signal that we've seen before that might be something.

5 MR. HAYES:

6 And the digital cost more?

7 MR. SHIFLET:

8 The data collection does cost more, sort of, than the analog. But the result  
9 is that you have fewer folks in the field digging nails. So you get a cost  
10 savings in the removal piece of that work. So there's a little more up front -  
11 - like everything. There's a little more up-front cost so that you know what  
12 you're doing. The payoff is in the back end when you have less number of  
13 guys and effort to actually do the removing.

14 MR. KRIEG:

15 The larger the site, usually, the higher the cost savings, when you start  
16 doing that?

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 Oh, much better, yeah.

19 MR. HAYES:

20 The what?

21 MR. KRIEG:

22 The larger the site is, the usually the higher the cost savings they're going to  
23 see, just because they're screening off all the unnecessary digs. On a small  
24 site, it wouldn't necessarily work to do all that up-front cost, to then go  
25 process it, to figure that out, if it's really small. Which, obviously, Camp

1 Croft is not.

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3 Right. All of them are large, yeah.

4 MR. KRIEG:

5 And we're talking about, if it was an acre site, it might not be worth going  
6 through that expensive --

7 MR. SHIFLET:

8 That's a good point. Yeah. For guys with an analog instrument, they can  
9 storm an acre and just dig it all completely, you know, quickly. That's  
10 where you, you know, that's where you'd want to use an option like that.  
11 But for these multi-hundred acre sites, you have to think about the back end,  
12 when they're actually in the field doing work. Intrusive work.

13 MR. HAYES:

14 One of the FS, when you got -- when you put data in the formulas and  
15 things, did you contact landowners about some of the data and stuff?

16 MR. SHIFLET:

17 Well, I mean, everything that we found is in the RI, and is available to  
18 anyone.

19 MR. HAYES:

20 Well, I just want to point out part that I -- can you go back to where the  
21 hazard ratings, where it shows the areas and the hazard ratings?

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 This one?

24 MR. HAYES:

25 Yeah, that'd be good. Okay, so there are all types of classifications that

1 added up to the score.

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

4 MR. HAYES:

5 Okay, well, I looked in the RI, and I'm talking now about the rocket grenade  
6 maneuver area, because it looks like it almost comes on my property. But  
7 it's down Foster Mill Circle from Glenn Springs, and is almost to the park,  
8 but it's right past the power line, and then comes back, it's probably a mile  
9 from a paved road.

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

12 MR. HAYES:

13 But in this, it says, activities currently occurring at the site. They've got  
14 some agricultural, which is not much. But residential. Okay, the  
15 agricultural totals a thousand receptor hours per year. And the residential is  
16 43,800 receptor hours per year. Well, there's no residential down there.

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 Okay.

19 MR. HAYES:

20 Is that just, you talking about trespassers?

21 MR. SHIFLET:

22 Well, we have to make some estimate of the number of hours that a resident  
23 might be in contact with that parcel. And --

24 MR. HAYES:

25 The resident of the property, or --

1 MR. SHIFLET:

2 Well --

3 MR. HAYES:

4 -- resident of the neighborhood?

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 Yeah, it's a little confusing because we typically will treat parcels as  
7 residential or recreational. So am really -- I'm not really looking at whose  
8 parcel it is or where it is. If it's a residential parcel, then that's what we call  
9 it.

10 MR. HAYES:

11 Okay. And it says, a single residential person spends 4,380 hours a year on  
12 this property.

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

15 MR. HAYES:

16 So, that's it for a year. So if you divide that by 24 hours a day for a whole  
17 year, that says that person was on that property 12 hours a day, seven days a  
18 week, 365 days a year.

19 MR. SHIFLET:

20 Sounds reasonable, from what I remember from doing those, yes.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 Okay. And then, it goes on and says, there's ten people doing this.

23 MR. SHIFLET:

24 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

25 MR. HAYES:

1           So there's ten people down there, down a dirt road a mile from any houses --

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3           I see where you're going.

4 MR. HAYES:

5           Yeah. But ten people are out there 12 hours a day --

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7           Right.

8 MR. HAYES:

9           -- seven days a week, 365 days a year. That's far-fetched.

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11          Again, I'm looking at it as a residential property versus a recreational

12          (indiscernible) parcel.

13 MR. HAYES:

14          Okay. Well, this is timberland.

15 MR. SHIFLET:

16          I understand. I guess I will say, I didn't evaluate every single parcel  
17          individually within every single area to calculate a real number for every  
18          single parcel. There has to be some way to estimate that. If the data are  
19          wrong, the good news is they can be revised. And this is where the public  
20          feedback is helpful.

21 MR. HAYES:

22          Yeah. Well, this data is wrong. Do you see anybody spending that much  
23          time on your property? And you're in a residential area.

24 COL. GOSSETT:

25          Let me ask you this: Out of the whole Camp Croft, 22,000 acres, none of it

1           made the last four.

2 MR. MOON:

3           Four is the lowest.

4 COL. GOSSETT:

5           Oh. Four is the low hazard?

6 MR. SHIFLET:

7           Right.

8 MR. HAYES:

9           That's just interesting to me. I'm not saying your wrong or right, I don't  
10          know. But you look at it, nothing in that whole 22,000 acres --

11 MR. SHIFLET:

12          Right. Well, again, we have to make assumptions about how a property is  
13          used. And without talking to a property owner for every parcel across the  
14          entire site, we just have to make an estimate.

15 MR. HAYES:

16          Yeah.

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18          So that's what we've done. Now --

19 MR. HAYES:

20          So that --

21 MR. SHIFLET:

22          Let me say, importantly. the one that you pointed out, the rocket and  
23          grenade maneuver area, despite its hazard level category, we talked about  
24          that MRS. Because we feel like it's not like the others. Our recollection is  
25          that the MEC items that were found there were fuses.



1 MR. HAYES:

2 You found two fuses.

3 MR. SHIFLET:

4 And that they were almost -- it's almost as if they were placed there by a  
5 tree --

6 MR. HAYES:

7 And I think they found a mess kit right next to them.

8 MR. SHIFLET:

9 Exactly. So -- but, MEC was found, and we can't ignore that. But for the  
10 FS --

11 MR. HAYES:

12 So fuses --

13 MR. SHIFLET:

14 -- preferred alternative --

15 MR. HAYES:

16 -- fuses are MEC?

17 MR. SHIFLET:

18 -- for that MRS, we think that land use controls is appropriate, not a  
19 removal action. So despite the fact that MEC was found, that is the one  
20 MRS in this list where we said it just doesn't look right.

21 MR. LIVERMORE:

22 Let me say this, Gary. During this process, the risk assessment portion of it,  
23 which is what we're talking about, is typically conservative. When you do  
24 any calculations for chemical contamination, and what we're talking about  
25 here with MEC, it's typically very conservative. You make those

1 assumptions because, obviously, you're trying to be overly conservative and  
2 address any potential hazards out there.

3 So -- but throughout the entire process, there are these points where  
4 we can make project management decisions based on realistic data and what  
5 the property is used for. So as Jason was mentioning, we -- even though it  
6 may have scored a two here, there's probably going to be some type of  
7 thought or thinking that we will probably go forward with maybe just a land  
8 use controls for that particular MRS. So just because it's got a two here,  
9 doesn't mean that that is going to have some type of an action.

10 And it'll be presented, like you said, per the plan based on what we're  
11 thinking as far as land use and those type of things. And obviously, the  
12 public will get a chance to comment on that.

13 MR. HAYES:

14 But it's a 760, so to get it to level three, you've got to go down 40 points.

15 MR. SHIFLET:

16 Yeah. Again, I mean, I'm not trying to make my case, but I see a piece of  
17 property that's residential. I have to make some evaluations on it. It might  
18 be uninhabited today. But six months from now, someone may have bought  
19 that property and built a house on it for a family of five. I don't know.

20 MR. HAYES:

21 Yeah.

22 MR. SHIFLET:

23 But I have to decide. And so, the numbers that you see were my decision at  
24 the time. Like I said, these MEC has and these MRSPP scores, they are  
25 evaluate over the course of the effort. They can change. So you know, the

1 Corps can direct me to go back and look at that parcel in particular and  
2 recalculate that score, and see what happens. That's an option.

3 MR. HAYES:

4 Yeah. But do you consider the fuses as MEC?

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 If they have a explosive hazard, they just are.

7 MR. HAYES:

8 And these did?

9 MR. SHIFLET:

10 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

11 MR. HAYES:

12 I know that maybe 20 years ago you found one rocket in the former  
13 (indiscernible).

14 MR. SHIFLET:

15 Right.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 And it was kind of in the middle of that.

18 MR. SHIFLET:

19 Right.

20 MR. HAYES:

21 But I was just, you know, when I saw this, it just kind of floored me, you  
22 know. This is pretty outrageous, as far as how many people, spending so  
23 many hours out there for a whole year.

24 MR. SHIFLET:

25 I understand.

1 MR. HAYES:

2 I just, I don't know where they are.

3 COL. GOSSETT:

4 What was the maneuver area? This is area where you had munitions activity  
5 and all up there. But if you had an area that's for maneuver where they  
6 camped and bivouacked and as the old Army said, they grabbed you know  
7 what and all that, how would that score?

8 MR. SHIFLET:

9 I mean, we can only score a site based on what we observe. It depends on  
10 what we find. I mean, it could be as wild as you imagine.

11 I mean, maybe soldiers had grenades they were supposed to use, and  
12 they just didn't, and they dumped them in a ditch. And there's a box of  
13 grenades there. I mean, it doesn't mean that that's a grenade range, a  
14 grenade court. But they're there. And you can't ignore it.

15 So, when I look at a site like this and I see the southern part of these  
16 ranges, the southern part of the former -- the FUDS, and I think of the term  
17 "maneuver area," I think of not an active range with an impact area, but  
18 where soldiers trained and they may have used this, and they may have used  
19 that. And you may find it, or you may not.

20 That's what I think of when I think of a maneuver area. And what are  
21 you going to find? I don't know. What did they use? They used a lot of  
22 stuff.

23 COL. GOSSETT:

24 If you've been in a combat zone, what you say is true. But on a military  
25 post, soldiers, unless they steal it, do not have access in maneuver areas to

1 live ammunition.

2 MR. SHIFLET:

3 I will say I don't disagree with that in philosophy, but I have seen wildly  
4 different in more places than one. It just shows up where you don't expect  
5 it. It just does. And, we might be looking at this site through the glasses  
6 that we have, but Spencer and Julie and Ray and I and others see these exact  
7 sites, just like this, all over, where this is supposed to be a small arms  
8 range, that's the only documented use. And why is there a 60 millimeter  
9 mortar? I don't know.

10 COL. GOSSETT:

11 Range. I agree on a range.

12 MR. SHIFLET:

13 Well, call it a maneuver area. Let me just say, actually, according to the  
14 history records, the 105 millimeter area, the property that's perhaps the most  
15 contaminated is a combat range that was, its only documented use was small  
16 arms. That's what's written down in the ASR.

17 MR. LIVERMORE:

18 And these are historical documents that we have.

19 MR. SHIFLET:

20 Well, that's obviously not true. And everybody knows that. And, I guess  
21 my point is, I can't make a judgment about what should be or shouldn't be at  
22 this site. I can only see what we saw. And that's what we try to do.

23 COL. GOSSETT:

24 I'm not trying to argue with that. I'm just saying my experience, with that,  
25 you didn't have somebody out squirrel hunting. It was a very controlled

1 environment with live ammo. Now, when we went down range, in wartime,  
2 it was a lot different. You started using squirrel rifles, you started using  
3 everything else. But just to go out on a military reservation and start  
4 shooting --

5 MR. SHIFLET:

6 Right. It's dangerous.

7 COL. GOSSETT:

8 I've been on most of them in the United States. And we'd had court  
9 marshals all over there.

10 MR. SHIFLET:

11 Oh, I'm sure. I'm sure.

12 And the other thing that can happen is that Hunter John is walking  
13 through the woods and finds something and picks it up and carried it  
14 halfway back to his car, and realized that he probably shouldn't take it, and  
15 puts it down. And now, it's there and not where it was. And we're not the  
16 wiser for it. So... It just happens.

17 Any other FS questions? Just questions about life?

18 (No Response)

19 MR. SHIFLET:

20 All right. Thank you.

21 END OF ZAPATA POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

22 MR. LIVERMORE:

23 Thanks, Jason.

24 All right, the next topic was -- this is something that, Gary, you had brought  
25 up and wanted added to the agenda.

1 MR. HAYES:

2 Yeah. I talked to some property owners, where they called me, and some of  
3 them seen me out or whatever. And that last time, critical action they had  
4 over behind Georgia-Pacific, the property owners went in and they said that  
5 the Corps of Engineers, Zapata, Andy had told them that when they go in,  
6 when they leave, they're going to leave it exactly the way it was.

7 Well, they didn't. They went in there and mowed everything down. I  
8 think it had already been clear cut, but it had several years of growth on it.  
9 And I mean, it was good -- it was getting to be good deer hunting property.  
10 So when they went in to do the removal, they went in and mowed everything  
11 down to the ground.

12 And so, the fellow said, well, you know, you going to do it back the  
13 way it was? He said, well, this is it. So he had to sue. And it cost him to  
14 sue, it cost him to get a lawyer. So, he didn't get much money, I think it was  
15 maybe 10,000 dollars. And it wasn't much at all compared to what it cost  
16 him to get a lawyer and do things to his property.

17 I don't even think he let y'all finish at that property, behind Georgia-  
18 Pacific. Did y'all finish that clean up?

19 MS. HISCOX:

20 Yes, we did.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 I was told that they told them to get out of there before it was finished.

23 But you know, a lot of people are telling me, said, look, they come  
24 on my property, they're going to have to have some good faith escrow  
25 money to have available in case they don't do what they say they're going to

1 do, where we have arbitrator or something where I don't have to sue to get  
2 my money, you know, get the money to fix my property back. And so, that's  
3 what it's about.

4 And so, you know, it's -- I know it's taken a lot of money to get the  
5 property, get the munitions off the person's property, but, you know, that's  
6 just what they're telling me, said, they won't get on my property, going to  
7 have to show some good faith and have some type of escrow.

8 But it can be discussions as we go along, or whatever. The board can  
9 make recommendations what we think would be fair or whatever. Us as a  
10 RAB board can't make anybody do anything. But we can make  
11 recommendations what we think would be fair to the property owner.

12 MR. LIVERMORE:

13 I mean, it sounds to me like it's going to -- it's basically going to have to be  
14 a -- there will have to be a negotiation between the property owner and the  
15 federal government. And I'll tell you, you know, up front, we don't have the  
16 authority, at least, my understanding is we don't have the authority to have  
17 some type of fund in escrow to be able to address those scenarios.

18 I know at least from the munitions projects that I've been involved  
19 with, that there have been -- any type of concerns afterward, any type of  
20 damage or any type of concerns afterward, we are required to restore it to  
21 pre-existing conditions. And like I said, I've been on a couple of munitions  
22 sites where we've had some issues with, you know, whatever, the ground  
23 condition or things like that, the ground was settling here, there, wherever  
24 we did some excavations. And we had to come back out and address those,  
25 those type of situations. But you know, just up front, we don't have the



1 authority to be able to establish some type of escrow fund up front.

2 LT. DYAS:

3 I'm going to address that, just so you can go back to the homeowner -- or  
4 the property owner and discuss that. Lt. Dyas with the Sheriff's office  
5 again. We actually went out there to assist them on that. And that -- I,  
6 personally, am glad they cut it down like that, because I wouldn't have  
7 wanted my people to go in there, dealing with as much conditions as was on  
8 that property. It was unbelievable. Because they were calling us every day  
9 to come down there, for over a month. It was that --

10 MR. HAYES:

11 They got tons of stuff out there.

12 MR. DYAS:

13 Five tons.

14 MR. HAYES:

15 Yeah.

16 MR. DYAS:

17 Five tons of stuff. And the way they had to do, and really, it was for safety  
18 purposes, they had to clear it down like that so we could maneuver through  
19 there. It was so bad. And everywhere you looked, in the areas that you  
20 could see munitions on top the ground that we hadn't got over there yet. So  
21 yeah, I'm glad -- I hate it for the owner, but I can say that as much as they  
22 got off there, I would think the owner would be pretty pleased with getting  
23 that off there.

24 MR. HAYES:

25 Well, I don't think they told him up front that they were going to clear it like

1           that.

2   LT. DYAS:

3           Well, the reason I say that, because they actually had to, it was that bad.

4   MR. HAYES:

5           Yeah.

6   LT. DYAS:

7           That was the only way they could do it. When we're going out there and  
8           they have a hundred different types of munitions lined up for us to dispose  
9           at one time. Every day. It was like, oh, my gosh. You've got to be kidding  
10          me. We were taking pictures of it. This is unreal. It was so -- there was so  
11          much that we actually called other bomb units to come and do some  
12          training. We'd say, hey come on over here and let me show you what we're  
13          doing, kind of get you an idea of what's going on with munitions on this  
14          property. And so they would come over and look, and they would say the  
15          same thing. Like, oh, my gosh what are you --- this is crazy. And I was,  
16          yeah. There was that much.

17                 And if there was that much on other people's property, man, I'll tell  
18                 you what, that's -- that's difficult. That's difficult to deal with. And that's  
19                 why they cleared it. You can tell them that's what they had to do. I mean,  
20                 there was no -- there was no choice in that matter. They had to do it that  
21                 way. Just to -- for safety purposes and to clear it the way they did.

22   MR. LIVERMORE:

23           Gary, it sounds to me like you're getting more -- maybe it's a  
24           communication issue. Maybe it's something that we need to be better up  
25           front talking with the property owners as far as informing them, you know,

1 the scope of the work and what's going to have to occur to be able to -- you  
2 know, for, like, remedial action. And that's just something that we'll have  
3 to do a better job up front, as far as talking to the property owners.

4 MR. HAYES:

5 Well, in a way, I think it seemed like they didn't tell him everything so they  
6 would get the right-of-entry. And then after they got the right of entry, just  
7 do whatever they wanted to do. And so, that's, you know, the way it sounds  
8 to me.

9 LT. DYAS:

10 Well, it changed. It actually changed, because it wasn't that way at first,  
11 when we first tried going in there. They hadn't cut it. They hadn't through  
12 cut it like that. They didn't cut it all the way down. There were some roads  
13 in there so they could get up in there, but then it got worse and worse. And  
14 then they was like -- they had to do it that way.

15 And that's -- I hope you address that with the homeowners, say, you  
16 know, it wasn't like they just wanted to. It's not something they just said,  
17 hey, let's just cut this down and make it easy. They did it safety-wise,  
18 trying to get to everything. Because there was stuff growing in trees and  
19 stuff. There was munitions that were growing inside of tree trunks. I saw  
20 them. So... It was difficult, there ain't no doubt about that.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 I'm surprised that when they clear cut that, that the contractors that clear cut  
23 it didn't call the sheriff or something, as much as was out there.

24 LT. DYAS:

25 Uh-huh (indicates affirmative response).

1 MR. HERZOG:

2 Do you have a contract resolution of the officer or administrator built into  
3 your contracts?

4 MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Yeah.

6 MR. HERZOG:

7 Is it one person?

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9 We have a contracting officer, and they represented --

10 MR. HERZOG:

11 Okay. And that's the person that makes the final decision if there's an  
12 argument between a homeowner and the contractor, where it's not put back  
13 the way it was. And then, if one person, contractor, or homeowner doesn't  
14 agree with that, the next step is court.

15 MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Well, we -- the contractor is required to restore it to preexisting condition.

17 MR. HERZOG:

18 Correct.

19 MR. LIVERMORE:

20 So obviously, if there is a claim that the property owner has and, you know,  
21 has an issue with it, then obviously, they can come to the board, they can  
22 submit a claim. And the obviously, you're talking, you know, you're going  
23 into a legal situation at that point. But I've had other munitions sites where  
24 we've had property owners submit claims, and we've had to go back and  
25 deal with --

1 MR. HERZOG:

2 Just that original encounters. You can take a lot of pictures. There should  
3 be before and after pictures.

4 MS. HISCOX:

5 Well, let me clarify one thing, particularly in respect to the timeline.

6 Because the contractor did their job -- and my name is Julie -- because the  
7 contractor was doing their job and they did what they had to do to clear the  
8 munitions out, this was not a claim against the contractor. And so, that  
9 claim was actually paid through our real estate division, who handles claims  
10 as, you know, because they signed that right of entry document. And that  
11 came out of our pocket. That was not the contractor payment.

12 MR. HAYES:

13 Okay. Well, another thing that I mentioned was if the state park needs to  
14 close down parts of their infrastructure that makes money for the park,  
15 whether they will be subsidized for their lost income.

16 MS. HISCOX:

17 That's not something we can pay. We had other people ask us that.

18 Generally, what we do is work very closely with the owner, in this case the  
19 state, to work around their schedule. So we do our best not to impact things  
20 that they have going on.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 Different times of year that --

23 MS. HISCOX:

24 Yeah. So we'll work very closely with them when it comes to that property.

25 MR. HAYES:

1 of the surrounding campgrounds or whatever, you know, that -- more people  
2 during different times of the year.

3 MS. HISCOX:

4 Right.

5 MR. HAYES:

6 But usually some year-round. And the same thing with the boat rentals and  
7 things like that. But all the state parks in South Carolina are trying to be  
8 self-sufficient now, so any lost income can really be detrimental to their  
9 budget.

10 All right, did everybody get their answers they needed to know?

11 Any more questions, anybody?

12 MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Gary, we had Lt. Dyas. I know I had talked to you on the phone earlier.

14 Just something, have an update on, if anything, that was found?

15 LT. DYAS:

16 Well, I actually went back and checked. It was in August.

17 MR. LIVERMORE:

18 Okay.

19 LT. DYAS:

20 We got called out to (Indiscernible) Road in August where the landowner  
21 was plowing up three acres, and uncovered a stokes mortar. It was not live;  
22 it was sand-filled. We disposed of it right there on the property, took care  
23 of it.

24 We had some in November, we recovered a 81 millimeter in  
25 Spartanburg, here, actually, downtown Spartanburg. It was an 81 millimeter

1 illumination. And it actually had been inerted by the Marine Corps. It had  
2 their sticker on it. So we were -- it was just left behind. The guy had sold  
3 the property left it outside a tarp.

4 And then we had two M69 mortars that were recovered over here off  
5 of Howard Street that we were told came from Camp Croft. The person was  
6 kind of being a little evasive with us. He said somebody had brought it up  
7 there to him, then he said they had got it from Camp Croft, but they didn't  
8 know where on Camp Croft.

9 So those two of the M69. That's what we've gotten in the last few  
10 months.

11 MR. HAYES:

12 Did they look deteriorated?

13 LT. DYAS:

14 Oh, yeah. They was deteriorated. Been in the ground. That's about what  
15 we've had so far.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 Be able to take them and blow them up?

18 LT. DYAS:

19 Didn't have to. It was just the -- it was the F 69s, just the practice grenades,  
20 practice mortars. So that's what it was.

21 And there again, for those of you, if you have something, all you  
22 have to do is call the Sheriff's office, and we'll come out and we'll spot them  
23 right there. So we'll come out and take care of it right there on the spot. So  
24 we're actually fortunate to be training with some people from Zapata. So all  
25 the EOD units there do come out and deal with it as emergency response.

1 MR. HAYES:

2 Lt. Dyas, y'all still taking the bomb truck around to schools or anything like  
3 that now?

4 LT. DYAS:

5 We have been, yeah. Yeah, we still do programs like that.

6 MR. HAYES:

7 Do y'all do anything like churches or anything like that, or just --

8 LT. DYAS:

9 Yeah. Yeah.

10 MR. HAYES:

11 -- for schools?

12 LT. DYAS:

13 We do scout groups, churches, schools, some of these harvest day events.  
14 Just things like that that we respond to. Right now we've been kind of a  
15 little busy with the election going on, with the sweeps, the bomb sweeps and  
16 things like that. But -- and hopefully, that's about over soon. But yeah, we  
17 do the outreach to the different organizations so they understand what's  
18 going on with all of that.

19 MR. HAYES:

20 Well, that's a good outreach tool for educating the public.

21 COL. GOSSETT:

22 Let me ask you a question.

23 LT. DYAS:

24 Yes, sir.

25 COL. GOSSETT:



1           You said you took it and disposed of it. Was that a live round?

2   LT. DYAS:

3           No.

4   COL. GOSSETT:

5           How do you know?

6   LT. DYAS:

7           You talking about the stokes mortar?

8   COL. GOSSETT:

9           No. You said that somebody brought in an 81 millimeter.

10   LT. DYAS:

11          Yeah. Yes.

12   COL. GOSSETT:

13          Was it a live round?

14   LT. DYAS:

15          It had been inerted by the Marine Corps. We have x-ray capability. And it

16          was checked, and we checked it all the way through. And it was -- it

17          actually had the inert holes through it, drilled in it and all that. So we didn't

18          really --

19   COL. GOSSETT:

20          Did it have a fuse head on it?

21   LT. DYAS:

22          It did, but they had already -- it had already been cleared.

23   COL. GOSSETT:

24          What color was it?

25   LT. DYAS:

1 Silver. You talking about the whole mortar, or the fuse head?

2 COL. GOSSETT:

3 Yeah.

4 LT. DYAS:

5 The whole mortar was white, but the fuse head was silver. The whole -- the  
6 mortar was white.

7 COL. GOSSETT:

8 If it had a fuse in it and you picked it up and moved it, you could have lost a  
9 hand.

10 LT. DYAS:

11 We had training. We had training.

12 COL. GOSSETT:

13 That's not even an Army color. There's not but three colors the Army --

14 MR. LIVERMORE:

15 You said it wasn't found -- it was at a homeowner's?

16 COL. GOSSETT:

17 There's not but three colors the Army --

18 LT. DYAS:

19 It wasn't found -- it was found in --

20 COL. GOSSETT:

21 Silver's not one of them.

22 MR. O'NEAL:

23 There's a possibility it was -- it's obsolete, and not related to Camp Croft.

24 LT. DYAS:

25 No, it's not -- I wouldn't think it was related to Camp Croft at all. But I

1           could be -- it was --

2 COL. GOSSETT:

3           Somebody disputing that you didn't have one. You and I know what color  
4           they are, don't we?

5 MR. O'NEAL:

6           That's right.

7 COL. GOSSETT:

8           There ain't but three colors.

9 MR. O'NEAL:

10          Absolutely.

11 COL. GOSSETT:

12          Silver's not one of them.

13 MR. LIVERMORE:

14          Thanks for the update, Lt. Dyas.

15 LT. DYAS:

16          That's all.

17 MR. HAYES:

18          Okay, anybody got any old business they want to discuss or bring up, or  
19          anything new for the next meeting? The next meeting will be the public  
20          meeting.

21 MR. LIVERMORE:

22          Correct.

23 MR. HAYES:

24          Has anybody got any discussion about the public meeting?

25 MR. LIVERMORE:

1 And there will be a newspaper announcement, and --

2 MR. HAYES:

3 Same as this meeting.

4 MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Yes.

6 MR. HAYES:

7 And mailers.

8 MR. LIVERMORE:

9 At the public meeting, we will make a presentation of the proposed plan. It  
10 will be similar to the Feasibility Study, as far as we'll identify the different  
11 alternatives that were evaluated, and as Jason said, what we're  
12 recommending for each particular munitions response site. And then, it's  
13 open to questions. And there will be a 30-day public review period of the  
14 proposed plan. So you can submit comments in writing or call. And as I  
15 said, the significant comments will be addressed in that Decision Document  
16 as far as the responsiveness.

17 MR. HAYES:

18 So the end of that 30 days will be about the time of our next meeting.

19 MR. LIVERMORE:

20 It'll be -- yes. Yes. Probably late April, correct.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 That's May the 5th. Okay. Does everybody understand our meeting  
23 schedule now? So there's a lot of people who got used to our meeting  
24 schedule before, and then we canceled some meetings and we had people  
25 showing up. So now, if we have to postpone or cancel, we probably need to

1 send a mailer out. Or somehow try to -- because that's how that happened.

2 MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Did we get the mailers out? I guess we had mailers that went out that said  
4 the meeting was canceled; right Heather? Or somebody -- about the that  
5 meetings were canceled?

6 MR. O'NEAL:

7 I know emails went out.

8 MR. HAYES:

9 Emails went out, yeah. Emails went out that it was canceled. That was  
10 just...

11 MS. HISCOX:

12 I think we sent out the mailers. I could swear I saw one.

13 MS. KIRLIN:

14 No, I think he canceled the meeting before the mailers were to go out.

15 MR. HERZOG:

16 He had already printed them.

17 MS. KIRLIN:

18 I had printed and I was ready, but then you had said the document was not  
19 ready.

20 MR. HAYES:

21 Okay.

22 MS. KIRLIN:

23 So nothing went out.

24 MR. LIVERMORE:

25 As far as invitations?

1 MS. KIRLIN:

2 Right. And then we didn't put a cancellation -- it was just discussed among  
3 the RAB and the Corps.

4 MR. LIVERMORE:

5

6 Okay.

7 MR. HAYES:

8 Well, there really shouldn't be any reason to cancel or postpone, for a few  
9 meetings anyway.

10 MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Right. We'll mostly be talking about the proposed plan and the pending  
12 Decision Document at that point.

13 MR. HAYES:

14 All right. Well, if you happen to have any questions about anything, just  
15 call Ray at -- your number's on the website; right?

16 MR. LIVERMORE:

17 It should be, yes.

18 MR. HAYES:

19 Camp croft (dot) net. Camp croft (dot) net. And all these -- I guess you'll  
20 be putting this presentation on the website?

21 MR. SHIFLET:

22 Yeah, I'll be happy to share this, yeah.

23 MR. LIVERMORE:

24 The presentation will be on the website.

25 MR. HAYES:

1 And the minutes of this meeting will be on the website.

2 MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Yes.

4 MR. HAYES:

5 So is that everybody? Got anything to add, or bring forward at the next  
6 meeting?

7 (No response)

8 MR. HAYES:

9 If not, we got a motion to adjourn?

10 MR. HERZOG:

11 So move.

12 MR. HAYES:

13 Second?

14 MR. MOON:

15 (Raises hand)

16 MR. HAYES:

17 Okay. We'll call this meeting to adjourn. We'll meet back May the 5th.

18 Thank you. 6:30.

19 (Meeting concluded at 8:30 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

)

CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG )

This is to certify that the within RAB meeting was taken on the 4th day of February, 2016;

That the foregoing is an accurate transcript of the meeting given;

That copies of all exhibits, if any, entered herein are attached hereto and made a part of this record;

That the undersigned court reporter, a Notary Public for the State of South Carolina, is not an employee or relative of any of the parties, counsel or witness and is in no manner interested in the outcome of this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal at Spartanburg, South Carolina, this 19th day of February, 2016.




---

Marla J. O'Brien, CVR-M, ACR

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 08/12/2021