

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING FOR FORMER CAMP CROFT

PLACE: Marriott Renaissance Hotel
Spartanburg, South Carolina

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, May 4, 2017
6:30 p.m. to approximately 8:00 p.m.

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

Terry Hamil
US Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville District

Suzy Cantor-McKinney
ZAPATA INCORPORATED
6302 Fairview Road, #600
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

BOARD MEMBERS
PRESENT: Gary Hayes, Co-Chair
John Gossett
James Herzog

REPORTED BY: Sandra L. Satterwhite
Sandy Satterwhite Reporting
P.O. Box 742
Roebuck, South Carolina 29376
Satterwhite@Charter.net
864-706-5698

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 I want to welcome everybody out. It looks like the weather is keeping
3 people in or interest is going down or something, but we're glad to see you out.

4 When was the last time we met?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 I believe it was a year ago, right?

7 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

8 It was a year ago May.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Yeah, May. May was the last time we met.

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 In May? Okay.

13 BY MR. HERZOG:

14 We're like Congress.

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 Yeah. Okay. On the New Business. Election of Community Co-Chair.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 I just, before we get into this, Gary, I wanted to mention that we realize
19 that you've only presided over one, one RAB meeting, and that has been a result
20 of trying to get these decision documents created and starting to get them
21 through our chain of command to get them approved.

22 So I wanted to mention this as a possibility to the RAB. Certainly, leave
23 it up to the RAB as far as their choice, but since you've only had the opportunity
24 to preside over one RAB meeting, that's what the term of the co-chair is for
25 one year, basically float this idea of you possibly sitting for another year, since

1 that's the term of the RAB members is for two years. So, I just wanted to go
2 ahead and put that out there for the RAB to consider, and we can discuss it now
3 and get you all's feedback or thought on that.

4 BY MR. HAYES:

5 Any discussion?

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Colonel?

8 BY JIM HERZOG:

9 I vote Gary continue as chairman an additional year.

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Okay. Colonel, you have any issue with that?

12 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

13 No.

14 BY MR. HAYES:

15 We just need to move on or ---

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 Yes, I guess that's settled, Suzy, yes, so we'll note a term for another
18 year, and then the two-year term for all the RAB members will be up at next
19 May, so.

20 BY MR. HAYES:

21 Okay.

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 All right.

24 BY MR. HAYES:

25 All right.

1 Next on the Agenda, Decision Documents by Army Corps of Engineers.

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 All right. I wanted to give a little bit of background since it's been a year
4 since we met just to kind of refresh everybody's memory. Just a quick
5 recapture of where we were. If you all recall, remedial investigation. That was
6 basically the characterization, the field work where we did delineation of the
7 former ranges, munitions response sites and where we had to find specific
8 areas of former use.

9 The feasibility study was the document that evaluated the different
10 remedial alternatives and used the, what's called the CERCLA, nine different
11 requirements to --- or criteria to individually evaluate the alternatives and
12 compare them against each other. From that feasibility study, we identified a
13 couple of remedial alternatives, and then the next stage that we had was the
14 proposed plan. If you all recall, last March, March of 2016, we had a public
15 meeting where we presented what's called the preferred alternative, and this is
16 basically one of those alternatives from the feasibility study that we felt,
17 based on the evaluation and the feasibility study against that nine criteria, was
18 the most appropriate for a particular site. In this case we have munitions
19 response site is the terminology that we use to refer to these different areas
20 that were identified, identified needing some type of further response.

21 So at that public meeting we identified the different alternatives that
22 were preferred for the different munitions response sites, and we had a second
23 meeting in May at the last RAB meeting that we conducted a, I guess, basically
24 a second public meeting where we again presented those preferred alternatives,
25 and what's required under CERCLA is to allow the public a 30-day comment

1 period associated with that proposed plan. So we conducted that. Any written
2 or oral comments that were submitted during that timeframe, the Corps of
3 Engineers is required to address those comments, and so those are done in
4 these decision documents that we've created since that time.

5 So, and I don't want to --- Suzy, speak up if I'm sort of shortcutting
6 something.

7 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

8 Keep going.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 I don't want to leave anything out.

11 So in the interim from the last RAB meeting that we had, we let the RAB,
12 indicated that the next step was to create these decision documents.

13 What the decision document is basically the mechanism where we gain
14 approval from our chain of command basically giving us authority to move
15 forward with implementing the remedial action. In those decision documents
16 there's typically three parts. One is basically just a summary of what the
17 recommended course of action is. The second part goes into a little bit more
18 detail and sort of summarizes the proposed plan as far as how that alternative
19 or that recommended action fared against the criteria, and then the third part
20 of those decision documents is basically a response to those oral or written
21 comments that we received during that public comment period.

22 And so what's happened in the last year is we evaluated the dollar amount
23 that was associated with these remedial actions. If you all recall, I guess, is
24 the dollar amount in here, Suzy, in the handout? So if you all look at the second
25 page, I guess it's actually probably the third page on the handout, but is has the

1 Decision Document Determination, and so you can see the third column has the
2 Estimated Cost, and what we were attempting to do when we were creating
3 these decision documents is to realistically look at a funding cycle that the
4 Corps of Engineers gets.

5 You know, obviously, the federal government operates on a fiscal year
6 cycle. It starts on October 1st and runs through September 30th. So what we
7 tried to do or attempted to do was look at a typical funding budget that we get
8 for the Formerly Used Defense Site Program in a year, an attempted to
9 realistically group these sites together at a dollar amount where we may be able
10 to get a realistic chance of getting funding to maybe get one or two of these
11 projects, maybe a couple of them awarded within a fiscal year to actually begin
12 the remedial action, and as a result of that, we had to create, you see, these
13 different projects.

14 I guess what is it, nine total, I think, Suzy? One, two, three, four, five,
15 six, seven, eight, nine, ten. Ten with the last one being, if you all recall when
16 we presented the remedial investigation, there was one site that grenade court
17 where weren't able to get access, Project 13, where were not able to get access
18 to that site as far as right of entry. So that site was recommended for
19 basically some type of remedial investigation or feasibility study because it
20 hasn't been characterized at this point.

21 So, anyway, we've got nine projects that were created as a result of
22 trying to get to a good dollar amount to where we can get these projects
23 awarded.

24 Question?

25 BY JIM HERZOG:

1 I will.

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Okay.

4 BY JIM HERZOG:

5 You may answer it.

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Okay, and so we were able to group a couple of these, if you all recall, we
8 used the term munitions response sites to refer to these separate areas, the
9 60 millimeter mortar area, for example was one, grenade maneuver area.

10 The terminology that the Department of Defense uses to refer to these
11 areas are munitions response sites. That's how we group a specific area of
12 concern moving forward, and so we had to create a specific project for each
13 one of these munitions response sites based on the dollar amount, and a decision
14 document for each one of these projects had to be created, so the, I guess we
15 can get a little bit more specific as far as the type of remedial alternative.

16 As you can see on that list Project 03 and Project 05, now those were, if
17 you recall, Munitions Debris Area, that was several of the areas of potential
18 interest, I believe is the terminology that we used in the RI.

19 A lot of areas in the cantonment area that we ended up not finding any,
20 the terminology, munitions and explosives of concern, unexploded ordnance
21 items, so the recommended alternative for that site was basically the land use
22 controls, which entails, if you all recall, again, from the proposed plan, public
23 education, signs, brochures, things of that nature to basically inform people of
24 the history, the potential to encounter possibly unexploded ordnance and what,
25 and the procedure what you do if you do encounter those type of items.

1 So those two projects, Project 03, Munitions Debris Area, was, again,
2 those areas of potential interest in the cantonment area. Project 05 was the
3 Range Complex Remaining Lands. Now if you'll look on, I guess it might be
4 helpful if you all look at the figures here. The top figure really breaks down all
5 of the different projects.

6 So Project 03, if you'll look at the northern part of the map in the
7 cantonment area, sort of those pink colored areas, that's Project 03. Project
8 05 is really sort of the range complex where we didn't identify any unexploded
9 ordnance or munitions and explosives of concern, and because there weren't any
10 UXO or MEC items identified in those two areas, we've recommended, basically,
11 that public education, which is the land use controls, and a long-term monitoring,
12 that includes basically a five-year review. We have to come back every five
13 years, look at the remedial action that's in place, and basically ensuring that it's
14 still protective of human health at the site.

15 So those two decision documents, because you can see the dollar amount
16 associated with those projects, those projects will be a little bit easier to get
17 approved. The --- and I'm sort of a little bit all over the place here, but I'm
18 trying to get to the point to where the signature level on these decision
19 documents at our division level, we have a two-star general who is the
20 commander at South Atlantic Division in Atlanta. He has the signature
21 authority for these decision documents where it's less than five million.

22 So, typically, what we will be required to do is staff these decision
23 documents up through our chain of command within the district to the division
24 level, and the general at South Atlantic Division would sign these decision
25 documents for projects.

1 Like I said, it would be Projects 03, 05, 06, 08, 09 and 11, and, again, it's
2 based on dollar amount as far as that signature level.

3 BY MR. HERZOG:

4 He can authorize them individually?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 He can authorize them, and what will happen is he will get the --- he will
7 get all those decision documents together. So he will probably sign them, I
8 would image, at the same time.

9 BY MR. HAYES:

10 For which ones?

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 The project, all the projects except for Project 10 and Project 7, and,
13 again, this is based on the dollar, the dollar value. Less than five million is his
14 signature authority at our division commander.

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 There's some stuff in there that it said before there's no further action.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 Yes. Now that is Project 12 is no further action. So that was the gas
19 chamber. If you look at ---

20 BY MR. HAYES:

21 There were places in Project 5 that were no further action.

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 I don't believe there were any sites in Project 05 that were no further
24 action. Project 05 is the Remaining Lands, and so what's been recommended for
25 Project 05, because we didn't find any unexploded ordnance items, but we did

1 find munitions debris throughout those areas in that site, what's being
2 recommended, again, is basically just public education, not any type of active
3 clearance, because we did not find unexploded ordnance in those sites.

4 BY MR. HAYES:

5 Are you talking about raising \$800,000 for public education?

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Well, that amount is --- I guess, Suzy, this is a public, a good time to
8 explain that. What the feasibility study does, the feasibility study determine
9 these costs and so that the, I guess, the top number, is that the estimated
10 cost?

11 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

12 Yes.

13 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

14 So in accordance with the regulations, EPA regulations and CERCLA, you
15 have to develop, you know, at this point in the game, this is a, you know, order of
16 magnitude, ballpark type costs, and you can see the range on the cost is plus 50
17 to minus 30 percent. So the actual cost estimate that we came up for that site
18 was \$566,000, and the --- now what that includes is you have to remember
19 these sites, the way they're costed, and you may not recall, but when a site is
20 going to have some type of long-term monitoring, it's costed over a 30-year
21 period.

22 So signs, brochures, that's over a 30-year period to continue renewing
23 those, replacing signs that may be get vandalized, brochures. It includes the
24 cost of the five-year reviews, as well, I believe, right, Suzy?

25 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

1 The second number.

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Yeah. The second number? Okay.

4 So every five years, every five years the Corps of Engineers is required
5 in accordance with the EPA Guides to conduct a five-year review to basically
6 ensure that this is still protective of human health.

7 So, you know, if I --- if we see that maybe, you know, folks that have
8 gotten a call that there may be an unexploded ordnance item that was found in
9 Project 05, then at that time during that five-year review we may say, "Well,
10 maybe there needs to be some type of actual clearance in those areas."

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 Well, ---

13 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

14 If it's determined that the five-year reviews, at the five-year review
15 that nothing is needed, that we haven't found anything, there's no more
16 munitions debris, at that time maybe we would downgrade the action to say
17 there's no further action that's required at this site. So those are always
18 options that can be considered at that five-year review to ---

19 BY MR. HAYES:

20 Well, they made up the numbers of the number of people that use the
21 land to start with to make their decisions. It was brought up at the meeting
22 the ridiculous number of people that they had using the property.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 For a cost, cost amount? Is that what you're saying, Gary?

25 BY MR. HAYES:

1 Well, to put it in a dangerous level, I think, but, you know, why are you
2 going to spend a bunch of money if nobody is on the property?

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Well, and, again, the reason behind having to do public education in that
5 area is because munitions debris has been found throughout Project 05, and
6 because there's munitions debris that's been found there, there is the
7 possibility that unexploded ordnance items could be found there.

8 You know, they may not have been found now. Maybe there's nothing out
9 there, but because the munitions debris items have been found there, we have
10 to implement some type of remedial action; and like I said, every five years that
11 could be re-evaluated. Is this overprotective? Is this not protective enough?
12 And that's the purpose of the five-year review is to come back and re-evaluate
13 the alternative for the remedial action that has been implemented for that
14 particular site.

15 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

16 And to clarify, Project 05 is the predominance of Croft State natural
17 area.

18 BY MR. HAYES:

19 Well, on this map here.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 So Project 05 is the large green area on that first map, so the primary
22 acreage of what was the range complex.

23 BY MR. HAYES:

24 Well, what? I see figure numbers on ---

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 It's just that first one, Gary. If you look at that very first page, it has
2 all of the projects on it.

3 BY MR. HAYES:

4 Okay.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 So Project 05 is the large green project.

7 BY MR. HAYES:

8 Okay.

9 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

10 And then the subsequent figures, ignore the figure number, because that
11 is a reference to the document figure number for that specific project.

12 BY MR. HAYES:

13 Okay. I see it now. 05 is the green.

14 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

15 Yeah. Look at the titles, the title block. It includes the reference to
16 the appropriate project.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 So was there a project number that you were thinking of instead of that
19 one, Gary? Was it a different project that you were thinking about?

20 BY MR. HAYES:

21 Well, it's just taken a while to figure out how to read the map.

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 Okay.

24 BY MR. HERZOG:

25 What you've got ---

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 I can see it now.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Okay.

5 BY MR. HERZOG:

6 It's on this.

7 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

8 This monitoring now, would that be like newspaper, television
9 advertisement or something that the general public would be ---

10 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

11 Just a second, Colonel, so we can hear your question.

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 We've got a couple of conversations going on.

14 Gary, did you have any other questions? I know the colonel has one right
15 now we can ---

16 BY MR. HERZOG:

17 I've got a question while you're on this finance.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 Let's address the colonel's question real quick, then we'll get to yours,
20 okay? Okay, Jim?

21 The colonel had asked about the term long-term monitoring for Project
22 05, and, basically, what that is, is, again, that's sort of the five-year reviews
23 coming back every five years. We would, obviously, talk with the local
24 authorities to see what, if anything, had been found in that interim. Again,
25 that's an evaluation of the alternative or the remedial action that was

1 implemented and try to determine is it protective of human health? Is it ---
2 and, again, is it overprotective? Do we need to do more? Do we need to do
3 less? So that's typically what the long-term monitoring is to continue to
4 evaluate the remedial action to see that it's protective.

5 Anything else to add to that, Suzy?

6 Okay.

7 All right. Jim, what was your question?

8 BY MR. HERZOG:

9 Briefly educate me here. It's got Estimated Cost, then it says plus 50
10 percent to minus 30 percent.

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 That's ---

13 BY MR. HERZOG:

14 Is that a general ---

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 That's what I was speaking to on Gary's question, and that is a --- that's
17 from the EPA Guides.

18 BY MR. HERZOG:

19 That's true.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 As far as under CERCLA conducting a feasibility study when --- so when
22 you think, yeah, when you're in the feasibility study, think about how far, how
23 many years ahead of actually getting into the field and doing the cleanup. You
24 know, so you've got a lot of unknowns, a lot of uncertainty at that point. So it's
25 a --- it's a ballpark figure, a, you know, order of magnitude where they give you

1 that range to --- again, this is sort of just the initial trying to estimate what it
2 would take to clean it up. So it will be ---

3 BY MR. HERZOG:

4 It's been several years for the feasibility study.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 It will be refined, obviously, when --- so when these decision documents
7 are signed, we will, depending on how much funding in a given fiscal year is
8 provided to the Corps of Engineers, you know, we may award the remedial action
9 for one, two, five, depending how much funding we have. So at that point we
10 would do a, what's called an independent government estimate what we think it
11 would cost to actually clean up that site to say implement the remedial action
12 for Project 06 to --- to go in there and do a geophysical survey and excavate
13 those anomalies that we feel are unexploded ordnance items, we would do an
14 independent government estimate, and then use that to award or basically
15 compare against contractor proposals to do the work. So it will be refined down
16 the road. Just at this point it's --- you know, it's sort of the big picture, you
17 know, type of ballpark figure at this point.

18 BY MR. HERZOG:

19 Okay. In your internal approval process, the Corps, has someone, they're
20 in the process of reviewing this?

21 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

22 Yes.

23 BY MR. HERZOG:

24 To approve it?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Yes.

2 BY MR. HERZOG:

3 Pending funding?

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Well, the funding, the pending funding doesn't really play, doesn't have an
6 effect until we get to the point of trying to award contracts within a given year.
7 The dollar amount is the dollar amount. That's what it is. That's what we've
8 determined based on our cost estimate.

9 BY MR. HERZOG:

10 I understand.

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 So what we've done at this point, as far as the, I guess maybe to kind of
13 go back a little bit and tell you about the process. What we've done at this
14 point is the Corps of Engineers has had to, again, break up these munitions
15 response sites as individual projects depending on, it could be based on type of
16 munitions used, the geography.

17 BY MR. HERZOG:

18 I understand.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Okay.

21 BY MR. HERZOG:

22 It's fluid.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Okay.

25 BY MR. HERZOG:

1 I'm just trying to figure out ---

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 So we've got a decision document for each one of these projects, and
4 based on whatever the cost estimate was associated with that decision
5 document, that depends on the --- that will determine the signature level of the
6 document.

7 BY MR. HERZOG:

8 Now you guys and the consulting engineers have done your job. You got it
9 to the next higher authority, which I guess is over Huntsville?

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Basically, we're staffing it. No, the signature authority for all of these
12 projects, so, again, if you look at the dollar amount, our commanding general at
13 our division level in Atlanta, South Atlantic Division ---

14 BY MR. HERZOG:

15 So ---

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 --- has signature ---

18 BY MR. HERZOG:

19 --- the general in Atlanta.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Has signature authority for decision documents less than five million
22 dollars.

23 BY MR. HERZOG:

24 He could authorize any of these things?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 He could authorize all of these with the exception of two of them, which
2 had to go to our headquarters.

3 BY MR. HERZOG:

4 He has?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 He has signature authority for all of these with the exception of two of
7 them.

8 BY MR. HERZOG:

9 I understand.

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 So, unfortunately, there is a staffing, there's a lot of folks on the
12 chopping block that had to look at this before the general looks at it. There
13 are folks in Office of Council.

14 BY MR. HERZOG:

15 I can ---

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 Yes.

18 BY MR. HERZOG:

19 I haven't seen much of anything out there in about five years.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Right. Right.

22 BY MR. HERZOG:

23 And I don't live out there. I'm sure guys that live out there are
24 wondering if they're ever go to do anything.

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Right. Right.

2 BY MR. HERZOG:

3 And I can't blame you guys. I understand the bureaucracy. I spent 35
4 years or longer, and it doesn't move quickly.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Well, here's the near-term schedule. Our ---

7 BY MR. HERZOG:

8 I think you're finally to the point where that tract of land out there, you
9 pretty much know with your best estimate as to what was where when.

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 And that's really what this map ---

12 BY MR. HERZOG:

13 That's been ---

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 --- this map shows you.

16 BY MR. HERZOG:

17 Correct.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 I mean if you recall from the RI, you know, that delineated these
20 different munitions response sites.

21 BY MR. HERZOG:

22 You've got, for example, you may have section of blue here, which I don't
23 know what's there, but that may be where John Moon lives.

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Right. A lot of that is the State Park.

1 BY MR. HERZOG:

2 I'll have to put my other map on top.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Well, you know, if you all, you want to look at specifics as far as what was
5 found where, obviously, the remedial investigation report, you know, that goes
6 into ad nauseam as far as all of the items that were found and what was found
7 in specific munitions response site.

8 BY MR. HAYES:

9 Did the people in --- did you all, the guests, did you all get a price sheet?

10 BY MR. KRIEG:

11 Yeah.

12 BY MR. ZIMMERMAN:

13 I got one.

14 BY MR. HAYES:

15 Did everyone get one?

16 BY MR. GOODWIN:

17 Yes, sir.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 So what will happen as far as the near-term schedule, what we're looking
20 at is, hopefully, by Suzy's part, as far as Zapata, has finalized or hoping or
21 finalize the decision documents based on the districts. The Savannah District
22 is the program manager for these decision documents. Those folks and the
23 folks at our center of expertise in Huntsville are now looking at this document,
24 and so once their comments are incorporated, hopefully here in the next month,
25 these decision documents will be finalized and they will be ready at that point

1 to start staffing through to the general and headquarters, depending on the
2 dollar amount. So ---

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 And how many munition sites is Camp Croft competing with for funding?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Well, you know, that's another discussion I know we've had a lot of RAB
7 meetings. You know, there are these Formerly Used Defense Sites, there's a
8 number of them across the country, so --- you know, so we're competing with,
9 obviously, with dollar, dollars for all those sites. What the Corps, and you all
10 may have heard this spiel in some of the past RAB meetings that we've had.

11 What the Corps of Engineers --- not the Corps of Engineers. I'm sorry. It was
12 the Department of Defense had implemented to try to get a handle on all of
13 these FUDS projects was they created the Munitions Response Site
14 Prioritization Protocol, and the acronym was the MRSPP, and so what that did
15 was sort of like a risk assessment. It takes into account the type of munitions
16 that were found, the land use, whether it's residential, receptors, sensitivity of
17 the type of munitions, chemical, if there was chemical munitions used, and so
18 what it does is it spits out a number and all of these FUD sites that have
19 munitions projects, they each get a number, a MRSPP score, basically, and so
20 what the Department of Defense is trying to do with this is basically sort of
21 rack and set. Prioritize them based on risks, and so I don't know. Suzy, do we
22 have a --- I don't know if we have a handout on what the MRSPP scores were.

23 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

24 No.

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 But I know that the Croft, the munitions response sites that we're doing
2 some type of removal action either two, to two feet, so basically Projects 06
3 through 11 have a pretty good MRSP score. I don't think, because we found
4 munitions, a lot of those areas are used, have residential development. Croft
5 State Park. You know, so you've got receptors that could potentially be exposed
6 to munitions. We have high explosive munitions that have been discovered at
7 the site.

8 So from what I recall, I think the scores are relatively high for Croft.
9 So I think --- I think we're in a good position as far as if --- the deal hasn't
10 started implementing the scores, yet, as far as racking and stacking them, yet,
11 because I think some scores are still --- some sites are still being scored, but I
12 think our scores are relatively healthy as far as deserving funding in the future.
13 So that's probably not the issue. It's probably, what's the issue is probably just
14 limited power as far as how many of these can we award possibly in one fiscal
15 year. It may be one or two of these projects, maybe four or five. I don't know.
16 I'll have to see once we get to a given fiscal year and how much funding the
17 program has at that time.

18 One thing I guess I would like to go ahead and sort of sidetrack a little
19 bit, Suzy and I had talked about this a little bit, and we don't need necessarily
20 feedback from you all tonight, but one thing I wanted to get you all to start
21 thinking about, I'd like to get some feedback from the RAB on, is if there is a
22 certain priority that you all feel there needs to be done to these particular
23 projects, you know, based on what you all know, because, you know, you all live
24 here. You know the community. What, you know, how would you all rank them?
25 You know, again, I mean, I don't --- you know, don't need an answer tonight, but

1 just to get you all to start think about that, because I would like to have that
2 type of feedback considered when we start getting to the point where we're
3 actually awarding the contracts for these projects.

4 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

5 I would like to interject. Ray, we do have in the decision document
6 another hazard assessment for each of these areas. It's the MEC hazard
7 assessment and that leads into the MRSPP scoring. So each of these documents
8 does indicate, for instance, this is Project No. 6, the Rocket and Rifle Grenade
9 Area, and I'll just read the type of language that goes forth with these
10 documents.

11 "Considering the current site conditions, the MEC HA results indicate the
12 potential for the highest potential explosive hazard conditions for current and
13 reasonably anticipated future land use within this project."

14 So there is language within each of these decision documents that pulls
15 forth that MEC hazard analysis and whether the potential is low, moderate,
16 high, extremely high based upon what was found during the remedial
17 investigation.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 And, again, that, the MEC Hazard Analysis or Hazard Assessment is in
20 that remedial investigation report and the feasibility study, I believe,
21 summarize that.

22 So if you all wanted to look at that again, that information is in there;
23 and as Suzy mentioned for each specific project, we've pulled forward that
24 scoring and whatever that result was for that particular project into that
25 decision document. So it will go along with that project to basically support the

1 need to authorize that remedial action that's being identified in the decision
2 document.

3 So I think we've talked about the different projects, the map.

4 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

5 Do we want to explain a little bit about the removal alternative?

6 We talked about land use controls and what that entails.

7 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

8 Okay.

9 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

10 And because land use controls don't take anything out of the ground,
11 hence the need for long-term monitoring to make sure that the education and
12 public awareness is still being protective of the individuals that live on the
13 property, use the property. Again, the predominance of those areas are the
14 State natural area.

15 The remaining projects were areas where unexploded ordnance, munitions
16 and explosives of concern were found during the remedial investigation. Some
17 areas also have significant quantities of munitions debris. So the risk for
18 contact and for an incident are higher in those areas.

19 The selected remedy that's going forth in these decision documents for
20 Projects 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, is a removal action to a depth. That depth is two
21 feet in all areas, except Project 7, and the depth is one foot based upon the
22 items that were found and the depth of what was found and the land use within
23 the park.

24 The way that the removal action is presented to be accomplished is one
25 that will achieve unlimited use, unrestricted exposure. So there will not need to

1 be a requirement for long-term monitoring, because that removal action, that
2 remedy is going to take, to the best technology that is available, remove all of
3 the MEC and the explosive hazards; and as presented in the feasibility study,
4 this is digital geophysical mapping and using advanced classification.

5 So there would be a surface clearance of these areas. Then we would
6 collect, we, the contractor would collect digital data so that data is actually
7 digitized so there's a record of what's out there based on the size of the piece
8 of metal, because we don't know what it is until we dig it up, the size of the
9 anomaly, the depth, the orientation. So we will have a digital recording of all
10 the subsurface, ferrous and non-ferrous items. Then using this advanced
11 classification, those data are compared to a library of similar digitized
12 geophysical data, and those items that are most likely to represent MEC and
13 unexploded ordnance, munitions and explosives of concern based upon the
14 signature or those electronic data, geophysical data, I should say, those items
15 are then targeted to be the ones that we would go out and remove.

16 So this remedial action is not walking and digging a hundred percent of
17 every subsurface anomaly across thousands of acres. It's we cover, and I say
18 "we" loosely. The contractor who is selected will digitally geophysically map the
19 entire area, and then only those anomalies that are most representative of a
20 munition and explosive of concern will be removed.

21 BY MR. HAMIL:

22 Right.

23 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

24 And that approach is to achieve unrestricted unlimited use.

25 BY MR. HAMIL:

1 What we call UUUE.

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Right.

4 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

5 Now for him to, for the contractor to get something to look at, how
6 would he do that?

7 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

8 He will actually do the digital mapping. So the contractor that is going
9 to do the subsequent excavation, they will do the mapping first. It will be a
10 phased, phased approach. So they will go out and map it with this geophysical
11 equipment, and to touch a little bit more on what Suzy had mentioned, my
12 understanding, I've tried --- I've gone to a couple of classes on the geophysical
13 on the advanced classification. My understanding is that there are several
14 sensors on these items that allow the geophysicists, it gives a 3D, basically a 3D
15 signature of the item, and that helps them determine the signature. It's a
16 cylindrical object as opposed to a horseshoe, and so it gives them a high level of
17 confidence that, yeah, this is cultural debris. It's a horseshoe. It's a nail. It's
18 not a cylindrical item, which could be representative of an unexploded ordnance
19 item.

20 So the --- my understanding is the process presents a huge cost savings
21 because you're not excavating every anomaly. You're only excavating those
22 items that have a signature or has a signature of a potentially unexploded
23 ordnance item.

24 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

25 Is that done from aircraft or walking on the ground?

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Walking. Walking.

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 Walking?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Yes, so there are --- you may know this better, Terry, as far as the type.

7 Like I know there's one that's ten pads and one that's a metal mapper, I think

8 are the two primary ---

9 BY MR. HAMIL:

10 We use --- we use both, right.

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 Yes.

13 BY MR. HAMIL:

14 Both types, mostly in this area, when you're talking about an area like
15 Camp Croft, one of the best ways that we would like to approach it from the
16 Huntsville Center is metal mapping. Metal mapping is one of the ways that we've
17 really, really advanced in technology, and you might hear of the 61s. They used
18 the 61s to go out and --- you know, they'll go out and trisects sectors and what
19 they'll look for is exactly what Suzy was talking about. It's a signature is what
20 we're looking for; and when you see that signature, it correlates with that
21 database signature, which equals a specific type of round, whether it's an 81 or
22 60 or 30, you know, something, and what we do is then at that point we'll say,
23 "Okay. We know that's there," right, and so like let's think of it as a football
24 field. If you go out to the 50-yard-line and there's a signature for a mortar at
25 that 50-yard-line and then there's nothing until you get to the goal line, why in

1 the world would you want to pay thousands and thousands of dollars to clear
2 from the 50-yard-line all the way to the goal line when there's nothing there?
3 Right?

4 And that's what --- I think that's what Ray was talking about.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 That's the cost savings, right.

7 BY MR. HAMIL:

8 So the cost savings in that is huge, because then what happens is we're
9 only removing the items that could cause a health risk to humans or anybody
10 else, at that matter.

11 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

12 Well, one advantage you'd have now, plastics wasn't around World War II,
13 so.

14 BY MR. HAMIL:

15 Absolutely.

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 Right.

18 BY MR. HAMIL:

19 And that's the reason why that it's really --- it is basic science ---

20 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

21 Right.

22 BY MR. HAMIL:

23 --- that is figuring this out with the shapes and the signatures that we're
24 using through the geophysics of science.

25 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

1 That's the problem we have with landmines locating them is when plastic
2 got to be available.

3 BY MR. HAMIL:

4 Right.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Sure. So Suzy had mentioned the, both Terry and Suzy had mentioned
7 the term that the UUUE, unlimited use, unrestricted exposure, that will apply
8 to these projects where we were doing the clearance using the advanced
9 classification.

10 BY MR. HAYES:

11 Well, we've done that on some pieces of property and it showed anomalies
12 everywhere, and then when they went to clean up all the stuff, there wasn't
13 anything there.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 Right. Right, and that's the whole point of what we're talking about using
16 this advanced classification is it allows you not to have to excavate all of those
17 items that are not potentially unexploded ordnance items. So ---

18 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

19 We have used digital geophysics during investigations, and you are
20 correct. The responses often time were munitions debris or cultural debris, so
21 we weren't employing the advanced classification, which is a much more complex
22 sensor array and much more robust analysis of the data to select those items.
23 So the removal action is taking, is using technology that's a little farther
24 advanced than the digital geophysical mapping that was used during the
25 investigation.

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 So how do you --- why don't you do that before you come up with the
3 figures? You know what you got to get before you go digging.

4 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

5 We used, and Zapata completed the remedial investigation. The data
6 that was collected during that investigation on how many munitions items, how
7 much debris over these certain areas, those data came into play in coming up
8 with this cost analysis for the removal.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 So all that prior work and the remedial investigation, you know, that's ---
11 that's characterization, so we're not --- we have to follow the CERCLA process,
12 the EPA's CERCLA process. So in the remedial investigation, you have to do the
13 characterization, where we did probably 25 percent, maybe --- you know, maybe
14 30 percent of the area. We're basically just trying to delineate where is that
15 boundary at as far as this area here is an area of concern that we need to come
16 back and do some type of cleanup later. So, so that's the process that we have
17 to follow. So that was the RI. We characterize it. Now we're at the point
18 where we're actually going to go out and clean them up. So I'm not sure if that's
19 what you're asking as far as why we didn't clean up previously or not, but ---

20 BY MR. HAYES:

21 So the Estimated Cost, you're going to go and ask for this amount?

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 That's what we're going to ask to get approval for.

24 BY MR. HAYES:

25 Before you do any ---

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Correct.

3 BY MR. HAYES:

4 --- scanning?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Correct.

7 BY MR. HAYES:

8 And before you find out what's there?

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Correct.

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 Okay. You know from the tangents from the other what the tangents
13 show, but, you know, I think it should be separated and go out with the scanners
14 and see what's there, and then get a cost analysis on what they found.

15 What you're talking about going in between the transects, right?

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 We're ---

18 BY MR. HAYES:

19 You're going to do a hundred percent scan of the property?

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Okay, and to what we've done previously is what you're saying?

22 BY MR. HAYES:

23 Yeah.

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Yes. Yes.

1 So these areas, for instance, on Project, let's just say Project 06, the
2 Rocket and Rifle Grenade Area, so up to this point we have done some transects
3 up there that were, I can't recall, Suzy, maybe, you know, let's say, 50-foot
4 spacing or --- yeah, 50-foot spacing. So, and, again, that was just to try to
5 determine to confirm, "Yes, we have unexploded ordnance in this area, and
6 here's where the boundary, we think the boundary is. This area within, you
7 know, that peach colored area there, we feel that is contaminated. We need to
8 come up and come back and do some type of cleanup."

9 So now we're coming back in remedial action and we'll do basically a
10 hundred percent coverage on that area to remove ---

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 109 acres?

13 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

14 To remove, yes, what has that signature of unexploded ordnance on it.

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 And Project 7 you'll have a hundred percent coverage?

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 Exactly.

19 BY MR. HAYES:

20 1,277 acres?

21 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

22 Correct.

23 BY MR. KRIEG:

24 Ray, can I add something, as well?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Sure.

2 BY MR. KRIEG:

3 I'm Kent Krieg with the South Carolina Department of Health and
4 Environmental Control. I'm the FUDS project manager.

5 Also with the advanced digital geophysical investigation, that's a
6 relatively new technique that they're using, because the database from across
7 the country, you know, the experts, they've been able to compile the library. So
8 since our investigation has been going on a lot longer here, it's not something
9 that they're able to use.

10 BY MR. HAMIL:

11 Years ago.

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Right.

14 BY MR. KRIEG:

15 Years ago.

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 The RI back in thirteen ---

18 BY MR. KRIEG:

19 And it's almost still --- it's past the developmental stage, but there's still,
20 I think a lot of states started buying in, but that's been very recently. I'm
21 going to say kind of within the past year the states have really gotten on board
22 with how they presented the data. That's how new it is.

23 BY MR. HAMIL:

24 Yeah.

25 BY MR. KRIEG:

1 This technique they're using the library and all that.

2 BY MR. HAYES:

3 I think it needs to --- the money needs to be split up, do the scanning of
4 the property and see what's there, and then figure out what the cost is going to
5 be.

6 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

7 And, Ray, if I may interject, and correct me ---

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Sure.

10 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

11 --- if I'm speaking out of bounds here, the bulk of the costs are actually
12 the advanced classification, the mapping and the classification. What we're
13 going to come up with after that are going to be much fewer holes to dig, and
14 then to go back out and remove those items that were identified for removal
15 after the data have been collected is a fraction of what the mapping is.

16 BY MR. HAMIL:

17 Right.

18 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

19 So the bulk of these costs, and correct me, Terry and Ray, if I'm wrong,
20 is actually going to be the mapping.

21 BY MR. HAMIL:

22 Yes.

23 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

24 That's the expense to save us, to save contractors and the government
25 from digging up horseshoes and anomalies.

1 BY MR. HAMIL:

2 Right.

3 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

4 So we anticipate digging up much less.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 That's a good point, Suzy. And, Gary, you know, the figures may look
7 large, but you think about doing a hundred percent coverage on some these
8 areas, that's what it's going to take to get out there and do the mapping, and
9 then the effort of the geophysicists, once they go back to the office and they
10 look at the data and evaluate all of these signatures, as Suzy mentioned, that's
11 what the majority of the cost is. That's that whole point of that, this
12 technology, is it allows us to reduce the amount of holes that we had to dig. So
13 that's --- that's where these projects --- you know, previously, that's where the
14 costs were all associated with was because we had to do so much excavation,
15 and it's time consuming. You know, you're talking about hand-digging most of
16 these, most of these sites, and you have --- if you have some of these sites
17 where I think, I haven't been on the project that long, but I know Project 10
18 with the 105-millimeter Area from my understanding is that the density there
19 is ridiculous. There is just so much that was used there. It makes it difficult
20 if you're excavating every single item if it's just a fragment of a shell. You
21 know, it's no longer, obviously, presents an explosive hazard. So that's where
22 the cost savings is that we're not having to excavate all of these items, and
23 that's a good point that Suzy brought up is most of that cost is going to be in
24 the mapping.

25 BY MR. HERZOG:

1 So you're hoping, when you spend most of this money, somebody is going
2 to be able to say, "There's not much out there."

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Right. Right. We've got --- you know, we've got 20 items, 50 items that
5 we've got to excavate in this particular munitions response site, correct.

6 BY MR. HAYES:

7 How many different contractors are you going to use?

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 I don't know about that. Again, that will depend on, you know, the bids
10 that are in and how they compare against the government estimate. I will tell
11 you this. I was in a training class for the advanced classification in November,
12 and the Corps of Engineers, and you'll probably speak to this maybe a little bit
13 better than I can, Terry, but the Corps of Engineers, this is from
14 headquarters, has --- has just put out, I guess these were requirements or a
15 memo that came out in January where they're going to require any contractor
16 that's going to do this advanced classification work to be certified, and they're
17 going to have to go through, I guess, doing the ---

18 BY MR. HAMIL:

19 Sure.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 --- process, and it's a long process.

22 BY MR. HAMIL:

23 That's right.

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 And from my understanding that's underway.

1 There are several contractors that have, I guess, they have sort of
2 started that process.

3 BY MR. HAMIL:

4 That's right.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 And they're going to have to be certified by the Corps of Engineers
7 before they can do this work. So it may be ---

8 BY MR. HAMIL:

9 That's right.

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 It may be a small pool. I don't know, and depending on how many of them
12 actually get the certification, and there may be more, obviously, as time goes
13 on.

14 BY MR. HAMIL:

15 Right. Ray is absolutely correct. What we look at, whenever this
16 happens, is, you know, you're going to have an award, you know, you're going to
17 have an RFP that hits the street, and it's a request for proposal and what that
18 does is that it basically is shooting out to the contractors out there that this is
19 an area that needs remediation, it needs environmental remediation, some type
20 of removal; and then what happens is then the contractor prepares a proposal
21 based upon a scope of work, and that scope of work is then developed based
22 upon the project's needs. You know, so --- so what happens is once we put all
23 this together and we put the RFP out on the street, you're going to get, you
24 know, hopefully, three or --- around three or four that contractors that are
25 going to bid on this, and they're going to say, "Okay. Well, here's how much we

1 believe it's going to cost us to do this particular removal for this project," and
2 then what it will do is it will range. You'll get a range, and you'll say, "Okay."
3 Well, you know, it could be anywhere between 15 percent range from the lowest
4 to the highest or it could be as vast as 80 percent. I've seen some folks come
5 in with some ridiculous numbers; but in looking for your best interest is what we
6 would do is we would come back and say, "This is what we believe the contractor
7 that can do it," and we would put together what's called a source selection
8 evaluation board, and that evaluation board would then try to select a
9 contractor that's going to be able to perform the functions and services to the
10 best of their ability and also at a cost that is going to be reasonable to us, the
11 people, and I'm saying, "Us," because, hey, guess what? I'm an American citizen
12 just like you.

13 BY MR. HAYES:

14 Well, it's been going on for 20 years. It's got a very escalated cost.

15 BY MR. HAMIL:

16 Yes, sir. I understand.

17 BY MR. HAYES:

18 They didn't plan for it to be this long. It looks like it's going to be
19 another 20 years.

20 BY MR. HAMIL:

21 I hope not.

22 BY MR. HAYES:

23 The last I heard it's going to be at least three years before any money is
24 available.

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Well, and we were getting --- I was sort of starting down that discussion
2 as far as near-term schedule. We're hoping to have the decision documents
3 finalized by the summer. They'll be staffed to, like I said, either through the
4 South Atlantic Division for his signature, the general's signature, or up through
5 headquarters for Project 10 and 7, and we're hoping to have those signed by the
6 end of the fiscal year, so by the end of FY17. It's possible they may not be
7 signed until early '18, but once that's done, you know, if there's funding available
8 in FY18 for taking on these remedial actions, we may be able to award a couple
9 of these in FY18. If not, we're looking at FY19.

10 So my, you know, best hopes are to get at least a couple of awarded in
11 FY18; and, obviously, you know, if we're talking about a removal action, you're
12 going to have some time, once the contract is awarded, you've got to have the
13 contractors prepare their work plan. There's going to be a review and so forth.
14 So as far as actually getting out in the field, you know, we're probably talking,
15 you know, at least a couple of years before by the time it's, you know, the
16 decision document is signed, the contract is awarded and they're out in the
17 field, you know, we're probably talking at least a couple of years before they're
18 in the field, but I think we are --- you mentioned, Gary, as far as how long it has
19 taken us to get to this point. I think we're, you know, starting to see the light
20 at the end of the tunnel, at least we're seeing some progress, and the fact that
21 we have these decision documents that are going to authorize this cleanup
22 action, I think is, you know, it's, obviously, a pretty good milestone, I think, to
23 achieve for the project.

24 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

25 Let's go back to one thing.

1 On land use controls, let's run that one by again, because that's a
2 preponderance of the acreage and probably one that has not been discussed as
3 much.

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Okay. Land use controls is probably a little bit of a misnomer in this
6 case, but land use controls as far as the gamut, what it can include can be
7 fencing, public education, which we described, deed restrictions for a site that
8 has groundwater contamination if we're dealing with an industrial park. They
9 may be amenable to restricting the groundwater use, so somebody doesn't put in
10 a well and use it for drinking purposes, things of that nature. What we had
11 done during the feasibility study, if you all recall at some of the RAB meetings,
12 we had sent out a --- was it an institutional analysis, Suzy, basically trying to
13 solicit feedback from the community on the how amenable it would be for the
14 community to consider some of these land use controls, and some of those
15 things were like, you know, fencing, things like that, you know, something on the
16 deed, stuff like that, and so the feedback that we got was that ---

17 BY MR. HERZOG:

18 They wanted to hang us.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 That was a non-starter. So we took that back, and basically, you know,
21 those were on the chopping block.

22 BY MR. HERZOG:

23 It mentioned the bad words on it, potential zone.

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Right.

1 BY MR. HERZOG:

2 There's no zoning here and nobody wanted that.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Right. So those got axed. So, in terms of Camp Croft, what the land use
5 controls that we are recommending for the munitions debris area and the range
6 complex remaining lands, Projects 03 and 05, is what we've discussed at this
7 point, basically public education, so brochures, things like that to try to get the
8 word out to the community as far as the history of the site. You know, it was a
9 World War II training facility. The potential for unexploded ordnance
10 certainly is there. You know, we can't say that we --- I don't think we can ever
11 say, "Well, we're going to get 100 percent of the items." You know, you just
12 never know. So that public education in the form of brochures, possibly signs
13 maybe along DOT easements, things like that. We can never force a property
14 owner to allow us to do anything on their property. So, for instance, you know, a
15 property owner did, and we wanted to put up a sign in a certain area, it's on
16 private property, the property owner can tell us to go to pound sand. We can't
17 force them to do, to put up fencing or do anything on their property. Just like
18 what we did when we did the remedial investigation. You know, we had to get
19 permission to right of entry to go onto their property.

20 BY MR. HAMIL:

21 Right.

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 So in this case, the land use controls, that's basically the limit of it. It's
24 public education. Again, just trying to get the word out to folks of what could
25 be out there and what to do if you encounter. You call 911. You call the local

1 authorities to handle anything that looks suspicious, and that's the extent of
2 the land use controls unless --- well, the five-year reviews, I guess.

3 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

4 Monitoring.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 That really kind of fits under the long-term monitoring.

7 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

8 You mentioned zoning. That's a very strong possibility for the whole
9 county. I don't know if you're aware of that or not.

10 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

11 Zoning?

12 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

13 It's a lie, and it's working its way.

14 BY MR. HERZOG:

15 Well, I know what they've done is that stuff down on Highway 101 that
16 they're looking at in that area. I don't know what all is --- it's been a while.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 Colonel and Jim, that would be --- that would be outside of our ---

19 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

20 Yeah, not the Corps. Right.

21 BY MR. HERZOG:

22 Right.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Not the Corps of Engineers as far as implementing, as far as zoning with
25 the County.

1 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

2 I've had discussion with some people in Spartanburg County about zoning.
3 It's a lie. It's working its way through, and if the people don't stand up to the
4 representatives, you're going to have zoning.

5 BY MR. HERZOG:

6 Oh, yeah. Right. Yeah.

7 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

8 All right. Now once you've got zoning, all this goes away, because the
9 County takes over, and then that's when this is going to get to be a pain where
10 you're sitting.

11 BY MR. HERZOG:

12 On this chair?

13 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

14 What's you're sitting on, if you've got any land in this area.

15 BY MR. HERZOG:

16 Yeah, I understand.

17 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

18 Because these people, they're working on another level, but when it gets
19 to where the local county takes zoning and makes it a public entity that you've
20 got to live with, then those seven council members sitting out there is running it
21 and telling you what to do, and if you don't do it, they slap you. The Corps
22 itself, what they're working on here and saying, "Land use controls," is livable, in
23 my opinion.

24 BY MR. HERZOG:

25 Yeah.

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 Well, that's what they're saying.

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 But if the County steps in, it is not livable. I can tell you that, because I
5 currently live under that zoning.

6 BY MR. HAMIL:

7 Let me ask one thing, if you don't mind. Okay. Another project that I've
8 worked on out at Camp Robinson, it's in Arkansas, okay, we did the same exact
9 thing as this land use control. What we did was we found some munitions. We
10 found some MEC, and what we had to do is we had to clear it. Now it took us a
11 while to get out there to clear it, just like it did with this project here. Okay.
12 The most important thing that we had to take into consideration was the human
13 receptors. We wanted to make sure that when we went in there, and we
14 removed those items, that the public was aware of what items that we found
15 and what items could possibly be there.

16 So what we did was we built kiosks, and these kiosks that we built had
17 fliers that were inside of the kiosks. We had signs that were out there, and
18 what we did was we got with folks like the State Park folks, forestry folks, and
19 we asked them to make sure that they, on their rounds, to ensure that the ---
20 you know, that the fliers were full, you know, that they hadn't been maybe
21 damaged or something, weather caused wet or something, and that they would
22 --- we would make sure that there was education to the public in that area, and
23 so far (knocking on table), we have done a really, really super job in informing
24 folks out there.

25 BY MR. HAYES:

1 Is that public property?

2 BY MR. HAMIL:

3 Yes, sir.

4 BY MR. HAYES:

5 Okay.

6 BY MR. HAMIL:

7 Absolutely.

8 BY MR. HAYES:

9 Well, what they're doing is sending out questionnaires to private
10 landowners whether they want land use controls or not, and they're saying they
11 don't want it, and so now they're including them on the maps after they said
12 they don't want land use controls. So they're making them including them on the
13 land use controls when they tell them they don't want it.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 No, we're not implementing any land use controls on their property.

16 BY MR. HAMIL:

17 We can't.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 No, and that's what I was saying. The only --- the land use controls,
20 that's why I said earlier. It's sort of a misnomer for Camp Croft, because the
21 land use controls that we're implementing are basically just public education. It
22 is brochures and signs. That's the only thing that we're doing for Camp Croft.
23 We can't --- and we can't put anything on private property unless the property
24 owner agrees to it. So there's nothing that we're implementing is what you
25 would kind of consider a restriction, you know, like a deed restriction or

1 something like that. That's not --- that's not items that have been
2 recommended in these decision documents.

3 BY MR. HAMIL:

4 Right.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 And that's something that we would have presented at the public meeting
7 as far as what's being recommended, and we didn't mention anything as far as,
8 you know, as far as some type of deed restrictions. That's nothing that's being
9 recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

10 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

11 And those ---

12 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

13 See, that's ---

14 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

15 Sorry.

16 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

17 That's why I brought up on your farm, County's on it. That's where the
18 problem is. That's the peril that we face as landowners of this property,
19 because all you've got to do is one politician pick up this and see something
20 about land use. You've never seen a politician stop at a stop sign.

21 BY MR. HERZOG:

22 I always did.

23 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

24 Well, if you're a politician, you're the first one then.

25 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

1 Gary, this --- I'm sorry, Colonel. Go ahead.

2 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

3 The County, if the County gets control, taking the work these people
4 done, taking these documents and if the County gets it and zoning goes ahead
5 like it's being pushed, then we've got another fight on our hands.

6 BY MR. HERZOG:

7 Well, ---

8 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

9 People like me and Gary ---

10 BY MR. HERZOG:

11 --- that would depend, I guess, on how they're zoned, residential,
12 agricultural, some ---

13 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

14 But what you don't understand about zoning, they can say, "Okay. It's
15 agricultural." All right. All of a sudden you want to build a house or you want to
16 sell off a hundred acres for an industrial site, you still got to get zoning
17 changed now. "Oh, wait a minute, you know, the Corps of Engineers did this,
18 they did this." Denied. The threat is the County. It's not, just because I was a
19 former Corps of Engineers' officer, it's not the Corps. It's not what they're
20 saying. That's why I asked him first, "What is that land use?" It's who picks it
21 up from here at the local level.

22 There's any real estate agents right now in Spartanburg that's saying, "If
23 you own land in Old Camp Croft, it's not worth as much as land on the other side
24 of the line."

25 BY MR. HERZOG:

1 But that's a political determination of the County.

2 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

3 I mean that's just what you're faced.

4 BY MR. HERZOG:

5 Not --- not with what the Corps concerned with. I guess your concern is
6 where it says, "Land use controls." Somebody is thinking, "Well, that means
7 they're going to tell you what you're going to do on your property."

8 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

9 Yes, land use controls is the ---

10 BY MR. HAMIL:

11 It doesn't mean how you can use your land. You as the landowner can use
12 your land however you want to. What we're trying to ask the owner to do is if
13 we need to put up a sign at his or her property, then would you allow us to be
14 able to do that. We have ---

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 We've already asked that.

17 BY MR. HAMIL:

18 Right, and if they said, "Yes," then we can do it. If they said, "No," then
19 we're not going to cross into their land and do that.

20 BY MR. HAYES:

21 But you included them on the map.

22 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

23 Well, ----

24 BY MR. HAYES:

25 It's going to be land use control.

1 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

2 And let me --- I think maybe this might clarify, and if not, ---

3 BY MR. HAYES:

4 Before ---

5 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

6 So ---

7 BY MR. HAYES:

8 --- I was told some pieces of property were no further action.

9 BY MR. HAMIL:

10 Yes.

11 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

12 Correct.

13 BY MR. HAYES:

14 So now they've got them on a map as land use control.

15 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

16 Those properties, and they are on the table, on the second page of the
17 Agenda, there were several properties that were no further action. Those were
18 previously identified as AoPI, areas of potential interest. They are not
19 identified as Project 12, and there are several of those individual areas. So
20 Project 12 is no further action. So there will be nothing that will take place in
21 those areas. Land use controls, as proposed, as a remedial alternative, is very
22 broad, and those are going to bleed over, because there aren't going to be
23 boundaries. If we --- if the contractor were to send out a mailing of an updated
24 informational brochure on Former Camp Croft, what to do if you find something
25 that's suspect, that might go to many people on a mailing list that may or may

1 not be in an no action. It's information. It's not putting a sign in someone's
2 front yard. The signs are intended primarily to be placed in the park of points
3 of ingress. I think the park has had signs in the past, educational informational
4 signs that are maintained. So that's where signs are envisioned.

5 Everything else might entail having a public meeting once a year, opening
6 it to everybody to, again, remind them of the history of the site and what to do
7 if you find something suspect. So that is --- that falls under land use control.

8 BY MR. HERZOG:

9 So ---

10 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

11 So that's the objective of that remedial alternative.

12 BY MR. HERZOG:

13 So you're actually ---

14 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

15 You're not targeting individual properties.

16 BY MR. HERZOG:

17 You're actually exercising more control on even 6 through 11 because
18 that's where you plan to do something.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Right. Some actual clearance, yes.

21 BY MR. HAMIL:

22 Right.

23 BY MR. HERZOG:

24 Am I right?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Yes, and, well --- and to get back to the land use controls, Gary. The, you
2 know, these, the land use controls are going to be discussed in the decision
3 documents. So whatever, that decision document that has to be signed by the
4 general, headquarters, whoever signs it, it will say what the land use controls
5 are. It will say, "Public education, brochures," things of that nature. If the
6 land use controls, if we wanted to implement some type of deed restriction, it
7 would have to be included in the cost, because we can't, you know, the
8 government, we can't spend money that hasn't been appropriated, it hasn't been
9 appropriated for that specific action. So it would have to have been estimated
10 in the feasibility study as part of our alternative, and then we would have to
11 have it in our decision document to forward it on to get approval, because we've
12 got to get approval to do whatever actions that we're recommending to do, and
13 because that was not something that was recommended, we aren't going to have
14 approval, and we aren't going to have funding to do those type of activities, and
15 it will ---

16 BY MR. HAYES:

17 I haven't seen anything about that. What I was saying here you said no
18 further action, and here you're saying land use controls.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Yeah, and the reason, the reason that we said no further action for these
21 sites is because we either found nothing at those sites or there has been some
22 significant cleanup that has already occurred on those sites to the point to
23 where we basically cleaned up everything, and I think Wedgewood was probably
24 one of those areas where they basically cleaned up the entire site during some
25 of the previous removal actions. So the areas where we're recommending land

1 use controls are areas where we found some munitions debris. We didn't find
2 unexploded ordnance items in those areas, but we did find munitions debris. So
3 because, because the potential is there that, you know, some day someone may
4 encounter an unexploded ordnance item in those areas, that's why we're
5 recommending some type of public education for those areas, because there
6 was something found there in the form of fragments of a shell, munitions
7 debris, what we call munitions debris.

8 BY MR. HERZOG:

9 Beer cans?

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Right. Well, not beer cans. If there was only beer cans, then we would
12 have probably recommended no further action if that was all that was found.
13 So some of these areas up here that are a part of that Project 12, the
14 Cantonment.

15 BY MR. HERZOG:

16 The ---

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 You know, so we didn't find anything in those areas, and that's why we
19 recommended no further action. So if there was nothing that was found in
20 Project 5, the Remaining Lands, if there was nothing that was found there,
21 then, yeah, we would have recommended no further action.

22 BY MR. HAYES:

23 Okay. On Project 3, the furthest one south along there on the very
24 bottom of the south part, ---

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Right.

2 BY MR. HAYES:

3 They found a fuse.

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Right. Right.

6 BY MR. HAYES:

7 On the upper part they found some kind of MEC up there. That's the only
8 thing they found in it.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Yeah.

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 But they want to draw a line all the way around the top part, back down
13 to the bottom and then encompass the whole thing, but they said there's no
14 further action because what they found didn't ---

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Well, not ---

17 BY MR. HAYES:

18 --- dig then because they figured it might have fell off somebody's
19 backpack or something.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Not no further action, but these public education, and, again, because
22 they drew that whole line because they probably found, I didn't look. I'd have
23 to look at the remedial investigation report, Gary, but there were probably, like
24 you said, there were probably a couple of items at the north end that were
25 found and probably a couple of items at the south end.

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 In the very first EE/CA, whatever they found from the satellite, spotted
3 something in the pine trees right in there.

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Okay. Was this like a LIDAR that was done or something?

6 BY MR. HAYES:

7 When they first, they were going around just pinpointing certain areas,
8 and they said that they found a little thing in the pine trees.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Okay.

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 They went in there and cut down the pine trees that were just planted,
13 and they did a sweep in there and they said they found something, but the lower
14 side, when they did the tangents this last time and everything, they found ---

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Two fuses, right?

17 BY MR. HAYES:

18 --- fuses, yeah.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Right. Right.

21 BY MR. HAYES:

22 Which they said didn't fit in. It wasn't supposed to be there.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Right. Right.

25 BY MR. HAYES:

1 It probably fell off somebody ---

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Like they were transporting it at that point at that location, right.

4 BY MR. HAYES:

5 And so they said, "No further action."

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Yeah. No, not no further action. Again, that area was recommended for
8 public education.

9 BY MR. HAYES:

10 But the landowners have declined.

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 Right, and --- well, and we may not be able to do anything, although we're
13 recommending --- again, we may recommend, for some of these sites where
14 we're recommending some type of clearance or removal action, on a certain
15 property we may not be able to do it, because the property says ---

16 BY MR. HAMIL:

17 No.

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 --- "Get out of here."

20 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

21 We don't ---

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 So even though we've recommended clearance for a particular property
24 that we know that something is most likely there, we may not be able to
25 implement because the property owner tells us to get lost. So that's just the

1 nature of the beast, so, you know, getting back to what we said. You know, we
2 can't force the property owner to allow us to do anything on their property.

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 Well, I think it would, down the road, before all this is cleared up, the
5 land use control, whatever you're specifying, education, all that needs to be
6 spelled out very explicit, because I don't worry about you folks or the Corps in
7 the future. I worry about the County, Spartanburg County, the county
8 government instituting zoning, and then politicians looking at what we have here
9 and all the other information that they can retrieve and saying, "This is the
10 zoning classification we're putting on this 9,000 acres, 200 acres, 12,000,"
11 however many it is total, and then the property owners are stuck with it. Not
12 only do you have a problem with doing what you want to do, but you have a
13 problem getting it changed or anything done, because they have their teeth and
14 hands sunk into something that was totally different than what the intention
15 was when you were doing it.

16 BY MR. HERZOG:

17 Right.

18 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

19 So I would ask that make the land use control as explicit, clear, beyond
20 any doubt.

21 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

22 Okay.

23 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

24 In all your documents, and it will help our grandchildren. That's who is
25 going to help.

1 BY MR. HERZOG:

2 Right.

3 BY MR. HAMIL:

4 If you look on the back of page one, on the very back of page one about
5 midway down where it says, "Remedial alternative definitions," underneath it it
6 says, "Land Use Controls, Alternate --- Alternative 2." That is the definition
7 for land use controls.

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 For Camp Croft.

10 BY MR. HAMIL:

11 For Camp Croft.

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Right. The specific items of land use controls that have been
14 recommended for Camp Croft.

15 BY MR. HAMIL:

16 Correct. Thank you.

17 BY MR. HERZOG:

18 But in the political realm people see one magic word and sets their hair on
19 fire.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Well, we just --- we just --- we talked about the last 30 minutes about it,
22 right?

23 Yeah. So I understand what you're saying, and so our decision documents,
24 you know, it's in our documents. It was in the feasibility study as far as what
25 was recommended and that alternative. It was in the proposed plan, you know,

1 what we presented to the public last year, and it will be in the decision
2 documents as far as this wording right here.

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 I do have a question on your pricing when you're ready to get prices to do
5 this.

6 You mentioned a couple of different things. Pure bidding and RFPs. Do
7 you have an option to do an RFP as opposed to a straight bid?

8 BY MR. HAMIL:

9 Absolutely. We have, inside the Corps of Engineers we have a contracting
10 directorate, and in that contracting directorate, it's just nothing but
11 contracting folks, contracting officers and contract specialists that study
12 DFAR all day long, and they're the best that I've seen in the Department of
13 Defense hands down, because I've worked in different areas in the DoD myself,
14 and we have all different kinds of things that are available to us through them
15 that they present to us and say, "Here's the best way of going about getting
16 proposals."

17 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

18 Okay.

19 BY MR. HAMIL:

20 If that makes any sense at all.

21 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

22 Yeah, it makes sense.

23 BY MR. HAMIL:

24 Okay.

25 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

1 But tell them that from somebody who has done a lot of it on both sides
2 of it, forget an RFP. Put it out for a straight bid with a performance bond and
3 liquidated damages.

4 I'm off my soap box.

5 BY MR. HAMIL:

6 Okay.

7 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

8 Well, I think, Suzy, Gary, I think we've covered everything on the
9 decision documents and schedule.

10 BY MR. HAYES:

11 Ready to move on?

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Unless there's any further questions about it or discussion that you guys
14 want to have on it.

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 Okay. Any Old Business?

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 I don't think we had any action items previously or from the last RAB.

19 BY MR. HAYES:

20 Any munitions been reported?

21 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

22 I have not gotten any information or any calls. I don't know.

23 BY MR. HAYES:

24 Haven't heard anything?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Suzy, have you heard anything? Yes, so I haven't heard whether there
2 were any.

3 BY MR. HAYES:

4 Is the Sheriff's Department getting mailings for today for the meeting?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 I believe they do, right?

7 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

8 They did.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Yes, they do.

11 BY MR. HAYES:

12 Okay. RAB New Business Topics? Anybody want to bring up anything
13 they want to talk about next time?

14 BY MR. GOODWIN:

15 Gary, it's not a good thing, I guess it's maybe clarifying to help
16 particularly things back to John, but I knew you asked about for the RAB to
17 consider if you guys have a priority for what if you guys could choose what
18 project would you want to start first, second, you know, rank them as far as
19 funding became available, how, what's the best mechanism for them to convey
20 that back to you?

21 Because I would say, you know, if we wait until the next RAB meeting, ---

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 Yeah.

24 BY MR. GOODWIN:

25 --- we don't honestly know when that actually is.

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Right. You know, phone.

3 BY MR. GOODWIN:

4 Email?

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 I guess email. Yeah, either way, whatever is preferable for you guys. As
7 far as any --- Kent was talking about feedback on prioritization. If you all felt,
8 you know, you all --- you all live here in the community, so you obviously have
9 probably more insight into specific areas that we've recommended for
10 clearance. So I'd like to solicit, you know, feedback from you all on maybe, you
11 know, what should the priority be from the community. What does the
12 community feel, as far as what areas? You know, if we can get, if we can only
13 maybe get two of these munitions response sites awarded in a year, you know,
14 which two would you --- what order would you want to put these?

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 Well, I think we need to start at the State Park somewhere and try to
17 get ---

18 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

19 Well, and that's what I want you guys, you know, think about it or
20 whatever and shoot me an email if you have ---

21 BY MR. HAYES:

22 But with that --- but with that it's got to be scheduled on the time of
23 year and what they're going to be using and their peak periods, because they're
24 depending on their money coming in.

25 BY MR. HERZOG:

1 Is there any prohibition from us getting together informally out there?

2 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

3 No.

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Not at all.

6 BY MR. HERZOG:

7 At the park ranger's place and say, "Here are the maps."

8 Are you with the park system with John ---

9 BY MR. GOODWIN:

10 Yes, sir.

11 BY MR. HERZOG:

12 --- Moon's office?

13 BY MR. GOODWIN:

14 Yeah, I work with John.

15 BY MR. HAYES:

16 This is Woody.

17 BY MR. HERZOG:

18 Okay. He's going to need a bunch of these maps so that he can ---

19 BY MR. GOODWIN:

20 I'll take them to him.

21 BY MR. HERZOG:

22 Yeah.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Jim, we had ---

25 BY MR. HERZOG:

1 I think we should go out there, and physically go there, because these
2 guys live out there. I don't live out there. Any members of the community that
3 want to come out ---

4 BY MR. HAYES:

5 Woody and John know the park like the back of their hand.

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 I'll let you all know this. I have a similar situation with what Terry was
8 talking about. I've got another Formerly Used Defense Site Project that I
9 worked up in North Carolina, Camp Butner, which is north of the
10 Raleigh/Durham area where we had identified similar to this, about six, seven
11 different munitions response sites where we were doing a two-acre clearance
12 around each residential structure to give them some immediate protection, and
13 so this was back in the mid-2000s, and we had a Restoration Advisory Board for
14 the Camp Butner Project, and we had asked several of the board members if
15 they would meet outside of the RAB and discuss a prioritization on what they
16 felt, and so they --- you know, they came up with sort of, you know, a matrix
17 based on this area is highly residential or whatever, and so they developed their
18 priority and they provided it to us, and we were able to sort of implement that
19 into our process as far as what we awarded to be done first, and that's simply
20 all I'm asking is if you all had some thoughts about, you know, what the priority
21 should be.

22 You know, you're certainly welcome to discuss it outside the RAB, and,
23 like I said, just give me the feedback that you all may have and we would
24 definitely like to incorporate it.

25 BY MR. HAYES:

1 Well, it's real tricky, because you don't know when money will be awarded.
2 If we recommend like around the lake and the campsites, then the money comes
3 in right at the peak, we'll probably have to do optional things, and how are you
4 going to get the money for optional things?

5 BY MR. HERZOG:

6 It's probably going to be a crap shoot anyway.

7 BY MR. KRIEG:

8 Well, I think that's a little bit, just because when the money becomes
9 available, it's not like, "All right. We're going out tomorrow to do the cleaning."
10 There's still a process. There's a work plan that's going to have be created.

11 BY MS. CANTOR-MCKINNEY:

12 Right of entries.

13 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

14 Yeah.

15 BY MR. KRIEG:

16 Yeah, there's still that. That's where Ray was talking about even if
17 there's funding next year for a project, the actual work being out in the field
18 might not happen for another year or two.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Right. Right.

21 BY MR. KRIEG:

22 That's one of those, even if funding comes in peak time for the State
23 Park, there's a work plan that we can --- you know, that's part of the work plan
24 is making sure, "Hey, when do we implement this?"

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Yeah.

2 BY MR. KRIEG:

3 You know, it might --- depending on where you are, not for State Park,
4 but, you know, the rainy season isn't necessarily always the best time to go out
5 and do field work because your field guys aren't going to be out doing work.
6 You're going to paying them for sitting, and so they frequently work around
7 schedules, you know. I mean in South Carolina it's hot. You know, you're not
8 going to do a lot of field work in July and August.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Well, we just did, we have another --- Kent is familiar with it, and Terry
11 will be, too. He's just joined the team. We have a project, a Formerly Used
12 Defense Site Project out in the Myrtle Beach area called the Conway Bombing
13 and Gunnery Range, and so there are several golf courses out there.

14 BY MR. HAMIL:

15 Right.

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 You know, near the beach. So we just completed the remedial
18 investigation at that project last year, and so when they were doing the field
19 work, you know, there was a lot of coordination that had to be done with
20 property owners as far as time of year, things of that nature. We did several
21 transects on golf courses there. So that was a lot of coordination that had to
22 be done with the property owners. You know, it kind of --- again, it comes back
23 to we can't force a property owner, you know, to allow us to do anything.
24 They've got to give us permission, and our contractor is always going to
25 coordinate the work so they're not impacting the property owner, and, you know,

1 we're trying to schedule it during off-season or --- you know, the process that
2 Kent was talking about, you know, there's going to be a work plan. The type of
3 work that we're recommending being done, this advanced classification, you
4 know, that's just all mapping. There's no intrusive work associated with that.
5 So they could be out there, and there's probably --- I don't know if there's any
6 evacuation distance associated with it, because all they're doing is just running
7 the equipment on it. So there's no real impact to it.

8 It's when they come to the intrusive work that's, you know, that's when a
9 lot of coordination will have to be done, but in all of our projects we're always
10 coordinating with the property owner to try to do, you know, as least of an
11 impact as we can on, you know, if it's a business, their operations or whatever
12 have you, so.

13 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

14 Well, what'd I recommend on the prioritization is base it on threat.

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 Right. Right. Well, and so if you all want to, you know, the documents are
17 available online. If you all want to look at them, you know, we've got the MEC
18 hazard assessment that was done, if you all want to look at that. The land use.
19 Those are certainly things that we will take into account, obviously, when
20 prioritizing the work. So, again, I was just throwing that out there for the
21 RAB, if you all want to have any feedback on it that we can incorporate,
22 certainly.

23 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

24 When you look at this map here, the first one, when you look at it, you
25 see where the threat is.

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 As far as the areas that we've identified for clearance?

3 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

4 Yeah.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Right.

7 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

8 You've already identified the area.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 But amongst those areas there are some that may stand out more than
11 others as far as prioritization.

12 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

13 But you have limited funds each year to work with, and you work from a
14 prioritization list of threat, then you're going to be helping the property owner,
15 as well as the general public.

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 Right.

18 BY COLONEL GOSSETT:

19 Now I realize the State Park is important, but there's 7,000 acres out
20 there, and somebody else has got 200 acres and they have an incident rate of
21 105 millimeters falling in there at maybe 10 or 15 an hour, it's a high threat.

22 Now that property owner, I know who that one is back there. He knew it
23 when he bought it, but he still --- you know, he's still been raising hell ever
24 since.

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 So, you know, those are things that we will certainly take into account
2 when we're prioritizing the work as far as fiscal year putting in our work plan.
3 Again, I just wanted to throw that out there for the RAB to consider, and,
4 obviously, we would incorporate any feedback that we get from the RAB.

5 BY MR. HERZOG:

6 I move we adjourn.

7 BY MR. HAYES:

8 Second.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 The only thing I would say, Gary, is we will be in touch as far as,
11 obviously, as far as RAB, I guess our next scheduled meeting would be?

12 BY MR. HAYES:

13 August.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 August. Is that right?

16 August. Okay.

17 BY MR. HAYES:

18 Yeah.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 We will certainly let you guys know where we are with the decision
21 documents as far as staffing them and how they're going through the process,
22 and I'll communicate with you as far as, you know, whether we feel we need to
23 have a meeting then to provide you an update and it may not be much or maybe
24 just a --- you know, all we may need is just an email to you all to let you know
25 where we are.

1 BY MR. HAYES:

2 Well, I think the most traffic in the public will be on the State Park, and
3 private property doesn't have that much traffic. So I think the biggest threat,
4 especially, what, Woody, around the lake there and the campgrounds, didn't
5 they --- the horse trails and things like that, and it's continuous use year round.

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Right.

8 BY MR. HAYES:

9 But it's public property. It belongs to the people of the State. So I
10 think a lot of that will --- if we get that cleaned up, it will help more people
11 sooner. At least we'll know where we're going and what we've got, but I think
12 before some of those places cleaned up before, things are showing up on there
13 again, but that will work, and we'll be back in August.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 All right. Thanks, everybody.

16 (MEETING CONCLUDED AT APPROXIMATELY 8:00 P.M.)

1 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
) CERTIFICATE
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

This is to certify that the within meeting was taken on
the 4th day of May, 2017;

That the foregoing is an accurate transcript of the
meeting;

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
on this copy at Spartanburg, South Carolina, this 6th day of
June, 2017.

s/ Sandra Satterwhite
Sandra Satterwhite
Notary Public for South Carolina
My Commission Expires: 3/8/27

(SEAL)