

00001

01 CAMP CROFT RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
01 \*\*\*\*\*  
02  
02 PLACE: SC School for the Deaf and the Blind  
03 Swearingen Conference Center  
03  
04 DATE: Tuesday, May 9, 2000  
04  
05 TIME: 7:05 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.  
05  
06 PRESENTATION  
06 GIVEN BY: Ronald Nesbit, Jr.  
07 Project Manager  
07 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
08 Charleston District  
08  
09 BOARD MEMBERS  
09 PRESENT:  
10 Clary H. Smith, Chair  
10 Joseph L. Crissinger  
11 Gary Hayes  
11 William B. Littlejohn, Jr.  
12 W. Brownlee Lowry  
12 David Mullinax  
13 George D. Mullinax  
13 Gerard Perry  
14 Robert W. Powell, Jr.  
14 Sanford N. Smith  
15 Stonewall J. Stewart, Jr.  
15 Sherry Wheeler  
16  
16 BOARD MEMBERS  
17 NOT PRESENT:  
17 Conley McIntyre, Sr.  
18 Darwin J. Wilson  
18  
19 ALSO PRESENT:  
19 Suzy McKinney  
20 Zapata Engineering, P.A.  
20 1100 Kenilworth Avenue, Suite 104  
21 Charlotte, North Carolina 28204  
21  
22 REPORTED BY:  
22 Sandy Satterwhite Reporting  
23 P.O. Box 742  
23 Roebuck, South Carolina 29376  
24 (864)574-1455

00002

01 INDEX

02 Welcome by Mr. Clary H. Smith. . . . . 3  
03 Review of OE Project Process . . . . . 3  
04 Status of Water Samples. . . . . .14  
05 Status of OE Responses . . . . . .15  
06 Status of Removal Actions. . . . . .16  
07 New Business . . . . . .21  
08 Closing Remarks. . . . . .24  
09 Certificate of Reporter. . . . . .28

00003

01 BY MR. SMITH:  
02 The meeting will come to order now, and I  
03 appreciate you all coming to our regular meeting.  
04 And one thing I would like to emphasize, make  
05 sure you state your name if you speak so that the

06 recorder can get the list.

07 So, we just welcome you to our meeting tonight,  
08 and now we'll just turn it over to Sissy and let her  
09 carry on.

10 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

11 Okay. Thank you.

12 What I would like to do this evening before we  
13 get started is to review the ordnance project process  
14 just to give everybody again that background for what  
15 it takes to get a project funded and the approach to  
16 an actual risk reduction alternative implementation to  
17 actually get these formerly used defense sites cleaned  
18 up.

19 And this just gets everybody back on the same  
20 playing field as far as information, and we have a  
21 handout that everyone should have: The Ordnance  
22 Project Flow. And most of you, if not all of you,  
23 approached this at some point over the last several  
24 years, and I will just briefly go through this and you  
25 can read it on your own. If you have questions later,  
00004

01 we can review those.

02 We'll probably go through the steps, the main,  
03 the driving factor through this process in reducing  
04 the risk of the public encounter in ordnance or  
05 unexploded ordnance. So risk, risk reduction is the  
06 primary goal of this project and this process, and we  
07 need to keep that in mind.

08 What presents a risk, it's the opportunity for  
09 an individual to find a piece of ordnance and what  
10 that consequence would be; and you'll see how that  
11 factors in as we walk through these steps.

12 Risk, briefly, before I go any further is  
13 dependent upon the past land use, the access to those  
14 areas, what those areas were used for. Was it a  
15 cantonment area? Was it a firing range, a fan? Was  
16 it a buffer area? All of those. Was it a bombing  
17 target? All of those and an individual's availability  
18 or access to that all plays into evaluating the risk  
19 that that area poses.

20 So let's go ahead and go through these steps  
21 briefly. The first step is the project identification  
22 and historical review. Before a project even is  
23 identified for funding through the Army, an evaluation  
24 and an assessment of the site is conducted. And the  
25 Army submits to Headquarters request for funding,  
00005

01 again, based on the risk that site poses; and this was  
02 done for Croft many, many, many years ago. We've been  
03 out for five years. So this process was initiated in  
04 the early '90s.

05 Once that occurs, then what's called an archive  
06 search report is prepared. These reports for Croft  
07 are in the library for your review and it compiles all  
08 of the historical data, the fan range maps, Mr.  
09 DuBeau, that you were asking about, historical  
10 interviews, site visits that have been conducted up to  
11 the point of that report development. So it pulls  
12 together all the historical perspective of this site.

13 Funding is approved. These are sites such as  
14 Croft. These are formerly used defense sites.  
15 Funding is approved through Congress and allocated  
16 through the Districts; and, obviously, as we are all  
17 here and have been for the last five years, Croft has  
18 been funded. The Board and the community have been

19 active and effective in requesting even additional  
20 funds through those years for these alternatives to be  
21 implemented and the additional site characterizations.

22 Keep in mind that as we go through the process,  
23 again risk driven, it's very systematic. It's very  
24 logical in a progression of activities and efforts  
25 that go through the ultimate cleanup of a site such as

00006

01 this.

02 At any point where there is an immediate threat  
03 to the public, a Time Critical Removal Action is  
04 implemented. So, just because a site characterization  
05 is under way, if there's a threat right there, it  
06 doesn't mean that the Army waits to respond to that.

07 There have been two Time Critical Removal  
08 Actions conducted at Croft, and we'll get to the  
09 timing of those in a moment.

10 So the characterization actually is part of what  
11 is called an Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis,  
12 and I know you've heard those terms, the EE/CA. There  
13 have been two EE/CAs prepared for this project, and  
14 what that does is sets out a process and a procedure  
15 to collect the data in a systematic method based upon  
16 the risk at certain areas within this former camp  
17 posed to the public.

18 Data is collected geophysically. It's mapped.  
19 I think we've presented over the years pictures of  
20 some of the equipment that was used to detect  
21 subsurface metal. All of that data is evaluated and  
22 presented. The community and the RAB both had  
23 opportunities to review and comment on those draft  
24 documents before they had come final.

25 As part of that characterization, we then take

00007

01 all of that data, we, the Army, the contractors  
02 working on the site, and public input, evaluate then  
03 where the sampling would take place based upon the  
04 data that's collected and the sampling and the  
05 findings of those samplings, then risk reduction  
06 alternatives are presented. Risk reduction  
07 alternatives, again, being what based upon past,  
08 current and future land use is going to be technically  
09 feasible and cost effective and have the biggest  
10 impact to reduce risks based upon the ordnance that  
11 has been characterized for those areas; and cost  
12 analysis is a very important part of that because  
13 these projects are driven by available funds.  
14 Foremost, however, is risk reduction and keeping the  
15 public safe.

16 So the risk reduction alternatives are presented  
17 in this Engineering Evaluation, again, for comment on  
18 by the public, and for that we look at primarily  
19 current land use and projected future land use.

20 What we want to do is, again, in areas that are  
21 not accessible by the public, we know that they're not  
22 going to be developed, an institutional control might  
23 be an effective risk reduction alternative.

24 We might not need to go in there and dig those  
25 areas, but maybe a fence, signs, education and public

00008

01 awareness to let people know if per chance they would  
02 be in that area what the risk is, and if you find  
03 something, don't touch it.

04 On the other end of the spectrum is in an area  
05 that is highly populated slated for development, those

06 areas would most likely warrant a clearance to a  
07 certain depth for that land use. We want to get down  
08 and remove everything that would pose a risk to  
09 developers, individuals in their yards.

10 So you have a range of alternatives that may  
11 apply, multiple alternatives that might apply to any  
12 given site, and at Croft we have had signs and fences  
13 within the Park, institutional controls. We've had  
14 clearance to depths to support development or the land  
15 use that's intended for an area, and we've had surface  
16 clearances in areas where there's anticipated to be no  
17 digging; and all of those are evaluated, again, to  
18 protect the risk based upon access and the public to  
19 those areas encountering an ordnance.

20 At the end of a project, and we're not there yet  
21 for Croft, is a reoccurring review, which I believe  
22 the time frame can slide -- and I'm thinking it's a  
23 five year review but it might actually be shorter than  
24 that -- where the Army will come in and evaluate the  
25 effectiveness of those controls.

00009

01 If we posted signs and a fence and people are  
02 still getting in or there are items found in an area,  
03 then maybe that control didn't work, and that area  
04 would need to be evaluated for additional controls to  
05 be implemented.

06 If an area was cleared for a surface clearance  
07 and five years down the line an unanticipated land use  
08 occurs, it was not thought of, maybe that's an  
09 opportunity to go back in and re-evaluate that  
10 alternative to ensure the safety of the public.

11 So I know you've heard this before. Again, I  
12 just wanted to review the process. It's driven by  
13 risk. It's driven by a very systematic -- you can't  
14 be spending dollars, running and jumping all around in  
15 this 19,000 acre site without a plan; and the plan is  
16 to look at the highest areas with the highest density  
17 of suspected ordnance and the greatest access by the  
18 public to come across those ordnance.

19 That's not to say that all the areas are written  
20 off and that there will not be any action or  
21 consideration. It might mean it might take a few more  
22 years to get to those areas with the appropriate  
23 characterization and then implementation of a  
24 response.

25 So the other side of your handout there's a

00010

01 time line of where we've been, how far we've come --  
02 and I ran out of space on where we're going -- for the  
03 efforts over the past several years.

04 Again, the archive search report was completed  
05 in '93, and it is in the library. A supplemental  
06 archive search report was also published -- and I  
07 don't think I have it in here -- I believe in the '95  
08 - '96 time frame, and it's also in the library for  
09 review.

10 As I mentioned early in the project, we did have  
11 two Time Critical Removal Actions based upon the  
12 ordnance and likely encounters by the public. The  
13 Corps was glad there were only two events. There was  
14 a quick turnaround efforts as opposed to having to do  
15 a site characterization and a full blown evaluations  
16 to get in there and address that concern. One was  
17 conducted on Dr. Lowry's property. They cleared  
18 surface clearance 15 acres, and I've listed in the

19 first green box in the middle row what items were  
20 found during that surface clearance, again, to remove  
21 any immediate risks; and approximately 50 acres were  
22 cleared in what we call OOU7 within the Park and the  
23 items that were found are listed.

24 Then the EE/CA phase, the first EE/CA for this  
25 site, began in '96, and that started with work plan

00011

01 development, identifying areas to be mapped based upon  
02 the past land use and where we're going with those  
03 areas, the access or accessibility by the public. All  
04 that evaluation was completed in late '96 to early  
05 '97. The removal action phase of that began, and this  
06 is where we addressed the remainder of OOU7, OOU1B,  
07 OOU2, OOU3, which is Wedgewood, and the horse trails.

08 And you can see the acreage that was addressed  
09 and whether it was a surface clearance or a clearance  
10 to a specified depth and the items that have been  
11 found. And if you note, not only are items are found  
12 but an awful lot of scrap is found, and that scrap  
13 just adds to the amount of level of effort and the  
14 time in the field that the ordnance crews need to  
15 process. So that definitely adds time, and if you're  
16 digging down to two feet, it's a significant level of  
17 effort. And, again, those depths of clearance were  
18 based upon the intended land use in those areas. The  
19 horse trails, we're not intending anybody to get off  
20 the horse and dig, so we're not intending to have  
21 anything below two feet cause a problem to individuals  
22 in those areas.

23 Then we moved over to an engineering design for  
24 OOU6, which is Dr. Lowry's property, and the removal  
25 action has been ongoing over there for a series of

00012

01 years off and on based upon, again, items found, the  
02 terrain, funding restraints and his anticipated land  
03 use for certain areas on his property.

04 The items in the blue box listed under OOU6 in  
05 1998 are only current as of about six to eight months  
06 ago, so I do not have a current accounting of what has  
07 been removed from Dr. Lowry's property within the last  
08 six to eight months.

09 Then based upon the supplemental archive search  
10 report it was determined that Wedgewood, OOU3, which  
11 was evaluated in '97 required a re-evaluation based  
12 upon additional information and concerns that had been  
13 brought forth; and that instigated a geophysical  
14 investigation last summer in Wedgewood, looking at all  
15 26-some properties in that neighborhood, and now the  
16 subsequent removal actions that are under way today,  
17 and I'll give you a status of where we are with  
18 Wedgewood in a few minutes.

19 So this, again, I wanted to present to show that  
20 it has been five years. It's been a long five years,  
21 but a lot has transpired. A lot of alternatives have  
22 been placed, and there is always a response in the  
23 event that is something is found. Again, the reminder  
24 to call Rick Renta of the Sheriff's Department at 911,  
25 and dependent upon the item and the location, if the

00013

01 need for a Time Critical Removal Action is necessary,  
02 again, a response by the government and the Army to  
03 respond quickly.

04 So, to date over 700 acres have been addressed.  
05 Over 700 items have been identified and recovered and

06 destroyed in an appropriate manner, and 16,000-plus  
07 pounds of scrap have been recovered, and that list  
08 grows as our actions continue; and, again, we are not  
09 complete.

10 There are several areas beyond the main firing  
11 lines that are still slated for investigation. So, as  
12 presented today, that doesn't mean that we're done and  
13 no additional characterization is going to take place.  
14 Again, it's a phased in approach.

15 So I wanted to bring everybody kind of current  
16 on the process, and, again, what drives the process,  
17 and I think Karl and Ron will be here for a few more  
18 years and we'll all be here or at least available for  
19 questions.

20 BY DR. POWELL:

21 Suzy, what costs so far, please, ma'am?

22 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

23 What is the cost?

24 BY DR. POWELL:

25 So far in round figures.

00014

01 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

02 Between ten and twelve.

03 BY MR. NESBIT:

04 Between \$10 to \$12 mill so far.

05 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

06 Approximately \$12 Million Dollars.

07 BY MR. NESBIT:

08 Approximately \$12 Million has been spent so far.

09 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

10 And that includes the report preparations, the  
11 work plans, the geophysical investigations, the data  
12 analysis, the Time Critical Removal Actions, and the  
13 actual site prep and intrusive investigations.

14 BY MR. NESBIT:

15 Right.

16 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

17 Okay.

18 Moving on to our next handout, one question was  
19 raised at the last meeting about the status of the  
20 water quality in the two lakes in the former Camp  
21 Croft area and Croft State Park.

22 And I had contacted DHEC, and the first section  
23 on this handout, water samples were collected from two  
24 of their stream monitoring stations in 1997, in  
25 February. One was at the head waters at McFadden Road

00015

01 and Kelsey Creek where it enters Lake Craig; and the  
02 other sampling station was at Johnson Lake Road and  
03 Thompson Creek before the creek enters into Lake  
04 Johnson.

05 The water, the surface water, creek water was  
06 analyzed for lead and volatile organic compounds, and  
07 those volatile organic compounds include petroleum  
08 products, what you might find from moving underground  
09 storage tanks, gasoline components; and lead was also  
10 a concern raised by individuals in the past.

11 All of the analytical results, and I've attached  
12 those for you, were below detection limits, below  
13 laboratory detection limits, which are -- those  
14 detection limits are significantly lower than levels  
15 of concern for hazardous materials.

16 So, as you can see, those water samples were  
17 clean and free of contaminants based on this analysis.

18 So I wanted to bring that to closure based on a

19 comment that was raised in the last meeting.  
20 BY MR. NESBIT:  
21 Okay.  
22 BY MS. MCKINNEY:  
23 And another comment that was raised or question  
24 raised during our last meeting was the responses.  
25 Rick Renta with the Sheriff's Department, the

00016

01 ordnance, over the past several years, and he had  
02 provided me with the following information that from  
03 1996 through approximately a month to two months ago  
04 they had received 43 calls to respond to ordnance. 48  
05 items were collected and disposed of according to  
06 standard procedures, safely disposed of. 12 of those  
07 48 items were live, and I've provided you a list of  
08 what items they did respond to.

09 Hopefully, that answers some of the questions  
10 that have been lingering for the past several  
11 meetings.

12 BY MR. NESBIT:

13 All right.

14 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

15 To move on to the next agenda item is the status  
16 of the current efforts that are under way in Wedgewood  
17 and on Dr. Lowry's property, OOU6.

18 I'll go ahead and give you a status of  
19 Wedgewood. The data was collected on the parcels  
20 geophysical data last summer through fall. Data was  
21 re-evaluated over the winter. The teams began  
22 digging, I guess, in March of this year. We had some  
23 down time for a couple of weeks to re-evaluate the  
24 data and the productivity rate and the approach to  
25 responding to those items and that removal action.

00017

01 About four weeks ago we started back up, about  
02 four weeks ago, and to date -- out of the parcels in  
03 that neighborhood, Wedgewood Drive and Wedgewood Place  
04 -- eight properties have been completely evaluated  
05 with all of the quality control -- QA and QC.

06 BY MR. SLOVAK:

07 Quality ---

08 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

09 I -- I know, Mike. QA and QC checks, all the  
10 back checks completed, so we have eight properties  
11 that have been totally evaluated.

12 We have six properties that are either -- have  
13 undergone the removal and we're waiting for QA and QC  
14 or are being flagged to be ready to do within the next  
15 one to two weeks. So we have six more being primed  
16 for the next several weeks.

17 We're averaging three to four days per property  
18 to dig and to maintain the safety restrictions and the  
19 controls that are required in a residential area.

20 Approximately 10 to 12 properties still either  
21 require mapping or are fringes to the golf course that  
22 need to be coordinated with that golf course schedule  
23 to get in there and conduct those investigations and  
24 just remaining properties that we're systematically  
25 working through the neighborhood.

00018

01 As far as the status on where we are with Dr.  
02 Lowry's property, approximately four acres that are  
03 remaining to be addressed for OOU6, and the Corps of  
04 Engineers has requested approval to use a remote  
05 control bulldozer and loader to remove the top one

06 foot of soil; and what that will do is this area is  
07 very heavy with frag and scrap, and it's masking  
08 anything that might be below it and it's very tedious  
09 and time consuming and costly to excavate, so they are  
10 requesting approval to go in, take all of that off and  
11 then be able to evaluate any remaining items on those  
12 four acres. So right now we're waiting approval for  
13 that process.

14 And that's where we are with the removal actions  
15 to date. I did want to make a note that the  
16 Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board, DDESB,  
17 has requested and invited themselves to come visit us  
18 on May 31st for a thorough review and evaluation of  
19 all the safety procedures that have been in place  
20 throughout this project. And they have not selected  
21 this project because of any wrongdoings or incidents  
22 that have occurred. They randomly selected -- looked  
23 at all the ongoing projects, and selected  
24 approximately two per year project sites that they  
25 come out and visit.

00019

01 So they will be out here on May 31st, and we'll  
02 have a briefing with them and take them on a tour of  
03 all the areas that have been addressed. So I just  
04 wanted to make you aware of that, that will be  
05 occurring at the end of the month.

06 And I believe that's all I have on my agenda to  
07 talk to.

08 Does anybody have any questions?

09 BY MR. HAYES:

10 How much money is left in the budget for this  
11 year?

12 BY MR. NESBIT:

13 When you ---

14 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

15 Ron.

16 BY MR. NESBIT:

17 When you ask the question about budget for this  
18 year, you've got to put that in somewhat of certain  
19 parameters. Okay.

20 Money that has been awarded for work to be done  
21 for this fiscal year is set and has already been  
22 awarded. So work will continue throughout this year,  
23 this fiscal year.

24 Now come next fiscal year, which begins in  
25 October, funding has not yet been approved for what

00020

01 Croft will get. And I might as well mention now to  
02 everyone, if funding limits for the environmental  
03 ordnance program is on a down swing -- in other words,  
04 this past year there were \$200 -- around \$256 -- 58  
05 Million Dollars approved for FUDS and HRW type  
06 projects. This coming fiscal year it's going to drop  
07 to around \$186 Million and that's for the entire  
08 program.

09 Now, what does that mean for us here at Croft?

10 It means that there is potential that the amount of  
11 money that we typically get will be reduced. Where we  
12 were getting something to the tune of approximately \$1  
13 Million Dollars for Charleston District, which  
14 included Croft, and Croft is one of the larger  
15 projects that we've got going on, it may mean that we  
16 will get that same amount because of the prior need we  
17 currently have, then again it may drop a little. And  
18 if it does drop, all that really means is that it will

19 take longer for us to complete the project overall.  
20 It's not that we will be pulling out or that we won't  
21 be doing anything on the site. Any project that's  
22 already been started, work will continue, maybe not as  
23 much as we had initially programmed on that given  
24 year, but work will continue and we will continue to  
25 make progress.

00021

01 BY MR. HAYES:

02 Well, is there -- is there enough money in the  
03 budget left over from this year to finish Wedgewood?

04 BY MR. NESBIT:

05 Wedgewood is scheduled to be finished this year,  
06 yes. That will happen.

07 BY MR. HAYES:

08 Will there be extra funds?

09 BY MR. NESBIT:

10 To go over into the next year? That's hard to  
11 say because we've been in Wedgewood already longer or  
12 it's projected to be longer than what we have  
13 initially planned. So we feel very confident that  
14 we're going to finish Wedgewood this year without a  
15 doubt. As to whether or not we'll be ever to carry  
16 over into the next fiscal year, is a question to start  
17 on something else.

18 So the answer to your question, that's still up  
19 in the air somewhere.

20 Any other questions about funding?

21 (NO RESPONSE)

22 BY MR. SMITH:

23 Do we have any new business?

24 I don't know of any.

25 BY MR. OSBORNE:

00022

01 Could I ask a question? Harold Osborne.

02 On -- I talked two homeowners on Wedgewood  
03 Monday morning, and the digging that they had done the  
04 following week or earlier that other week, nobody has  
05 come and told them anything yet. When are you going  
06 to go tell them?

07 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

08 When their individual parcels are totally  
09 complete, and when the whole neighborhood is  
10 completed.

11 We're in constant contact with the neighbors and  
12 the residents on a weekly basis, and they all have our  
13 number to call, 800 number, for information.

14 BY MR. OSBORNE:

15 Well, they were on his property last week. They  
16 dug all these hills, made blue marks on his ground and  
17 so forth. He was getting ready to go out and mow his  
18 grass, and he said, "Nobody told me anything."

19 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

20 Well, when -- I'm not sure whose property and  
21 who you talked to, but when that is totally QC, QA and  
22 they're out of that area, and I think we agreed once  
23 the entire neighborhood was complete, all homeowners  
24 will get a listing of the items found.

25 BY MR. NESBIT:

00023

01 One other point I might mention about that as  
02 well. There was a meeting held just last night  
03 between the Corps and the residents of Wedgewood to  
04 give them the status of what's been going on, what  
05 they can expect in terms of how much longer it's going

06 to take, as well as to the kind -- to try to find out  
07 the kind of difficulties they have encountered and/or  
08 anything that they needed to talk to us about, as  
09 well. And the conclusion of that meeting, from what I  
10 understand, was very positive. It didn't appear that  
11 there were any serious problems or that people were  
12 being put in situations that they could not deal with;  
13 and, in fact, things, they felt, were going very well.  
14 So, hopefully, that continues throughout.

15 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

16 Karl, did you have a comment?

17 BY MR. BLANKINSHIP:

18 No.

19 BY MS. MCKINNEY:

20 If those individuals want to contact me, nobody  
21 raised questions that were at the meeting last night  
22 We have an open line of communication. So that's not  
23 being raised directly in any of those residents.

24 BY MR. SMITH:

25 If there's no other new business, I believe Ron

00024

01 has something he wants to say.

02 BY MR. NESBIT:

03 Well, actually, I've already covered most of it.  
04 However, there's a couple of things that I do want to  
05 mention.

06 Since the existence of RAB, the Board, RAB  
07 Board, especially the members that are here tonight,  
08 the great majority of them, have served two terms and  
09 have gracefully accepted to serve an additional term  
10 now.

11 The Board itself was to be in existence for two  
12 years, I believe, and -- the term of the Board,  
13 rather, is for two years; and as of this past  
14 December, that was the two year term. And because of  
15 members and the interest of the participants on the  
16 Board, we requested, and it was gracefully accepted by  
17 the Board members, to continue on on the Board.

18 What I then did was to talk to our Commander at  
19 the Charleston District. You have not met him to  
20 date. I plan sometime in the not too distant future  
21 to try to bring him to one of the next meetings -- not  
22 the next one, but one of the future RAB meetings so  
23 you'll have an opportunity to meet him. His name is  
24 Colonel Mark Held. In fact, he mentioned to me just  
25 before leaving yesterday that he wanted the

00025

01 opportunity to come and actually be at one of the  
02 RAB meetings here. He has an additional -- well, one  
03 more year left at Charleston, and I plan for him to  
04 come here and meet with you at least once before he  
05 leaves. So, I will be working in that direction to  
06 try to make that happen.

07 Having said that, he did sign some Certificates  
08 that I brought back with me, and I believe Patty is  
09 going to pass them out. Would you, please?

10 And they're just a means of appreciation from  
11 the Charleston District and from all of us that  
12 participate with this project. When I say the  
13 Charleston District, I'm actually saying the Corps of  
14 Engineers in a whole, because Huntsville is an  
15 integral part of this whole operation, and Zapata, of  
16 course, helps us out tremendously, even though their  
17 name is not on it.

18 (OFF THE RECORD)

19 BY MR. NESBIT:  
 20 But, in any case, these are just being passed  
 21 out to show his appreciation. Thank you.  
 22 BY MR. SMITH:  
 23 Thank you, Ron. We appreciate this.  
 24 I don't know of anything else to come up to  
 25 bring to us.

00026

01 BY MS. MCKINNEY:  
 02 Our -- I'll go ahead and announce our next  
 03 meeting, unless we feel the need to meet sooner, it  
 04 should be about the same time that we'll be completing  
 05 Wedgewood and have the results to present. It will be  
 06 in another three months, August, and we'll send out  
 07 meeting fliers.  
 08 Again, copies of the transcript, as always, will  
 09 be available in the library in the next three to four  
 10 weeks.  
 11 BY DR. POWELL:  
 12 Is the date set?  
 13 BY MS. MCKINNEY:  
 14 The second Tuesday, unless it falls near a  
 15 holiday.  
 16 BY DR. POWELL:  
 17 The second Tuesday.  
 18 BY MR. SMITH:  
 19 If there's nothing else, do I hear a motion?  
 20 BY MR. HAYES:  
 21 Motion to adjourn.  
 22 BY MR. LITTLEJOHN:  
 23 Second.  
 24 BY MR. SMITH:  
 25 So move.

00027

01 BY MR. NESBIT:  
 02 Thanks, everyone, for coming out. We really  
 03 appreciate it.  
 04 (MEETING CONCLUDED AT 7:35 P.M.)

00028

01 STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 01 ) CERTIFICATE  
 02 COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG )  
 02  
 03  
 04

05 This is to certify that the within deposition  
 06 was taken on the 9th day of May, 2000;  
 07 That the within deponent was duly sworn to tell  
 08 the truth and that the foregoing is an accurate  
 09 transcript of the testimony given under oath;  
 10 That copies of all exhibits, if any, entered  
 11 herein are attached hereto and made a part of this  
 12 record;  
 13 That the undersigned court reporter, a Notary  
 14 Public for the State of South Carolina, is not an  
 15 employee or relative of any of the parties, counsel or  
 16 witness and is in no manner interested in the outcome  
 17 of this action.  
 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my Hand  
 19 and Seal at Spartanburg, South Carolina, this 25th day  
 20 of May, 2000.  
 21  
 22  
 22

23  
23  
24  
24  
25

(SEAL)

---

Notary Public for South Carolina  
Commission Expires: 3/24/07