

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

A public hearing of the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held at the Jennings County Public Library, North Vernon, IN at 7:00 P.M. on October 4, 2000.

OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. I'm going to ask everybody to take a seat please. You can sign in now or sign in before you leave so we can get an accurate attendance record. I would appreciate it and we will get started. I would like to welcome everyone to the JPG Restoration Advisory Board meeting for October. Would encourage everyone to sign the attendance sheet. We have a copy of the slides I'll be showing tonight. They will also be provided in mailing to the RAB members and will also go in the Administrative Record at Hanover College. So if you either don't get a copy or want to tell anybody who's interested they can always go there. There's always copies at the Proving Ground with the site staff and Mr. Knouf also has copies. I'm Paul Cloud. I work for the United States Army. I'm dual hatted. For the Proving Ground I'm in charge of the Environmental Restoration of the Proving Ground and I'm also

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

the Community Omnibus man for Reuse of the facility by the Office of Secretary of Defense Base Transition Office. It's a job I gladly assumed the mantle from Mr. Hudson via Mr. Early and it's proved to be quite a challenge. Anyway I welcome everyone here. I don't have any other opening remarks. Richard Hill is the Community Co-chair for the RAB. Richard do you have anything you would like to say?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Thank you Paul. Good evening. Good to see everybody out on this dark and stormy night. And that's really all that I have.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. Let me go to the next slide. It basically shows our agenda. We'll talk about the Western parcel on the Proving Ground as far as UXO clearance where

1
2 that particular effort stands. We'll talk about some
3 Findings of Suitability to Transfer their status. We'll
4 talk, actually the Corps of Engineers, Mr. Brooks Evens is
5 here from the Corps of Engineers Louisville District. He'll
6 talk and give an update on status of some removal actions we
7 have recently performed with the coordination and
8 cooperation of the State and the EPA program managers at a
9 number of the sites at Jefferson. So we've actually in fact
10 removed some contamination from the soil and in some solvent
11 pits at the Proving Ground within the last month and a half
12 (1½) or so. And I think that's a very positive step. And I
13 appreciate both the State and the EPA's support on that
14 effort and we would like to recognize Mr. Tom Smith from the
15 EPA and Mr. Kevin Herron from the Indiana Department of
16 Environmental Management for their cooperation and support
17 in that effort. Lastly we in the Army have had an Internet
18 website for JPG for some time now. As I think most of you
19 know there was a re-organization of the Army Testing about a
20 year ago and as a result of that JPG was administratively
21 shifted from one (1) command to another. As a result of
22 that the new command had a different format and template
23 that they required for their facilities regarding Internet
24

1
2 websites. So we have gone through that effort and I will
3 show you a couple of slides and provide you with the new
4 Internet website address for the new JPG website. You can
5 access that for information on reuse and environmental
6 restoration and natural cultural resource information and a
7 lot of point of contact of E-mail addresses that you may
8 find very useful and you can always pass it on to anyone
9 else. And then lastly we'll have an open discussion period
10 which is more or less standard but if you do have questions
11 during our various different items, topics of discussions,
12 feel free to raise your question at that time and we can
13 address it then. And then we will have some closing remarks
14 by Richard and myself and we will thank you for attending.
15 So having said all that we'll now go to the UXO Engineering
16 Evaluation and Cost Analysis for the Western parcel. Now
17 for your information this Western parcel that we're talking
18 about is this parcel right here (indicating), approximately
19 three hundred (300) acres, and this little parcel right here
20 of about twenty-three (23) acres. This is the last area
21 south of the firing line in the cantonment area of Jefferson
22 that we via the Archives Search Report that was done by the
23 Corps of Engineers have identified as having any potential
24

1
2 for unexploded ordnance. The other areas (indicating), this
3 area here, the airfield area, the hundred (100) acre parcel
4 here, this southeast area and these two (2) little pie
5 shaped slices here have all been completed as far as the UXO
6 clearance action has been - is concerned. With the - one
7 (1) unique part of this three hundred (300) acre parcel is
8 that this parcel right here (indicating) is not, I repeat,
9 not, within Mr. Ford or the Ford Lumber and Building Supply
10 Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance. Currently there are two
11 (2) competing claims for that parcel and we are in the
12 process of working out who will be given precedence. The
13 two (2) competing claims are Ford Lumber and Building Supply
14 and Jefferson County as a public park. Anyway we are - this
15 is the last parcel (indicating) right here that we have to
16 address for UXO. It is a - basically a completely forested,
17 heavily unused area. There's no infrastructure development.
18 No other environmental contamination that we are aware of
19 in that particular area. And subsequent to the UXO
20 clearance and a wetlands delineation in this area we will be
21 looking at who in fact does have the first right of refusal
22 or opportunity to obtain that parcel. When I say we that's
23 the U.S. Army. This slide gives you a little bit of the
24

1
2 history of the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis. We
3 did have a public hearing last November where the Huntsville
4 Corps of Engineers and their contractors came in. It was a
5 meeting in Madison. They presented the draft plan where it
6 basically discussed several options regarding what we might
7 be able to do there, anything from no action to a very
8 intensive mag and flag standard operation we have done
9 basically throughout the rest of the parcels of Jefferson
10 south of the firing line. The reason why we have proceeded
11 along this particular path there are a couple of very
12 significant reasons. One (1) this area is probably one (1)
13 of the more isolated areas of the cantonment parcel. It is
14 not in the Lease in Furtherance of Conveyance. And it is
15 heavily forested and we do not expect to find much in the
16 way of unexploded ordnance there. But since it has been
17 designated as having that potential the Army is committed to
18 in fact performing an investigation. As one (1) of the
19 options we've examined and looked at what is called a - a
20 risk based statistical approach where when you go and the
21 basic proposal - the basic process when you do a UXO
22 clearance on a parcel is you survey it and grid it off in
23 two hundred (200) foot square areas. Then within those two
24

1
2 hundred (200) square foot areas you create six (6) foot wide
3 lanes and then just have an individual who's qualified to
4 walk that lane with a magnetometer. Every time he gets a
5 hit on his magnetometer he puts a flag in the ground. And
6 then qualified DOD people will come back at a later date and
7 they will do an individual excavation on each one (1) of
8 those hits to examine what it is, whether it's Farmer Jones'
9 plows or it's a sixty (60) or eighty-one (81) millimeter
10 mortar or whether it's a one o five (105) shell or a mine or
11 whatever. And they will take care of it appropriately.
12 What we're proposing here, and I will discuss a little bit
13 more, is in modification of that in that we will look at
14 still dividing it up into two hundred (200) foot squares and
15 then we will come in and do the mag and flag around
16 basically the perimeter until we get two (2) consecutive
17 side by side two hundred (200) foot squares clean. And then
18 we will consider that as being adequate for the entire area.
19 Now whether we have to do the whole area or just a minimum
20 amount that will remain to be seen. But we don't expect
21 much to be found there. There's never been any recognized
22 or identified activity in that area as far as when the Army
23 had the facility in operation. It's basically a hundred
24

1
2 (100) percent forested. We had a public comment period for
3 the EE/CA. That started back in November of last year. We
4 requested comments. There was an extension of that because
5 of the holidays. We received comments from not only the
6 Indiana Department of Environmental Management but Region 5
7 of the EPA and the public. And we have been working on
8 responses to those comments and revising the EE/CA. That
9 has actually been done. It is currently being staffed
10 throughout the Army Management. Because it is a different
11 process than has been used in the past there are more
12 administrative checks and reviews than if it were to the
13 standard intensive mag and flag, do what you've done before,
14 just go out and do it. Therefore it has taken us longer. I
15 feel that if we don't have to do many more of those checks
16 that either late this year or beginning of next year that
17 the revised document will be provided to not only the State
18 and EPA but the public but then we will provide direction to
19 the Corps of Engineers and Huntsville to commence field
20 work. So it will either start late this year or early next
21 but it's going to depend most specifically on whether or not
22 there is a policy level decision made as to whether because
23 of the differences that are being utilized for this last
24

1
2 parcel we are required to go back and obtain a Department of
3 Defense Explosive Safety Board's approval. They are the
4 regulator for ordnance and explosive waste or UXO. We
5 already have their approval if we go through the standard
6 method we have done in the past. Because this is a change
7 we have to at least allow them the opportunity to make that
8 call. And so we are still in that process, working our way
9 up to them, and there will either be a decision yes we will
10 review it or no what you've done in the past is sufficient
11 to cover what you propose now. But we will get that
12 determination and then we will provide the documents to the
13 State and EPA and public and then proceed on with the actual
14 field work.

15

16 **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

17 Paul can you go back to the maps for a
18 minute?

19

20 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

21 Sure.

22

23 **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

This question I have is I understand that the lanes are going to be pretty well parallel to Tokyo Road and south of Woodfield Road. You may have talked of this but is there any - it doesn't seem to suggest they're worried at all about finding anything on either side of the railroad line that came in. Has that been addressed or do you know whether they're going to have separate lanes on either side north or south of the one (1) railroad ah - railroad line that came in where they did haul in ammunition in during the war?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

To be quite honest I can't remember at the present time. I will have to go back and look at the document. It's been a while since I've even looked at it to see but I will get back to you.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

I get a feeling that they had that incorporated into their plans. But I'm wondering if they should.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I think there were some comments along those lines if I recall correctly from either the State, the EPA or the public. But I just don't remember what the response is. It's been several months since I've even seen the document. Kevin?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Well I remember that we had made comment that there was some issue along the railroad lane and how that was presented but there was also - it was also presented that using a magnetometer to detect metal and you've got a large amount of metal in the railroad track that there could be problems with interference there. So that's something. Again I don't remember the exact particulars of that but I do remember that issue was - was all part of it. And that EPA and the State did bring up the issue of running parallel to the tracks. So I don't know how that was addressed as far going in and being able to check that as far as any kind of magnetometer depth. But I do know that the interference issue was brought up.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I just don't remember right off the top of my head. It's been quite a while since I've looked at it. But I will find out and I will give you a call. Any other questions right now regarding the UXO clearance on this parcel? Okay. On a Finding of Suitability to Transfer, Central Cantonment Area FOST, approximately twelve hundred (1200) acres, ninety (90) buildings, the comment period was back in early 1999. We did receive comments and revised the FOST. We responded to - asked the State and EPA to respond or identify outstanding comments. We did in fact receive some outstanding comments and we responded to that and sent the document up to our higher headquarters which has the authority to approve those documents. The document was in fact signed for approval to initiate the actual title transfer of this approximate twelve hundred (1200) acre parcel back in May of 1999. Fortunately while the Corps of Engineers was in fact preparing the Title Transfer Document, the issue of lead base paint raised a significant question

1
2 as to who would do the inspection, who would do the risk
3 assessment, and who would do any required identified clean
4 up for lead base paint in structures that were being
5 utilized as residences. We looked at a number of different
6 options, discussed the issue at length with Mr. Ford. After
7 a protracted amount of time and effort it basically came
8 down to the fact that one (1) way or the other the Army
9 would pay for the inspection and the risk assessment, but
10 any remediation of identified lead base paint hazards in
11 these residential structures would be Ford Lumber and
12 Building Supply's obligation to clean up. I think we have
13 worked through that issue now. I met with Mr. Ford earlier
14 this week and we discussed that. I met with his
15 surveyor/contractor on Monday and we walked basically or
16 drove around and identified the perimeter boundaries of this
17 parcel and they have in fact started the actual survey and
18 legal description. It is currently our intent and schedule
19 that by the end of this month the lead base paint inspection
20 result in the risk assessment will be completed and provided
21 to Mr. Ford with the identification of those areas that need
22 to be cleaned up for lead base paint hazards in residential
23 structures. And Mr. Ford will provide to the Corps of
24

1
2 Engineers Real Estate Office in Louisville the legal
3 description survey of this twelve hundred (1200) acre
4 parcel. Those in fact are the only currently known items
5 that need to be completed for transfer of this parcel. And
6 when that is completed, we expect before the end of the
7 year, Mr. Ford of Ford Lumber and Building Supply Company
8 will be the owner of this twelve hundred (1200), including
9 this little section here (indicating), parcel down here and
10 cut out this area right here (indicating). The reason why
11 you cut around here and cut this out (indicating) is because
12 these areas have still existing environmental contamination.
13 And we did not want to try and include them because there
14 would be too many controls and would be a much longer
15 process so we just basically worked around it. And we
16 designed this parcel to transfer the maximum amount of
17 property to Mr. Ford with the minimum number of holes in his
18 four (4) areas that still had environmental contamination.
19 And that was about the biggest parcel that we could come up
20 with. Are there any questions on the Central Cantonment
21 Area parcel? Yes sir?

22
23
24

MR. CHARLES FACEMIRE:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

On the lead clean up what kind of assurance do we have or will be provided to you that it will be done in a timely manner?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

In accordance with federal statute, HUD Title Ten (10), Ten Two o Four (204), once an inspection and risk assessment have been performed and there has been an identification of a lead base paint clean up requirement, there is - it starts a twelve (12) month clock. That will be part of the Deed Title Transfer. If that twelve (12) month clock expires before the work is done a recertification of the results of that inspection or risk assessment are required to either verify they're still valid or however they're going to be modified. That - if that were to occur and unless there were some extenuating circumstances that the Army would agree to that would be Mr. Ford's bill. If there was an act of God and he was not in control of it we would evaluate it but until such time he would be on the hook there. Now he can pass that cost on. If you wanted to buy one (1) of the houses out there he might give you a very good deal on that house if you agreed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

to pick up the tab on the lead base paint. That is his option.

MR. CHARLES FACEMIRE:

Yeah.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That would be his decision. Did that answer your question?

MR. CHARLES FACEMIRE:

Yes.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Any other questions regarding the Central Cantonment area? Kevin?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

The orange things painted along the roadways is that part of the survey?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Yes sir. Okay. The next FOST I would like to talk about is the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office or DRMO Area. We have a copy of that FOST. It was just signed and approved by the Army Materiel Command last Friday, September 29th. This gives a little bit of the history of it, how big it is. There's one (1) building in it. We had a comment period. We did receive comments. We revised the FOST, put the document back out, received some additional comments. Normally at that time if we felt the additional comments were not of a nature where we would encounter some issues down the line we would have proceeded with possible transfer. However in this particular case it appeared to be a very simple matter of removing some additional soil and providing some additional soil results to the EPA. We did in fact do that. Did that earlier this year. Provided the results to the State and the EPA and we did in fact receive their concurrence to the documents. The document was then staffed within the Army and up to the Army Materiel Command and the last bullet there, it was approved and signed on the 29th of September, last Friday. The next step will be for a copy of that document to be provided to the Real Estate Office of the Corps of Engineers in

1
2 Louisville and they will start preparing the Deed Title
3 Transfer documentation. Mr. Ford already has a legal
4 description of that. If that can be verified and it's still
5 valid and accurate his effort will be done. There is not a
6 lead base paint issue here because this is not a residential
7 transfer. There will be a Deed restriction for
8 industrial/commercial use only. There is only one (1)
9 building there anyway. Any questions regarding the DRMO
10 parcel? Just to show you where that parcel is it's this
11 little (indicating) sub-section right here. This is
12 PaperMill Road, Woodfield Road. It's a small little section
13 right here. There is a major railroad track switching
14 complex right here being worked on by the Madison Port
15 Authority right now to improve that particular crossing.
16 But this is the parcel right here (indicating). Kevin?

17

18

19 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

20 Did they use lead base, not lead base, but
21 asbestos in there, in the DRMO building?

22

23 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

There is a - not in that building. Not in that building. There is a status of the condition of the asbestos in that building in the FOST. I mean and you can - if you've got a copy of the FOST you can --

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

I just remember there was a lot of work this past summer out there.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Not in the DRMO building. There hasn't been any.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

It was supposed to be the other end I believe Kevin, two thirty-one (231) and two thirty-seven (237).

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yeah. INDOT for everyone's information, the Army has in fact transferred to Mr. Ford this thirty-six

1
2 (36) acre parcel right here (indicating). He in turn sold
3 that to the Indiana Department of Transportation. That's
4 what you're referring to here. There are a number of
5 buildings, about a half a dozen in there, and the State was
6 in fact going in there and doing some asbestos removal on
7 those buildings. Okay. It's now my pleasure to introduce
8 Mr. Brooks Evens from the Louisville Corps of Engineers and
9 he will talk briefly about the removal action being
10 conducted this summer.

11

12 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

13

14

15 This summer we wanted to tackle some sites
16 that we felt we could clean up, facilitate some property
17 transfer, and to facilitate some future remedy actions that
18 we're going to do for ground water. There were sites
19 thirteen (13) at the airfield, sites thirty-three (33) which
20 is the new incinerator, and sites twelve (12) A, twelve (12)
21 B, and twelve (12) C. Site thirteen (13) is in the airfield
22 and it's one (1) of the last sites remaining to close that
23 airfield parcel out. And we felt we needed to go get that

24

1
2 site so we could transfer as a whole the whole eight hundred
3 (800) acres without having a little island in there that we
4 had to watch over over the next several years till we
5 finally got to a ROD. Went to that site. That site has
6 been excavated, samples taken and confirmed, and it's been
7 back filled, seeded, close reports going on. We hope to
8 have that site closed out over the next two (2) or three (3)
9 months going through the review with IDEM and EPA. Site
10 thirty-three (33) has been completed also. Sites twelve
11 (12) A, twelve (12) B, and twelve (12) C, those sites were
12 unique. They were solvent pits. It's where they dumped
13 solvents out the building into a little three by three by
14 three (3x3x3) gravel field pit. It has caused ground water
15 contamination and as part of the Remedial Action or remedy
16 to ground water you have to do a point source removal to do
17 natural attenuation monitoring which is going to be proposed
18 for those sites. I want to thank EPA and IDEM. These three
19 (3) sites had unique in that the contamination was right up
20 next to the building foundation. And one (1) thing the Army
21 doesn't want to do is tear down a building and have to build
22 a building because Mr. Ford purchased property as is, as
23 where is. So anything we take off we've got to replace it.
24

1
2 We didn't want to take down a building. But the
3 contamination in buildings twelve (12) A and twelve (12) B
4 goes right along the foundation. And we had to screen all
5 the way down to twelve (12) feet. At twelve (12) feet it
6 was like we felt like we were getting too deep to have
7 structural integrity on the building so with IDEM and EPA we
8 came up with excavate until twelve (12) feet, do sort of a
9 passive soil venting and help increase natural attenuation
10 of the soil by putting in simple fertilizer in the bottom of
11 the pit, bring up a lift, throw some fertilizer in there,
12 and then we placed screen tubing down along the building
13 foundation to help as we come back ever so often to recharge
14 the system with nitrogen. Nitrogen is one (1) of the key
15 components to increase natural attenuate. And IDEM and EPA
16 was very cooperative and these sites are going to be
17 considered closed as far as the soil operation. We still
18 have a long way to go with the ground water but as part of
19 our remedy for ground water this point source was - had to
20 be done so we felt we would go ahead and get that done now
21 and start monitoring natural attenuate and start building a
22 data base for our ground water. And this all occurred. We
23 had the funding last year, did the work plans, quality
24

1
2 control plans, and there was a whole bunch of work plans
3 you've got to go through. IDEM and EPA gave us great
4 response and went to the field this summer. I think this
5 was one (1) of the more successful removal actions we've had
6 out here. We were able to make field decisions which in the
7 past when we did intra measures actions, we weren't able to
8 do that often and it got cluttered up and it just started
9 stumbling all over itself. But this is one (1) of the more
10 successful ones we've had to date. And we look to do - I
11 doubt if we will be doing any more of that. Most of the
12 sites that are left are large enough sites that they should
13 go through the RIFS proposed plan phase. So we're probably
14 through doing any type of removal action unless a request
15 comes from the future land owner that I really want this and
16 then Paul will make a decision there and DA will make the
17 other decisions about moving forward with that. Any
18 questions? Cool. Cool.

19

20 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

21

22 Thank you Brooks. Appreciate that. Brooks
23 has been the Corps of Engineers field engineer for JPG for a

24

1
2 couple of years now and has been an invaluable asset to the
3 Army and myself as we have gone through this process. And
4 I've periodically called on - on him to give us an update on
5 some of the field activities. Next item I would like to
6 talk about is - this is the new JPG website home page right
7 here (indicating). You see it's got a different template
8 format, layout. The basic information is still the same.
9 This is the new address now. And if you access that by one
10 (1) of your Internet browsers on the Internet that's what
11 you have to type in. And it is up and accessible. I will
12 make one (1) informational statement. If you want to access
13 the Archives Search Report, which is available on this
14 Internet site, for some idiosyncratic reason you have to use
15 Internet Explorer, not Netscape Navigator. I do not know
16 why. And I - the Army is not endorsing one (1) vice the
17 other. But there is something very deep in the internal of
18 those two (2) that one (1) works and one (1) does not. So
19 if you want to actually have on your computer and read at
20 your desk the Archives Search Report for UXO for the entire
21 facility at Jefferson you will have to use Internet
22 Explorer. We have identified the issues to the Corps who is
23 doing this and they are still looking at it. I've not
24

1
2 gotten any feedback yet as to why. But it took me by
3 surprise because I was using one (1) browser one (1) day and
4 it came up and no problem. And the next day I went back to
5 the other and it was gone. I couldn't figure it out. I
6 kept sending E-mails and they said it's there. What's wrong
7 with you you know? And I said no it's not. And they said
8 yes it is. And then finally we said what browser are you
9 using? And I said this is what I typically use. And they
10 said well we're using this. And they tried the other one
11 (1) and I tried the other one (1) and we both agreed. One
12 (1) works and one (1) doesn't. So if you want to access it
13 just use Internet Explorer. This is a little hard to read
14 but it basically gives you the site map of all the different
15 pages within the site. It covers such things as reuse,
16 history, operation, mission, environmental, clean up, reuse,
17 restoration, natural and cultural resources. It's a very
18 extensive site. There are over a hundred (100) pages to it
19 and there are a lot of links to it, not only to the State,
20 the EPA, the NRC but just about any place else you want to
21 get environmental information from the Department of Defense
22 you can access us through this site. We are continuing to
23 look at it and we will be working on making enhancements and
24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

improvements and additions to the site. So if you have anything that you would like to see please provide that to us in a phone call or an E-mail. My E-mail address is identified on the site. There's also a toll free number identified on the site where you can call me in Aberdeen, Maryland and make a suggestion. So suggestions are welcome. Are there any questions regarding the JPG website? Okay. Any questions? Comments? Open discussion period. Anyone have anything they would like to identify or address? Major? Bob?

MR. ROBERT HUDSON:

I don't know anything.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

We're not done. Wait.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. Richard?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

A couple of things.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well you either had your closing remarks or now is your opportunity to.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

I will just do it all together.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Go for it.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

We - I did get your - Paul's E-mail about setting up a schedule of meetings for next year. So we will be working on that. We need to let everybody know when that is - when those are I guess.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

So I wanted to let everybody know about that. We don't have that set yet. And also I did get a communication from the Army concerning the license termination schedule for the DU area and basically that has been delayed somewhat which I think is a good thing. You just get more time to look at it too and stuff like that. So anyway it's been delayed. Originally the Final Draft of the - what was being called a Decommissioning Plan for the DU area was to be done by or right around the end of September. Of course we're past that. And so their rescheduling puts us more into early next year even around maybe in March something like that for the whole process to be gone through. Their drafts will be submitted and reviewed by I guess the NRC and the Save The Valley and you know everybody that has to look at it. And then Final Draft is now scheduled to be done somewhere around March. So that's where the DU termination plan is at right now. I believe that's the only two (2) things I thought of since the agenda came out. I don't have anything else.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Again I would like to thank everyone for

1
2 coming. It is a dark and stormy night and I hope I don't
3 get too wet putting all this stuff back in the car. Please
4 sign the attendance sheet if you have not been in meetings
5 before. I use that to add you to my mailing list so that we
6 can keep you informed of meetings and information and you
7 can always get ahold of me via the website and the E-mail
8 address or the toll free number we have at Aberdeen if you
9 want to ask any specific questions. Also have a site staff
10 out at the Proving Ground who is headed by Mr. Knouf and
11 they're there Monday through Friday. You can always go out
12 to the Proving Ground or call there and ask a question if
13 you're interested. Having said all that as soon as we do
14 come up with a new schedule we will put that out in a
15 mailing and then it will ultimately come up also on the
16 website. You will be able to access it there. But I will
17 put it out in a mailing to everyone that's on the mailing
18 list and that's over two hundred (200) people. And anyone
19 that's here is obviously on the mailing list. So there
20 shouldn't be a problem with that. Having said all that
21 thank you and good night. Stay dry and drive home safely.

22 * * * * *

23 CONCLUSION OF HEARING

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF INDIANA)
) SS:
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I, Sharon Shields, do hereby certify that I am a Notary Public in and for the County of Jefferson, State of Indiana, duly authorized and qualified to administer oaths;

That the foregoing public hearing was taken by me in shorthand and on a tape recorder on October 4, 2000 in the Jennings County Public Library, North Vernon, IN; That this public hearing was taken on behalf of the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board pursuant to agreement for taking at this time and place; That the testimony of the witnesses was reduced to typewriting by me and contains a complete and accurate transcript of the said testimony.

I further certify that pursuant to stipulation by and between the respective parties, this testimony has been transcribed and submitted to the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board.

WITNESS my hand and notarial seal this ____ day of October, 2000.

Sharon Shields, Notary Public
Jefferson County, State of Indiana

My Commission Expires:
July 2, 2007

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24