

15-1138



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY SOLDIER AND BIOLOGICAL CHEMICAL COMMAND
5183 BLACKHAWK ROAD
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND 21010-5424

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

February 24, 2000

BRAC Environmental Coordinator

Member
Jefferson Proving Ground
Restoration Advisory Board

Dear Member:

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Jefferson Proving Ground (JPG) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting minutes for the JPG RAB meeting of January 6, 2000. Should you have any questions concerning the JPG RAB meeting minutes enclosed please contact me at 1-800-392-2015, extension 5-2381.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Cloud
JPG BRAC Environmental Coordinator

Enclosure

UMSSOIPublic

**JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

DATE: January 6, 2000
TIME: 7:00 P.M.
PLACE: South Ripley Elementary School
Versailles, IN 47043
PRESENT: Paul Cloud, Co-Chair
Richard Hill, Co-Chair

Sharon Shields, Reporter

Audience Members

Sharon Shields
S.A.S. Reporting Service
3650 N.Old SR 62, Madison, IN 47250
Business: (812) 265-2994
Fax: (812) 273-5220

1 A public hearing of the Jefferson Proving Ground
2 Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held at the South
3 Ripley Elementary School, Versailles, IN at 7:00 P.M. on
4 January 12, 2000.

5
6 **OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 Okay. I would like to get started and
8 welcome everyone here to the Jefferson Proving Ground
9 Restoration Advisory Board meeting for January 2000. It
10 appeared that everyone weathered Y2K. I'm not sure about
11 the flu bug but it looks like everybody survived the turn of
12 the century and the millennium. We encourage to sign the
13 attendance sheets so we make sure you're on our mailing
14 list. And we have a copy of the agenda and slides that you
15 will be seeing tonight and we will discuss. I don't have
16 any other introductory remarks. Richard?

17
18 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19 Thanks Paul. Good evening. That's it.

20
21 **MR. KEN KNOUF:**

22 Did you get that Sharon?
23
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

COURT REPORTER:

Yes.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. As you will see on the second page of the slides this will be our agenda for the evening. The first thing we'll talk about is UXO clearance on western parcel of the cantonment area. Then we will talk about our Findings of Suitability to Transfer for various parcels and then we will have open discussion period. As I'm sure most of you know in November there was a Jefferson Proving Ground RAB board meeting in Madison. And at that meeting on the agenda was the public hearing for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for UXO clearance action on the western parcel. And at that meeting there were presentations given about that process and the various options and copies of the report were available to the public and the State and Federal regulators. We have gone through the comment period for that public review. We have received comments from ah the State, Federal EPA and the community. This next slide here will show you a little bit of that history. The comment period was actually up in December but because of the holidays we did get requests to extend it out and we did. And we did receive comments from

1 the public on the 3rd and the State and EPA on the 4th. All
2 those comments are currently down with the Huntsville Corps
3 of Engineer's office. They are the center of expertise for
4 ordnance and explosives of the Army and they are reviewing
5 them along with contractors to see what type of proposed
6 response will be generated for those comments. The February
7 15th date up here is an estimated date that we are looking
8 at having a revised document and response to those comments.
9 I would expect that once we have gotten those responses and
10 revised documents accordingly that hopefully at the March
11 RAB meeting, and I will get into that toward the end of this
12 meeting, ah we will have a presentation at that meeting as
13 to the results of those comments and responses and make
14 available the revised document. It may come out a little
15 bit earlier but that's kind of the ball park sketch on the
16 schedule for that particular effort right now. Okay.
17 Regarding the Findings of Suitability to Transfer ah this
18 one (1) has been signed. This is the Central Cantonment
19 Area approximately twelve hundred (1200) acres. The
20 document has been sent to the real estate office of the
21 Huntsville or the Louisville Corps of Engineers, excuse me,
22 and right now there is a issue regarding lead base paints
23 serving and risk assessment that is impacting the transfer
24 of that property. As soon as that issue is resolved we

1 would expect to ah proceed on with the transfer of that
2 parcel. Right now it appears that the transfer will
3 probably happen sometime in the spring of this year after
4 the inspection and assessment of the lead base paint has
5 been completed. The next area we have is the DRMO, Defense
6 Reutilization and Marketing Office parcel. Some of you may
7 be familiar with this area. It was originally a parcel that
8 we proposed to transfer about two (2) years ago that was
9 ultimately reduced in size by about this five point seven
10 (5.7) acres and was transferred to Mr. Ford who ultimately
11 ended up selling it to the Indiana Department of
12 Transportation. The issues that required this particular
13 area to be taken out had to do with the soil contamination
14 in two (2) of the areas. We have in fact addressed that
15 issue. We put the FOST back out for this area, it was
16 commented on, we received some comments from the State and
17 the EPA and because of that we are now in the process of
18 taking I believe it's two (2) additional soil samples in the
19 area that is identified. And once we have those samples
20 taken and analyzed and results back ah we would expect to
21 provide that information to the State and EPA and move on
22 with this document. Right now that schedule indicates
23 probably by the end of February all of that will have
24 occurred and we will be ready to process that FOST up

1 through our chain of command to see if it's satisfactory for
2 signature. If it is then it would go to the Louisville
3 Corps of Engineers' real estate office and we would begin to
4 transfer ah all that particular parcel to Mr. Ford. The
5 airfield area there's another FOST that has gone out. It's
6 approximately six hundred and fifty (650) acres, has twenty-
7 one (21) buildings in it. Comment period has expired. We
8 have received comments from the State and the EPA. Ah
9 response to those comments are pending the identification of
10 reuse in that particular parcel. If you're a member of the
11 local community you are probably aware that there has been
12 some very intense discussions about a landfill being located
13 at the southern portion of the open airfield parcel, Solid
14 Waste Municipal Landfill. Ah the reason why this
15 complicates the potential transfer of this parcel is that
16 Mr. Ford had asked that the reuse of this parcel be expanded
17 to incorporate residential reuse. That was not in the
18 original document that went out for public review. Because
19 the landfill issue has come up and it has not been
20 completely resolved whether it will proceed or it will not
21 proceed it's highly unlikely that anyone would want to be
22 within twelve hundred (1200) or fifteen hundred (1500) feet
23 of a Solid Waste Landfill, although that would be beyond
24 minimal distance that's required. So we, the Army and Mr.

1 Ford, have agreed to hold on this particular FOST for the
2 immediate future until the landfill issue is a little
3 clearer, whether the company that is seeking the zoning on
4 that is actually going to be able to obtain that or not.
5 Should that occur then we will proceed on one (1) particular
6 avenue. If it does not succeed then we will proceed in a
7 different vein to proceed with that transfer. So I would
8 expect probably within the next three (3) to four (4) weeks
9 to have some more definitive word on whether or not the
10 landfill will be seriously considered by the local
11 community, the governing boards for zoning or not. Once we
12 know that then we will know how to proceed on that
13 particular parcel. Are there any questions on what we have
14 covered? This is probably going to be a fairly short
15 meeting as far as prepared documents and discussion that I
16 have slides for. Ah so if there are - I will leave this
17 slide up there right now. Are there any questions that
18 anyone has on any of these that I have discussed here or any
19 issue you would like to bring up? I will turn the floor
20 over to Mr. Corning. He always has a question of two (2).
21 Bill?

22
23 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

24 I don't know of anything I need to know

1 tonight.

2

3 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

4 Mr. Hudson?

5

6 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

7 What makes you think I would have anything?

8

9 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

10 Because I used to work for you Mr. Hudson
11 and I know better.

12

13 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

14 No not really. I - this is not a question
15 to you but a comment connected to the landfill issue. It
16 would seem to me in the big picture in the long run as far
17 as the surrounding area of the landfill is concerned it
18 would be in Mr. Ford's best interest to - to not let that
19 landfill - or he's not asked for that. But it looks like to
20 me once that landfill goes in there it will just kind of
21 kill this property around it.

22

23 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

24 That is a common perception. And there is

1 some truth to that. If this were twenty (20) or thirty (30)
2 or forty (40) years ago that would probably be very close to
3 a hundred (100) percent accurate. It's not twenty (20) or
4 thirty (30) or forty (40) years ago. It's now. Things have
5 gotten better as far as designing the operation. I'm not
6 going to stand here and look you in the eye and tell you
7 that operations like that don't have a potential to impact
8 and to cause people concern because clearly they do or there
9 wouldn't have been as many people you know showing up at the
10 various meetings on this issue.

11
12 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

13 You remember the days in the past when we
14 were considering the chicken farm on the north of the
15 Proving Ground?

16
17 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18 I remember those meetings well.

19
20 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

21 And what a reaction that brought into the
22 community. And I'm not surprised this one (1) does not give
23 some - some regard to the south.

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

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well you know I've discussed this issue with a number of people and I've been kept very well informed. And to be honest I haven't seen anything that has surprised me. You know this is a typical not in my back yard type of issue. I think there - you know if you asked whether or not there is a landfill need in this area everybody would agree with that but they just don't want it here in their back yard.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

In a few weeks in the past they talked about in the paper one (1) day about the landfill. But kind of I think in the same - in the same article in the same breath they talked about this - some kind of recreational facility, race track, I don't know, motel, hotel, whatever it was. Is that - that would kind of be an either/or I would suppose?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's my understanding although I'm not that well informed on it. But I would suspect that that's probably the case. That's you know --

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. BOB HUDSON:

But you haven't heard any more about that?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Have you Ken? Heard anything about that
idea?

MR. KEN KNOUF:

Only through the rumor mill Bob.

MR. BILL CORNING:

On television the other night people that
are building the track down in Kentucky.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Over here at Sparta?

MR. BILL CORNING:

No down in Kentucky.

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. BOB HUDSON:

Yeah.

MR. BILL CORNING:

Is that Sparta? Okay. They were on and they ah said that ah they were looking at the possibility of building a - a midget track and a dirt track or these ones with the ones on them in conjunction with this track that they're building now. And that would be - that would be foolish to build one (1) on JPG to compete with that.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Unless they were the ones building it.

MR. BILL CORNING:

Yeah. But they were talking about --

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Not against Sparta.

MR. BILL CORNING:

And the same place that they've got their track now because they have their garages and all that stuff there.

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. BOB HUDSON:

This one (1) - ah this comment is probably not one (1) that ought to go in the record.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Then maybe we should say off line.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Well no, no. I'm going to --

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

You want to say it anyway?

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Yeah. I'm thinking about maybe finding a small apartment if you can find something about a couple of hundred square feet that I can get. Do you know anything?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Talk to Mr. Ford. He's got them. Talk to Mr. Ford.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

Do you want to slide down the fire pole or

1 what?

2

3

MR. BOB HUDSON:

4

5

6

7

8

MR. KEN KNOUF:

9

10

11

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

12

13

14

MR. KEN KNOUF:

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Well I - slide down might work but my problem is getting up. I don't know how I'm going to get up to the bedroom.

Paul could I throw a hypothetical at you?

Sure.

On - on the landfill. Of course nobody wants one (1) in their back yard. Everyone recognizes that we have an extreme need for one (1) but unfortunately that seems to be the way society still deals with its waste. But if a company came in and asked the Army about the possibility of developing one (1) north of the firing line fence and they had equipment, armored equipment for excavation and they would do all the UXO things that we require of those folks, what conceivably would the Army - would the Army even consider - I don't mean to chagrin my

1 esteemed colleagues here, but this - these kind of things
2 may arise in the future. And what - what might the Army's
3 response be and how might Fish and Wildlife Service react to
4 it? I don't know.

5
6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 Well the issue is not that far from what has
8 already been proposed with the exception of having to come
9 in and have their own armored equipment to do that. The
10 community did, when Jefferson was still active, make similar
11 type of proposal on the eastern side only they never
12 followed up with - they didn't find any specific spot or
13 take an advantage of the offer from Colonel Wheatley to use
14 our DOT people to go see if the area was geologically and
15 hydro geologically satisfactory. Those are the - you know
16 the things of criteria. That's why they have to go in and
17 do that. Ah the second thing that would have to happen is
18 they would have to be some type of agreement that would
19 address UXO should they find any should any agreement ever
20 come about. But really the bottom line would be that if
21 there was such an agency, company, public, private or
22 whatever who had a desire to engage in that type of
23 operation, the first step is always write a letter you know.
24 And they have to send it to the Army so the Army can

1 evaluate it and see if it's in fact relevant and serious
2 before they would respond. As to how they would respond no
3 idea. But with - absent a letter ah it's all conjecture.
4 Hypothetical. Bill?

5
6 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

7 Three (3) sites were picked and we were told
8 that fifteen hundred (1500) feet of the fence was clear.

9
10 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

11 Not clear. Not intentionally because - big
12 difference.

13
14 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

15 Well at that time. At that time. And the
16 three (3) sites were picked. And the Army said no way. We
17 - we don't want to give it to anyone. It's closed. Because
18 that was the same situation that happened with that chicken
19 farm because I was involved in both of those clear up to my
20 ears.

21
22 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23 Well that - the issue continues to
24 periodically come up, the subject does, and unless and until

1 the Army receives a request in writing from an entity,
2 whether public or private I mean it's all discussion and
3 that's all it really will be until such time as someone does
4 do something more. And how the Army would respond as I said
5 before I don't know. It would depend on the specifics. And
6 clearly if there is a Memorandum of Understanding with the
7 Fish and Wildlife Service and the Air Guard that addresses
8 their usage of the area north of the firing line, then that
9 would be an additional factor that would have to be
10 considered and they would probably have much more
11 involvement than they would right now today or last year or
12 two (2) years ago or whatever. Any other questions or
13 comments? Richard?

14
15 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

16 On the airfield FOST with the introduction
17 of the request for residential use.

18
19 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20 Un-huh (yes).

21
22 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

23 Let's just assume that the landfill doesn't
24 go through.

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:

Okay.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

So that makes it more desirable to have residential use there. Ah will the process be opened up to the public comment again because of the change of the request for residential use?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I suspect it will. That is fairly substantial change. We already have some comments from the State and the EPA on that particular issue so yes I believe the Army would come out with a thirty (30) day review. It's not something that's finalized yet but I suspect that it would be at least some type of additional review. There are some hurdles that have to be gotten over on that particular issue. And I have discussed that with Mr. Ford so that he understands it. Those hurdles are - some of those hurdles are the following: One (1) that typically the Department of Defense, Department of Army will clean up the area one (1) time to one (1) standard. And then if the reuse changes then whoever then owns the property it will be their burden to meet additional clean up criteria.

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. RICHARD HILL:

Right.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

An example would be if we cleaned up an area to commercial-industrial standards and then the next owners said well I want to build residential buildings here. That's fine. You go to the proper State and EPA and find out their criteria for the additional clean up levels and get the levels down there, you get their concurrence with the results of that effort, and then the Army will come back in and they will modify or remove that restriction from the deed. That's one (1) hurdle that will has to be addressed, whether or not this is a change in reuse. As you may be aware there was no residential uses by the Army at that portion of the facility when it was open. The other portion of it is that it's typical that that facility be serviced whether it's the Army, Navy, the Air Force, to clean up to a "like kind" type of reuse. Again this area was not residential per se. That's - that's an issue that has potential precedence and policy setting implications. However, if in this particular case it could be addressed on site specific basis and if the amount of additional money was marginal, then it may be seriously considered. Those

1 are some of the issues that have to be resolved before the
2 Army would even agree to it. If the Army decided for
3 whatever reason that no this area was used as a commercial-
4 industrial area and that's how we cleaned it up and that's
5 how it was transferred, then the document would stand as
6 written and we would proceed along those lines. That
7 decision hasn't been made yet. Because we don't know one
8 (1) for the landfill and two (2) once that is you know
9 resolved then we know which way we're going to go, and we
10 have to address that issue or not, review and address it
11 and if the document has to be modified to propose an
12 extended reuse then I believe it will come out for public
13 review.

14
15 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

16 Okay thank you.

17
18 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19 Bob?

20
21 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

22 I don't know if this is a RAB question
23 necessarily. But are we training the Fish and Wildlife guys
24 to fly jets yet?

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:

Find what?

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Fly jets yet.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

Hardly. I doubt they are.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

That's right. Is there any - has anything been done on the request for additional range of the Guard and all that stuff?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

We are still ah talking.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Well at least that's progress.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's - that's good. We haven't - we haven't formally met in about six (6) to eight (8) weeks. And the real reason why is - it's two (2) fold. One (1) we

1 had the holidays so obviously there's been two (2) or three
2 (3) week span there where we in fact didn't get much done.
3 We were always going other places and doing other things.
4 But the major reason was because the basic Memorandum of
5 Understanding document was provided to the Fish and Wildlife
6 Service and the Air Guard for their agencies to look at it
7 outside of the small group who had been meeting with the
8 Congressional staff to create this document in Washington.
9 We have not heard back from the Fish and Wildlife Service or
10 the Air Guard formally in writing. We've had some phone
11 conversations with them but we need that - you know the
12 process. We need what their formal written comments
13 suggestions, comments, concerns are on that document. I
14 would suspect that probably within the next four (4) weeks
15 or so, maybe a little more or maybe a little less, we will
16 have received their comments and there will probably be
17 another series of meetings in Washington with the
18 Congressional staff to go over those issues and to hopefully
19 get to the point where we're ready to sign the document.

20
21 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

22 Paul just for information. Where - where is
23 the Air Force or - the Air Force practicing?
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

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

They practice --

MR. BILL CORNING:

I don't mean at JPG. I know that.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay.

MR. BILL CORNING:

But if they don't do it here where - where?
Because they've taken that island away from them.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I don't know where that they would
specifically have to go. That's what you're talking about?

MR. BILL CORNING:

Yeah.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That would be occurring. One (1) of the
things that complicates that issue it's just not the Indiana
Air Guard that uses the Jefferson range. You have units

1 from Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky.

2
3 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

4 Right.

5
6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 There are half a dozen different units that
8 come in here from three (3) or four (4) different states.
9 They have stated that should Jefferson range not be
10 available to them their fly away costs per year would be in
11 the seven (7) figure order of magnitude per year because it
12 would cost that much just to go someplace else. Not to go
13 build it but just to go somewhere and fly there. Because
14 there's no place conveniently located. It only takes five
15 (5) or ten (10) minutes for those S-16 to come to Indiana.

16
17 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

18 Well my feeling is, and of course I'm an old
19 man and I admit it, ah we expect these young gentlemen to
20 take these airplanes and we send them all over the world to
21 - for police action and all this other garbage. And they've
22 got to learn how to fly these planes and they've got to
23 learn how to drop these bombs and shoot these rockets and
24 stuff. And if there's no place to practice it's just like

1 with the landfill, not in my back yard. Ah how are they
2 supposed to do - how are we going to send trained troops if
3 we don't train them?
4

5 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6 That would probably be question that's asked
7 of the Air Guard because I'm sure they have some thoughts
8 about what if Jefferson range was not available. What are
9 we doing? That's clearly not something the Army would be
10 involved in per se. But I'm sure they've had some thoughts.
11 You might want to ask Major Nolen that question.
12

13 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

14 Well see you're talking Air Guard and I'm
15 talking the Air Force and the only difference is semantics.
16

17 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18 Well --
19

20 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

21 Because the President --
22

23 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

24 I wouldn't say that to the Air Guard. Or

1 the Air Force either.

2
3 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

4 The President sends the Air Guard. There's
5 Air Guard overseas right now.

6
7 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8 That's true. That does happen.

9
10 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

11 So they need to be trained.

12
13 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14 I don't disagree with you.

15
16 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

17 I hope the Air Guard - I hope the Air Force
18 is trained better than the Air Guard.

19
20 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

21 They were flying tonight.

22
23 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

24 Beg your pardon?

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. BOB HUDSON:

They were flying tonight.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Are there any other comments or questions?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

In December you submitted the intermit
measures document to us concerning what's going to occur on
the RI sites?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That was for the ground water sites and two
(2) other sites?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Yeah I think it was for sites twelve (12),
thirteen (13).

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Twelve (12) A, B, C?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Yeah.

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:

Thirteen (13) and thirty-three (33)?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Right. Ah well due to the holidays and due to staff moving around I was wanting - that deadline is either close or it's passed for that document.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It's close. The 17th.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

So I was - I've been asked, all those moving, if there was any way - you know if there's a way to get an extension on that document? Or you know what kind of time line do we have ah for getting that document reviewed and - and --

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Make me a recommendation on what you think is a reasonable extension.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Okay.

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:

We will go from there.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

See Paul if this would have been late December he would have used the excuse Y2K problems.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well we're all alive.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

He's using the excuse of moving.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well I moved too.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Well I just know that my staff was - they were scheduled up and they always take off two (2) weeks during the year all through the holidays. That's just the way they are. So --

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well if you want to send me an E-mail or

1 give me a call I will be back in the office Monday.

2

3 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

4 Okay.

5

6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 I check E-mail almost every day on the
8 weekend when I'm home.

9

10 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

11 Yeah. I sent a couple of them through there
12 and I got back that you were home.

13

14 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

15 Well I had an automatic response. I did
16 check them while I was home. In fact every time I logged in
17 it said you got the automatic response. Do you want to keep
18 it? Yes.

19

20 **MR. KEVIN HERRON:**

21 Yes.

22

23 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

24 Yes. Any other comments or questions?

1 Richard?

2

3 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

4 Yeah. I have some questions about the - the
5 decommission plan for the depleted uranium area?

6

7 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8 Good question. Wish I had a good answer.

9

10 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

11 That has been submitted to the NRC?

12

13 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14 We have submitted a lot of things to the
15 NRC. Ah I had discussion about two (2) weeks ago. They
16 have changed their program manager. Mr. Pittaglio, while I
17 think he will still remain in an over site role, his role is
18 probably not going to be the initial point of contact. I
19 have not met the new program manager at Headquarters Office.
20 They are trying to set up a meeting the end of this month at
21 Aberdeen Proving Ground to go over some of their issues.
22 Mr. Pittaglio would indicate that he would make a serious
23 effort to be at the next RAB meeting in March to go over the
24 status of that particular issue, where it stands, what they

1 feel has to be done and so forth.

2
3 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

4 Un-huh (yes).

5
6 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

7 I did send him a copy of all the RAB minutes
8 so he expected questions like this to arise.

9
10 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

11 Okay.

12
13 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14 And I will make sure that he's aware that
15 the community has asked some questions about this.

16
17 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

18 Well I mean I - I'm aware that it's been
19 published in the Federal Register that there is a
20 decommissioning plan and that was published December 16th
21 and there's a thirty (30) day period to request a hearing on
22 the plan. And I - I've seen the plan and I have some
23 questions about it. Have you seen copies of the plan?

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

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Then I can't ask you about it. Okay. I mean I could but you wouldn't know.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well I might.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

I had some questions about it but I - I do know that Save the Valley is going to ask for a hearing at the time because we - I'm putting on another hat now. Ah we have some questions that there's - there's some parts of it that's just not real clear to us. So ah - and I was going to ask some things about it to see if I could maybe clear them up tonight. But if you haven't read it you can't help me.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No I - it's been probably a year and a half (1½) to two (2) years since I've even looked at a copy of it.

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. RICHARD HILL:

Un-huh (yes).

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

So I --

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Well they're talking about a surface clean up some of which has been picked up right?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yeah.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

You can tell me that?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

We cleared out - you know we haven't done it since the Proving Ground closed basically. Not the way we used to when the Proving Ground was open.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Yeah. And then - but it's not real clear to me. It kind of infers that they may go in there and do that

1 again, go back in there and do it again. But then it's not
2 clear at all. So that's one (1) thing I wanted to know
3 about.

4
5 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6 Okay.

7
8 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

9 And then the monitoring issue is not clear.
10 In parts it says that it would be really good to have
11 monitoring you know for water and soil and plants and
12 animals, but it doesn't really come out and say that that's
13 going to be done.

14
15 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

16 Yeah.

17
18 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19 So that's another question and concern.

20
21 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

22 That may - that may come out at a meeting
23 later this month.

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

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Okay.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Any other comments or questions?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

As far as the - the depleted uranium issue, I do know that the NRC has contacted us and they have assigned actually a project manager to it. And the new one (1) is a lady named Kim. I'm not remembering her last name right now. But they've - also in doing so also have informed our State Department of Health about the - about this submittal and stuff. So I know that our State Department of Health is going to at least be getting involved in that issue too. So things are - it's obvious that things are happening.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Yeah.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Whereas before it was - there - they weren't doing anything from the NRC's prospective.

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:

Any other questions?

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Paul along those lines I have a question. When ah - the years that Aberdeen guards had the depleted uranium against the hard targets, and you know ah - and then they since went to an enclosed line target, what was the status or what is the status of that area down where they did that hard target firing in the open? Did that get cleaned up or did that have a decommission plan? Or is it just setting there, just setting?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Don't know.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Have you ever - do you know where they buried those?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I've never physically been out there.

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. BOB HUDSON:

Haven't been out there?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No. I know the general - where it was at the Proving Ground. But I'm fully occupied with Jefferson so I don't have the luxury to go out to Aberdeen.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

Well see I was - I was down on testing you know when they fired no targets so I didn't - I didn't pay any particulars to it.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

That explains a lot Bob.

MR. BOB HUDSON:

But I have a good excuse.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Did you have any luck doing some of the web sites and getting access to those? I know I sent something to you before.

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:

Yes. We have in fact a new web site address. However there is a problem on the server right now that some of the functions or some of the capabilities of the old web site are not functional on the new server at SPC.com. I have addressed that to the people. They are looking into it. If I gave you the address you could access it now but a lot of the things that you are expecting to normally see, while it would be there all you could see is a blank box. If you put your cursor on it it would indicate something and it would be functional and you go to the place. It's very user unfriendly right now. There are some updates on it that I have incorporated I think in December. And then they put it on the server and I called them up. And it jumped out. It was very - needed a lot of work. And once - they haven't been able to do that. But I would use the old address right now. It's still available although it's not as current as what is on the other address. You would find it very user unfriendly. It's there but it would be very difficult to readily access things that you're looking for and you know where you want to go. Some of the buttons don't come up with their normal information.

1 **MR. STEVE MILLER:**

2 I don't even think when I tried to get into
3 the Archives Search Report that I could even get in there.
4

5 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6 Yeah that is an issue also. That is a
7 separate issue. There was last year a concern DOD wide on
8 the web sites that all web sites had to be used for content.
9 Somewhere the sites were taken where the access to some web
10 sites was restricted or we used to eliminate. The Archives
11 Search Report clearly doesn't fall into that category
12 because it is a public document and it is in the Army Admin
13 Records. And I have sent an E-mail to Huntsville basically
14 to say either give me the new address or give me the report
15 in electronic form and I will put it on site, one (1) or the
16 other. If you need a copy let me know and we will - we can
17 handle that. But that is - that is not the only one (1).
18 There are some others, not a lot, probably a handful that
19 fall under that category. Sometimes because of this issue
20 and sometimes it's just because particular web master has
21 decided, for whatever reason, to change web - you know the
22 address. And so you will click on something you are
23 expecting to see and all of a sudden your message is not
24 there anymore. I have to periodically go through and just

1 verify that those links are in fact current and up to date.
2 And that's just standard, typical.

3
4 **MR. STEVE MILLER:**

5 I haven't been able to bring the site up.
6

7 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8 Like I say it is up but it is very user
9 unfriendly and you would probably give up very quickly after
10 you started because some of the basic things in there are -
11 when you try to find - go page to page or section to section
12 it's - it's not the way it used to be. And it needs to be
13 fixed and I'm working on that.
14

15 **MR. STEVE MILLER:**

16 Okay.
17

18 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19 Anything else? I see a very heavy
20 discussion going on there between Mr. Knouf and Mr. Corning.
21 Is that going to generate a question?
22

23 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

24 No.

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:

Okay. I wasn't quite sure.

MR. BILL CORNING:

We were deciding where I'm going to eat tomorrow.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's important. I would like to thank everyone for coming. I will point out that our next meeting will be March 8th at the Jennings County Public Library in North Vernon. That's a Wednesday at seven (7) P.M. Hopefully we will be able to get the NRC there. We will probably know a little bit more about the landfill at that time and how to proceed with the airfield FOST. Should have more information and status on the Central Cantonment Area FOST as far as the lead base paint issue goes so we should be making some progress there. Again please make sure that you sign in and take a copy of the agenda and the slides and I will see you in March. Richard anything else?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Thanks for coming. I do have a couple of copies of the decommissioning plan.

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:

Good night everyone.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION OF HEARING

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)

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 January 12, 2000 in the North Ripley Elementary School, Versailles, 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 19th day of January 2000.

Sharon Shields
Sharon Shields, Notary Public
Jefferson County, State of Indiana

My Commission Expires:
July 2, 2007