A public hearing of the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held at the Madison Jefferson County Public Library, 420 West Main Street, Madison, IN at 7:00 P.M. on February 6, 2002.

OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. Good evening. I would like to get started. Welcome everyone to the RAB meeting. I don't have any other opening comments other than we have a number of handouts in the back. We also have an attendance sheet that we'd like you to sign so that we insure that if your address is changed or if you're new that we add you to the mailing list so that we can keep you informed and keep sending you information of our other meetings. Like I say we do have a number of handouts. We have a copy of the slides you'll be seeing tonight. We have a couple of copies of documents that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has asked us to make available and we will discuss those as we get further into the meeting tonight. There's a copy of a Final Environmental Protection Agency Regulation on ah the standards for uranium and drinking water. There's also a copy of the Inspection Report that the Nuclear Regulatory

Commission performed on their annual inspection of JPG last year. So all of those are back on that back table. And I would encourage you to pick up a copy and go through it as we go through various things here tonight. And if you have any questions you can either ask them tonight or you can always get ahold of myself or Richard. Other than that Richard?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Good evening. Thanks for coming out. I don't have much to add to what Paul did. I will mention - this doesn't have anything to do with any of this - Paul was talking about being sure to speak up and if you have plenty, you know have something to say and be sure and do that, identify yourself. That brought to my mind I was watching a ball game on TV last night and Dick Vitale was the announcer and his co-announcer was trying to get him to eat these cookies to shut him up. And he was eating the cookies and he was still talking away. So it didn't help.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It didn't help huh?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

But that doesn't reflect on anybody that's here. And we don't have cookies anyway okay?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

This is what we have on the agenda tonight. I've gone through the welcome and intro. The first actual subject matter is the Western Parcel UXO Clearance. What we have here tonight is a couple of gentlemen, one (1) from the Huntsville Corps of Engineers who is the center of expertise for ordnance and explosive waste. And also a gentleman from the contractor, American Technologies, Inc. who are the sub-contractor through the Corps that is actually the ah clearance on this three hundred (300) acres. What I would like to do right now, and make sure I do this right, is to turn this over to Mr. Glenn Earhart from the Huntsville Corps of Engineers and he will go through some of the steps on the administrative side of the actual clearance that's being done on this three hundred (300) acres currently.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Hopefully I won't need that. This is a little restrictive but we'll deal with that. Glad you all could come tonight. My name is Glenn Earhart. I'm from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers out of the Huntsville Engineering Support Center. Down in Huntsville we have this mandatory center of expertise as well as the design center for the entire Corps of Engineers. We provide technical support to our geographic districts on any matters related to ordnance and explosives. And as a result of this project we've been working with the Louisville district who is our district up here in this vicinity and we've been providing technical support on the ordnance since the initial project in 1996. Ah and I - I gave you all a briefing I think it was a year and a half (1½) ago when we finished the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis for the Jefferson Proving Ground. And fortunately I've been involved with the project since the very beginning and we're getting pretty close to the end of it. So that's - you don't experience that - those happenings very often in the - in the Corps

where you can take something from beginning to end. All right. What I want to talk about I also have Jim Daffron who's from American Technologies, Inc. who is doing the actual clearance operation for us at the site. What I want to talk a little bit about how we got to this stage, talk about some planning, ah the contract mechanisms that we use to - to get the work done. Ah the work plan phase and we'll keep reminding you that a majority of the project is designated for safety reasons. Ah safety is the paramount issue here and the entire process is based upon making sure that the project is done in a safe manner. And then we'll actually talk about the removal phase and Jim will come up and show you what we've been doing for the last six (6) weeks and we will probably be doing for another six (6) to eight (8) weeks more. And then we'll talk about final report that we normally do. As you're - as you are probably aware this is the last remaining ordnance disposal site that we have south of the firing line. We've cleared four (4) other sites: the hundred (100) acre site, the Airfield site, the east area and the twenty-three (23) acres up northeast of the site. So the wooded site is the final parcel that we're working on. As you recall these sites are identified

in the Archives Search Report as areas of concern that we need to evaluate from an ordnance prospective. Very early on when we first started about two (2) years ago we did an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis. We - we try to do those types of investigations to narrow down the site. As you're aware digging anomalies is very expensive for sub-surface metallic signals and we want to optimize - when we dig we want to optimize finding ordnance and not being nails and debris and wire. So part of the way we can do that is we do ah some investigation from a geophysical mapping prospective. We take magnetometers and magnetic equipment out there that you test sub-surface magnetic signals. Then we investigate some of those, determine what the probability of finding ordnance, what kind of ordnance we would find, then we - we take all the data, we do an alternative analysis, what's the best alternative to clean up this site? And then we select the alternative and that alternative is a document in an Action Memorandum. And that Action Memorandum was signed in February of 2001. Essentially the selected alternative was that we would clear two (2) rows of grids and if we found an ordnance item, an unexploded ordnance or item of ordnance scrap in one (1) of those

grids, we would go further and do two (2) additional grids until we had two (2) completely cleared grids. And that was the alternative selected and identified in the Action Memorandum and that's essentially what we put in our scope of work to initiate the ah removal of the clearance process. What we did was we wrote up a scope of work in March of 2001. That scope of work was solicited to the community, the contracting community. Ah we evaluated the proposals. We got the proposals from a category of contractors that do this kind of work. We evaluated the proposals and we made an award in 4 May of 2001. That award was a firm fix price cost. Since we had enough data collected throughout the process we were able to define the scope and award this as a fix price contract. The basic contract was for six hundred twenty-five thousand dollars ($625,000) and some change. And we had an option clause in that contract for additional grids. If you recall in the Action Memorandum we said that if we would find any OE scrap, ordnance scrap, or unexploded ordnance in any of this grid we would do two (2) additional grids. So our option clause accounted for a fix price cost to do any additional grids that were found or that were required when we got out in the field to do the actual work.

So that option clause is essentially what allows us to make sure that we fulfill the requirements in the Action Memorandum. And also allows the contractor to get you know compensation for additional work that we did not identify up front in the original solicitation. Ah as I said before safety is - is one (1) of our primary concerns. The way we did that and the way we incorporate safety concerns is we go through what some people would call rather elaborate work plan process. Before we will issue a notice to proceed to the contractor to do work he has to prepare certain plans. Those plans have to identify how he's going to do the work, what people are going to work on the job, and a whole series of issues that when he starts work on that site all that is already approved and he knows exactly what to do. And the important part also allows us to do quality assurance on that work since we're all working off the same work plan and the work plan has been approved by the - by the safety community as well as the center of expertise in Huntsville.

So the work plan in process - the work plan was submitted in August. What we did was we issued an initial notice to proceed in September. That initial notice to proceed allowed them to just move equipment up. Did not allow them

to begin any work, just mobilize them to the site, a trailer, get the rental agreements, whatever. So once they got on site they were required to do a - a geophysical plan that told us how they were going to do the geophysical work. And we approved that. We issued notice to proceed for the mapping work on November - in November. And this project, since it's a clearance, required ah an Explosive Safety Submission. That's a document that the Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board requires to be approved at the Pentagon by the Defense Department Explosive Safety Board and that - that explains how we're going to do all the explosives on the site, how we're going to handle explosive management on the site. So that Explosive Safety Submission and the work plan to begin digging was approved in November of - on November 19th. And the complete notice to proceed was issued on November 20th. So they were - on November 20th in 2001 they were allowed to do all types of activities. And Jim's going to talk a little bit about what those activities included. Ah I just have a time for questions and I'll turn the floor over to Jim. Ah do you have any questions of me now or later? I'll be glad to answer them. Yes ma'am?

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

What does non time critical mean?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Non time critical removal action?

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

I just want to know what the word non time means.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Okay the ah - that's a good question. I should have explained that a little bit better. In the ah - in the Regulations that allow us to do the work there are two (2) types of removal actions: time critical which applies that there's more of an imminent hazard that you need to get out there and do the work a little bit quicker, within six (6) months and then a non time critical removal action which allows us to remove action that takes longer than six (6) months.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Does that answer your question? Ma'am did that answer your question?

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Yes. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

How many grids was that for before you went in?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

I think that was for a hundred and forty (140), approximately a hundred and forty (140). That included two (2) grids and with the layout of the site there are some partial grids that we just counted as two (2) grids.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

And I'll explain a little bit more how we laid the grids out. A grid is a two hundred by two hundred (200x200) square foot ah section of the property. So there were a whole lot of small grids with just a little bit of area along the roads in an irregular shape. Glenn talked a little bit about the relationship between my company, ATI, and the Corps. And that's shown here in the Organizational Chart but I want to make sure to point out the way we're organized to do the work in the field. And there's two (2) general areas that ah are shown on here of expertise. One (1) is directly related to the unexploded ordnance and that's under the ATI SUXOS, which is the senior unexploded ordnance supervisor. And he's the person on site with the most experience in dealing with ordnance. And he is responsible for all activities that we do on site. The other major area that we deal with is geophysics and data and information management and some of that takes place on site. When that's taking place on site there's a site geophysicist who controls his operations but he is also under the control of the SUXOS. So he is still controlling the actual field operations of the geophysicist. A lot of the geophysical work is done off site and a lot of the

information and data management is done off site. So that's basically how we're - we're organized. What I want to talk about this evening is the process that we're in now, the Removal Action, the clearance operations that we're currently about halfway through we think. Ah we started with mobilization activities once we got on site and then we actually got into the field work and we're pretty far into that now. I'll show you the progress at the end. And then after the field work there'll be some final wrap up and clean up activities going on and a final report. These are some of the mobilization activities just to give you an idea about the size of the crew that we've got. We mobilized you know pick up trucks to move people and equipment around, the John Deere Gators we use out - they're an all terrain type vehicle that's used out in the field to move equipment off the roads in and out of the wooded area. We've also got geophysical equipment that mobilized in and our crew size varies quite a bit depending on what kind of operations are going on. But around fourteen (14) people on site at one (1) time is a pretty good average crew. There's - I kind of broke the field work up into six (6) general areas of categories of work. And I'll go into each one (1) in detail

but these are the six (6) areas. Starting with the geophysical prove-out, surface sweep, location surveying, which is just land survey, and we have to remove a certain amount of vegetation in order to do the geophysical survey which is the geophysical mapping. And then we go in and reacquire targets and actually do the removal action. So during the first phase is the geophysical prove-out. This is where we take the - the potential geophysical instruments, and there's various types of instruments that could be used to detect things that are sub-surface, metallic objects that might be sub-surface. So in the prove-out we design this to determine which instrument is most effective for this particular piece of ground where we are, what - what types of things we're expected to find. And we - the first part of this is to do a test plot and that's what they're doing in this photograph. They're actually digging holes and seeding items that we might expect to find out in the wooded area. And they are pretty precise with where they locate these items, the depth they put them, the orientation that they put them. Some are put straight up and others are put vertical - I mean horizontal. And then they run the geophysical instruments over it and

sees which one gives the best results. And we select the instrument based on the results of - of this test plot. (Looking) This is one (1) of the instruments that was tested, a CC magnetometer. This is another instrument. It's a GM-61, a similar piece of equipment. Basically a metal detector that looks for the metal that's below the surface that can't be seen on the surface. Some of the other stuff that's attached to it is - is to maintain and track your position on the ground so you know where you are in the ground. We tested different methods there as well to determine what worked best with the trees and that type of thing. So we were testing the ability to detect the anomalies or the metal objects under the surface and also our ability to track where we are on the grid as we walk through the area.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Excuse me? Is GPS built into all the machines?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

GPS can be used into it but it is not

always. And in fact this case when we tested it we didn't have very good results because of the canopy. We didn't get good contact with the satellites and we actually did not use GPS ah routinely when we were collecting this data. Ah we do have GPS on site and we use it some ah - I mean we use it some for reacquisition which I'll get into a little later and identify you know grid corps and stuff like that. But we did - we did look at GPS and ah it wasn't the most effective way so we're using a more manual method of keeping track of where we are on the grid and I'll show you that when we get into the - the geophysical mapping.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Okay.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

The next step was to go through and clear out anything that was on the surface. So we have our UXO technicians go through and they're looking for things that are on the surface that might be a hazard to their people

that come in to clear brush out of the way or do geophysical surveying or the land surveying. And they'll do that with the assistance of a hand held magnetometer and they'll - they'll carry that with them as they walk through the grid and where there's areas with thick brush or you know if there's a lot of leaves or something on the ground they'll wave this hand held magnetometer over it and if they get a signal then they'll you know make sure that there's nothing just under the - the ah leaves or under some brush. I've got a movie. I hope it's going to work, a movie clip. (Showing) This is some of that surface sweeping. What they will do is they will line up and depending on the terrain and the vegetation they will spread out where they can see in a lane. I think this - most of what they did here was about five (5) foot lanes that they walked through the grids and see they're carrying the magnetometers to help them identify metal that's you know on or near the surface. Okay. After we did the surface sweep to make sure there weren't any hazards on the surface, and even while we were doing the surface sweep, we were doing some land surveying where we surveyed in the boundary line and started laying in those two hundred by two hundred (200x200) foot grids. And

while that was going on the survey - the surveyors which were sub-contracted to us were assisted by UXO technicians you know to insure that they avoided any potential hazards. So they had metal detectors with them while they were doing the surveying and before they drove any stakes into the ground they would check the area and make sure there was nothing hazardous to the survey. But in the survey, the land survey, this part of it was pretty routine. They just used standard surveying techniques and instruments to - to ah lay out our grids. And we used the grids as a reference for everything else that we do. When we find something we report where we found it in the grid and everything is referenced to - to the grids. After we're sure that the surface is clean we will go in and clear out the vegetation that is needed, the under brush primarily. When doing the geophysics the instruments are real sensitive and you have to have pretty clear paths to walk through with those instruments to get good results. So what we did was clear out under brush, ah things that were less than three (3) inches in diameter that were - that would interfere with the ability to collect geophysical data. Ah we tried a couple of different methods. We did some hand clearing in areas

and we tried to expedite the clearing with ah mechanical means. This is one (1) example. We ended up using another piece of equipment that's a smaller piece and I'll show you here that was really more effective. Yes?

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

That picture was taken after November the 20th?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yes.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

You're kidding?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No, not at all.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

I can go back and see when we did that. We started ah - we started the - the ah surveying in September, mid September.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That may have been in October.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yeah. Yeah.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Full clearance wasn't approved until after November but some of these other activities were approved before that.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yeah we got - right. We got - okay yeah it probably was. I'm sorry. The ah - we got limited notices to proceed and various notices to proceed if certain documentation was approved. And so this is not part of the - considered part of the UXO Clearance or the geophysical collection. We didn't start collecting geophysical data until November and that was because we had to get the results of the prove-out reviewed by the Corps and then give them back to us. And if they were satisfied that our method

was - was a proper one (1) so yes this was before November. It was sometime after the middle of September but obviously I guess you can tell up here that this is no the way it looks in November. So this - this actually did start before November. I've got another clip here if it will work. (Showing) This is what we ended up doing most of the clearing with which is basically a bobcat that's got like a bushhog. It's a rotary cutter that can cut you know through small brush and clear the paths. And this was just to demonstrate how this equipment was used. We'll - we do some additional brush cutting. We've added some grids so we'll be doing some brush cutting, repeating these same steps on the grids that have been added. So we've finished all the initial brush cutting and now we'll have to do some additional - to ah clear the additional grids.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

Jim was that fairly effective on your two (2) to three (3) inch diameter?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yeah it was. It worked really well. The biggest problem we had was the - the moisture. It got really wet in there when we got in trying to cut this brush and it took a lot longer to cut the brush than we anticipated. And we tried several things until we came up with this. And it seems to be the most effective. It doesn't eliminate the need to do some hand clearing in certain areas where it's too thick to get the instrument, the mechanical brush cutter in and it's too wet. But it does speed the process up quite a bit. The next step is the geophysical mapping. Ah I've got some video. What they're going to do - we have to lay out within the grids lines so that we can reference where we are. They lay lines out every twenty-five (25) feet and they walk through a path that's about two and a half (2½) feet wide and they will set cones out and they will walk from one (1) cone to the next. Once they've walked the length of the grid they will move the cones over and that keeps them on line in doing the ah - the various lanes through the grids. And you'll see here how that is done. You won't see much. Of course you walk into the picture. He carries this instrument and ah basically just walks in a straight line. As he crosses

these tapes that are laid out ah he'll push a button and it will record his position ah or record his time actually. And that time is equated back to a position where he is on the grid relative to these tapes. When he gets to the end here, this is the end of the grid, he's got to turn around and plug into the computer that he's starting two and a half (2½) feet further over and ah he will walk another line. It's kind of a time consuming process. You've got to be careful with the instruments. You've got to try and hold them steady and walk at a fairly constant pace or your data won't be ah - it won't be good. You'll end up having to do redo the grids.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

What's the diameter of the sensitivity of the instruments?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

What?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

What's the diameter of the sensitivity of

the instruments?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well there's several things that ah - that influence the signature that you get. Ah the diameter or the ah actual mag - the magnetic properties of the - of the metal object that you're looking at which is somewhat related to the diameter but also the mass and other things, but also the depth of detection. So if you've got something small on the surface it can have a sign - a signature that is similar to something that is bigger but deeper. But we're digging up you know pieces of wire, nails, ah horseshoes, ax heads along with you know fairly small pieces of ah ordnance and explosive fragments. So it varies quite a bit. You can see what's on the surface really well, really small things. If you start going deeper you start losing your ability to see it. So there's several factors that ah play into it. But we're - we're finding a lot of small scrap. And where we did the test bed what we were looking for were the OE type items that we thought we would find the mortars and the rockets and things that ah we expected to find in the areas. And wanted to make sure that

we could see those ah down to beyond the maximum penetration depth of those items.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So you still haven't given me a number by the way.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Do what?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

You still haven't given me a number.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

I don't - there's not a number.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

All right just on the surface. You're walking every two and a half (2½) feet? What's your diameter for surface detection?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

The diameter of what you can detect on the

surface?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

The diameter of the surface detection. Yeah. Your detector is the point source and you're detecting within a radius around it. What's the radius?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Oh the radius of the area you're detecting? Oh it's about two (2) - two and a half (2½) feet which is the reason for the two and a half (2½) foot lanes. I mean you hold --

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

You'd be double covering every piece of ground is what you're saying?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well no we're not double covering it. We're walking --

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Are you saying the radius is two and a half (2½) feet or the diameter is two and a half (2½) feet?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

The diameter would be two and a half (2½) feet.

MR. MIKE SLOVAK:

The distance (inaudible)

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

What's the radius?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right. Okay.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So which is it? Radius or diameter?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Diameter. The lane - the lane you're walking is two and a half (2½) feet so it would be the

diameter. You walk the lane, you move over, you make a second pass and you've covered five (5) feet. And you walk down to one (1) end and back you've covered five (5) feet, two (2) diameters of two and a half (2½) feet. I thought you were asking the diameter of what you could detect. That's what varies. The lane that we're clearing is a two and a half (2½) foot lane. What you can see from the data and I can show you on our web site, I will explain a little bit more what we're posting on the web site, you can look at the data graphically and you can see if ah - if it's not matching up because you - an anomaly may appear in one (1) pass and you can expect to see the other edge of that anomaly when you're walking back through. In a lot of cases you know where you've got a large anomaly it will be detected in two (2) passes. If it shows up in the same location on both passes then you know you're getting pretty good data. In our case we got really good geophysical data and ah it's all mapped out and color coded and it shows the strength of the signal. And you can tell kind of intuitively that - that the data is - is pretty good data. Now the geophysics can tell a whole lot more - the geophysicists can tell a whole lot more about what the data

is saying and interpreting the data. And they do that when they select the picks. And the picks are the things that then the UXO technicians go in and dig up. And that's a joint effort between our geophysicists and the Corps of Engineers geophysicists at Huntsville. Both review the data and select the anomalies to dig. Does that answer the question about the diameter and radius?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Yes.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Okay. Ah then the final step is really kind of a two (2) step process that we're - we're doing them kind of in conjunction with each other. We'll go in and reacquire - after the geophysicists have reduced the data, selected the anomalies that need to be done, they will plot those on a map with distances from the grid corners that our UXO technicians go out then with a hand held magnetometer, located an anomaly, reacquire it and they'll flag it and reacquire what's on a grid and then all the unnecessary people move back off the grid and the UXO technicians will

then ah investigate that anomaly and it's all - so far everything we've done has been by hand. You know we'll dig down beside the anomaly, investigate as we go down ah with the magnetometer until you kind of pinpoint where the anomaly is, the depth of it and that type of thing and then you know just kind of carefully you know by hand dig out around the anomaly and identify what it is. And the UXO technicians then decide how it is that they need to handle it. Everything that we've found has been safe to move with one (1) exception of something that we found on the surface. We couldn't determine if it was inert or not so we ah vented it in place and found that it was inert. We've not found anything live. But the UXO technicians are trying to make those calls. They make those in the field.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

When we say venting essentially what we do is put a little shaved tires on that item and that shaved tires by explo - by a small explosion ah consumes any explosives or spotting charge that may be inside it.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

(Indicating) And this is another clip of that operation. Ah what they're - what they're doing here is actually pulling the tapes in from the corners to get the general location of where the anomaly was found and then there's others here that have the hand held magnetometers. They'll pinpoint the exact location. And there's little red flags that they'll put out to identify the ah location of those anomalies so they can go back then and ah - and dig. Okay. And as of February 1st these are the results that we found. Ah we've done about a hundred and twenty (120) acres of surface sweeping and in that - in that hundred and twenty (120) acres we've ah identified, found and taken off, removed twenty-two (22) ordnance and explosive related items. Ah scraps or components from - from ordnance you know that's just laying on the surface. Ah it didn't - that - we've got sub-surface investigations. We've done a little over two thousand (2,000) digs as of the first of ah - of ah February and of those two thousand (2,000) digs eighty-seven (87) percent of them turned out to be non OE related things. You know anywhere from horseshoes, ax heads, the wire, any type of metal scrap that was left out there before it was used as a range I - I assume. Ah and then the OE related

items that we found represent about eight (8) percent. We found a hundred and seventy-three (173) items. Again the details of those items are shown in the table and you can see the types of items that we're finding. Most of those things or all of those have been ah either fragments or you know obviously don't contain explosives or inert items that didn't contain explosives. It's a you know a variety of different items that have been found.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Jim?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yes?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

So none of these items were found to - that contained high explosives?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

No.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Is that correct?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

And this area - these grids that - that these OE related items were found in would you say - if I understand it right you kind of started it on the parameter.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Un-huh (yes). Right.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

And so I assume that's more or less where these were found and the work that you yet have to do would be even further inside?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Toward the center of the area is that right?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right. That's right. I've got a map coming up that shows our progress. We basically went two (2) grids deep from the - the two (2) main roads. One (1) was Woodfill Road and Tokyo Road and the - I guess the east and the north boundary of the property. Went two (2) grids deep and started our investigation as you said basically kind of working our way into the area. And as we find things we will continue to add grids and go deeper into the property. And it seems to be the case in looking at the geophysical data that there's a higher concentration of anomalies outside you know along the roads which I think is probably somewhat to be expected. There's fewer anomalies. The grids are a lot cleaner that are interior grids away from the road.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

Jim? Any speculation where these items were actually shot into the woods and used as a range or just

exposed up in the woods?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well I think a lot of them don't really look like they were fired into the woods. I mean I can't - I don't - some of it you can't really speculate on. Some of the fragments I don't know how it may have gotten there. But a lot of this stuff, especially this stuff that was laying on the surface you wouldn't think it impacted and just laid flat on the surface. You - I would think you know that it got there by some other means. The fact that there's a lot of stuff along the road may indicate you know that stuff was you know pushed off the road or fallen off the road off of a truck and somehow it ended up from the road into the edge of the woods. Ah but you know some - some of the stuff is you know --

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Let me add a comment to that. I think, Paul correct me if I'm wrong, I think we've cleared about two thousand (2,000) acres and we found a mine. I don't remember finding any mine anywhere else on the entire

property. The two thousand (2,000) acres that we've cleared to date this is the first time we've ever found the mine on Jefferson Proving Ground.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

But it was a dead mine?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Yeah. But just the fact that we found the mine. Nowhere on the site - on the property did we find them but we found one (1) at the wooded site. How did it get there? That's - we found two (2) pieces of two hundred (200) pound fragment bombs. Ah they cleared - we've cleared thirty thousand (30,000) mortar on - on site property and we haven't found any bombs. We found two (2) bomb fragments so go figure.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

May I ask a strange question? You've gone pretty far along on this so far and you don't have all that much more to go I gather?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Have much more what?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

On the clearing. Would you feel comfortable taking - when you're finished with all this given the thoroughness and the clearing that you've done, you're the person or you're intimately involved with clearing out in the fields. You know exactly what's going on. Would you feel comfortable taking your kids on a picnic out there for the day?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Ah I think the areas that are in there are clear. I would feel comfortable with the areas that we've covered and we'll provide documentation saying that those areas are cleared and I would expect them to be you know relatively free of hazards. Now you know there's always - you know I - you know it's - I would - I would personally but you know I mean - I'm not going to say that --

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

There's no absolute one hundred (100) percent guarantee on that.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

I understand that.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

But Jim is saying that he wouldn't feel as comfortable as I would having my family or anyone else go out there and do any activities that was allowed.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

I would feel comfortable.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

What will happen when clearance is done and ATI writes their report and reviewed by Huntsville and then it will be analyzed by them, they will propose to the Army what's called a Statement of Clearance. And in that Statement of Clearance there will be restrictions for excavations on this property based on the fact that it had at one (1) time contained unexploded ordnance or there was a

clearance done. In some areas we have had clearances done where there is an excavation restriction. On the twelve hundred (1200) acre parcel that we just recently transferred to Mr. Ford that hundred (100) acre parcel that's south of the housing has a four (4) foot excavation restriction on it. The clearance we did on the Airfield has no excavation restriction on it. That's based on things that were found, depths they were found at and a number of other things. It depends on the site specific characteristics of the area and types of munitions that were found or not found, whether they had explosives or not. There are a number of different factors. But I think the bottom line question or he answered your question Diane. I would feel comfortable taking my family out there after they complete the clearance and the Army's accepted the report.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Because that relates to what the potential uses are afterwards?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's one (1) of the potential uses.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

And that's the key is you know whatever the restrictions are should be abided to. But yeah as far as the method and the technology I've got you know a hundred (100) percent confidence in the method and technologies that are being applied. And the geophysics ah are very effective. The data has been extremely good that's come in. And you know I think that we're you know digging an awful lot of things and being extremely conservative in what we select to ah go out and dig. And it's gotten several reviews. I think there's at least three (3) geophysicists, maybe as many as four (4) or five (5) that are involved with reviewing this data that's coming in. So I think that I've got a lot of confidence in that.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

What's the deepness that you have recovered some of these findings? From what depth?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

I think fourteen (14) inches.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Fourteen (14) inches?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Depth.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Well how deep does the ordnance usually go? Fourteen (14) inches is nothing.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It depends on the type of ordnance. If you - if you have a - the smaller things that we have they can't penetrate more than four (4) to ten (10) inches. It depends on what you - what it is. If it's a large item it has a tendency to go farther. One (1) of the factors that we're looking at also in clearing this area is to be sure that we go below the frost line in this area. Frost line is defined in the document as somewhere between ah twenty (20) and twenty-four (24) inches. We're going down farther than that also. We've done that in all the two thousand (2,000) acres that we've already done south of the firing line.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yeah. I'll tell you that one (1) of the most probable munitions was the sixty (60) millimeter mortar and that was what we used in our test plot. And I don't remember the exact numbers but they - there are tables that determine the maximum penetration depth and the various soil types. That's based on you know the thing coming in you know at maximum speed and going straight into the soil. And ah our detection depth is deeper than the maximum penetration depth. I think the maximum penetration depth for the sixty (60) millimeter was somewhere around eighteen (18) inches or something like that. And ah our maximum detection depth which we were able to prove in the test plot was ah two point two (2.2) feet I think is what it was. I'm not a hundred (100) percent sure of the number. I just know that our detection depth is greater than, deeper than the maximum penetration depth. And that penetration depth is based on the high point as I understand it, the high point of the mortars. So the sixty (60) millimeter mortar may be eight (8) inches long so it's going to penetrate and the ah - the shallowest part would be ah at the maximum penetration

level.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

I'm a little confused. I was under the impression that you had a penetration depth detection capability to four (4) feet and that's why you had a four (4) foot excavation because you were confident down to four (4) feet.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It depends on the piece of ordnance. You know a sixty (60) millimeter mortar will not penetrate.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

No I understand the penetration. He's saying that the detection depth is two (2) feet.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's a sixty (60) millimeter mortar. That's not like a one o five (105).

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Paul you said - Paul wait a second. My understanding from what I just heard was eighteen (18) inch penetration depth, two point three (2.3) feet detection depth which is below eighteen (18) inches.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

For sixty (60) millimeter mortars.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Right. I understand that.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

What's your question?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

But the detection depth should be the same no matter what it is.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

No.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No. It depends on the size of the ordnance. There's several different size penetration to deal with. Sixty (60) millimeter and the eight-one (81) millimeter mortar, the one o five (105) round.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So am I hearing that you're only confident on the very large pieces down to four (4) feet?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

The other smaller objects are not capable of going below that depth. Physically impossible for it to penetrate the ground in farther a certain amount.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

The other factor is that's why we keep track of all this. If we find something that - that's different than what our projections are then we go back and we call it a Probable Munition Amount. We go back and redo fragment distance and things like that. So as long as what we find is consistent with our original projections based on history of the site, load conditions, we ah - we use depth

penetration for the army. Right now we're - we're going to - we're confident down to I think you said two point three (2.3) feet?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

I think the test plot we had set - we put things down to four (4) feet deep in the test plot and ah - and I don't - I don't want to say the wrong number but - but I'm confident that ah - there are tables that say what the detection depth should be and we got to that level and I think slightly below what the published detection depth was supposed to be for the instruments we were using.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So it still comes down to the prediction that something of a certain size will not penetrate below a certain level and your detection capabilities for that site is good enough to go below where its penetration should be?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Or to the (inaudible)

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So take that four (4) foot absolute certainty that you should absolutely not go below it because there really is a chance that you've got --

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Well I mean anything below four (4) feet - ah anything below four (4) - normally we think five (5) feet. It's very rare to find an item that the depth of penetration would be below four (4) feet. A lot of times four (4) foot depth is for burial pits. Things like when you have burial grounds and they dig the pits deeper and they burn things. Our - our instrumentation could very easily detect a pit or a trench.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Un-huh (yes).

MR. GLENN EARHART:

When you talk about the sig lights - sig lights we have to use the depth of penetration because of

the detection equipment. We know when we can find a pit or trench so our - our limitation is the sig light. So how do you - how do you set the equipment up to find a sig light? Well depth of penetration, soil condition, what type of items would you find there, the flexibility that you can find something that surprises you. You go back and re - you know regauge everything, redo everything. So that's why we're extremely confident that ah when we're done with this site ah we're going to be able to give Paul this recommended clearance here.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

May I ask just one (1) odd question? This is fairly red soil. How much does iron in the soil confuse the magnetometer?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well that does play into it and that's the reason for doing the test plot. The soil conditions at every site are slightly different. That's why we did a test plot right out on site next to the - next to the area that we're actually clearing. And that's exactly - and that's

one (1) reason that we do that is because if you're in another part of the country you're going to get different readings from the same instrument looking at the same ordnance.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

You're controlling for your background?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right. You do that.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Soil.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

You do that with your test plot.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

And it can be a problem because there are a lot of sites that have magnetic draw.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

I would think here would.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

We took that into account. That's why we set the test bed right up in the same geographic co-traffic type condition. There are a lot of sites where there are magnetic rocks.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

And each time we bring an instrument back on site we'll go over the test bed to make sure there's not a variation in the instrument. You know we try to - by putting in the test bed that's kind of a quality control measure that we have to make sure that we're seeing what we're thinking we're seeing and verifying that. And these are some of the items that were recovered. Ah have been stored. And then I've got a couple of items of you know some of that more unusual things that a lot of them we found were you know components from a four and a half (4½) rocket, frag maybe from mortars. This is what we were talking about before the hundred (100) pound bomb fragment. And those hold a hundred (100) pound bombs. (Indicating) Ah this picture didn't come through very well but that's the land

mine that he was talking about that we found out there. These - this may shows the grids that we laid out and ah it's a tool that I used to kind of track the progress ah where we are. The colors - basically everything has been geophysically surveyed with the exception of some grids that we just got added last week. So everything can either be yellow meaning the investigation, the physical investigation has been completed or the pink or red color. That means the excavations have been finished. So the things that are yellow we haven't dug yet although we've already collected the geophysical data on things that are red and those are a hundred (100) percent complete at this time.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Well most of it has no action taken right?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well right. And that - that part is not in the scope and - and the addition of that blue is dependent on what we find if we work from the roads. In other words the roads run - here's one (1) of the roads that runs along

the east side of the - of the property (indicating) and then this road along the north. So the way the scope was written we started going two (2) grids in from each road, two (2) squares in and then dependent upon what we find if it's completely clean we're going to keep going further west because the - the thought was in doing this - in doing the study I mean up to this action that the - first of all I think there was the expectation that there might be more along the road. But as you went further west it would be less likely that you would find ah items. And that seems to be based on the geophysical data we've collected true. But there is the clause in the contract. You can't see it very well but let's see if I can point it out. (Looking) Where these lines have been drawed in, that's where our scope has recently been expanded to include some additional grids in these areas. Ah that was based on some - I think that was actually based on the fact that we found that land mine over here in this grid (indicating). So we added these grids (indicating) and if there's something found on those grids ah then this - we would keep moving ah until we find that it's clean. These grids up here have been added (indicating). There's a lot of stuff that was found up in

this corner right near that road intersection so we've added these grids in here (indicating) and recently we added these three (3) grids based on items that we found.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

And that comes to twenty-three (23) right now and I just got additional funding so we'll be adding - what did we come up with? Forty (40) some?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Total.

MR. KEN KNOUF:

I think forty-seven (47).

MR. GLENN EARHART:

I think forty-seven (47) additional grids above and beyond the twenty-three (23).

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Can you define for everybody what ah - what could be detected that could set off a - a new layer of grids and what wouldn't qualify for setting a new layer?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Well the OE - OE scrap, most of what we dig up - eighty (80) some percent of what we dug up is just metal scrap that shows up as an anomaly and we go and we dig it and we confirm that it's not ah OE. But ah it's based - I guess that --

MR. GLENN EARHART:

All the things in that chart caused us to do two (2) additional grids. All those fragments.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Any single one (1).

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Any single - I mean we're doing two (2) grids in an area where we found five (5) inch piece of ordnance.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

And that's it?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

That's it. That's the only thing in the grid but we're still doing some additional grids.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

So they find that little scrap and they have to go two (2) more grids?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Yes.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Okay. Got it.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

That's the commitment we made to everybody.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

How come you only go west? Why didn't you also go east or something?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

That - that area has been - the area that - this area over here (indicating) has previously been cleared under other --

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

You've already done that?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's the Airfield. That's already been done.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

That's the Airfield right.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Ah if - if - if you want to - I think there's a - if there's computers here that are connected to the Internet I can show you better on the - on our web site where some of this OE scrap has been found. It's actually pinpointed and located on here and you can see where it's been concentrated you know up here along this corner

(indicating) primarily and a few - a few little pieces along the roads here. Ah and we can look at that and what we can do is we can actually click on the item that was found and get the information about it, what the item was, what the depth it was that we found it if you want to look at that in a little detail. If we've got some time when we finish up here I will be glad to show that to you.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

And ah now that we're off of that there were some - okay there we go. The red grids ah within the blue area?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

They look like they're kind of random areas?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Right. They were part of the original scope that was to do kind of a random check inside there to see

what we would ah - you know what we might find. And they were ah relatively clean even of non OE scrap. They were fairly clean grids. Very little metal in it.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

We did find one (1) item on one (1) of the middle ones and we're going to have to do additional grids.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

(Indicating) Around this site.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

That's part of forty-seven (47) or forty-nine (49).

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

It's not shown - it's not shown on the map because it has not been awarded yet. But that's going to add some grids, interior grids.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That one (1) grid will require us to do

twenty-four (24) additional grids.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Seven thousand (7,000) grids.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

I know before when UXB was here doing clearance they always had a Corps of Engineer person here that - there was QA and QC afterwards. I know this time you buried rounds to see how accurate they were on finding them and stuff.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Okay it's two (2) phase to the question.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Okay.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

The first question is we always have a hundred (100) percent on site. Mike Slovak is our

Huntsville rep this week. We try to move people in and out at two (2) or three (3) week intervals so that they can spend some time with their families. When we do a removal there's a hundred (100) percent over site by Corps of Engineers every day on the job.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Okay.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Now the rationale - when we originally started this site the expectation there was nothing there. So one (1) of the challenges we have in the business is how do you prove negative? So one (1) of our concerns was that to insure being able to substantiate our work we buried certain number of items in locations that only the government knew where they were buried so that it's a test on the geophysics that ATI would do. So when ATI does their work we expect, our geophysicists at Huntsville, expect to see sixty (60) millimeter mortar at this specific location where we buried it. And so that - we normally don't do that. We're going to start doing that more often. But we implemented that for the Jefferson Proving Ground wooded

site because of the wooded nature of the - of the area, the difficulty in doing geophysics in wooded areas and the fact that we really didn't expect to ah you know to find anything. In fact you know last week we had a budget meeting with Paul and our original projection was a little bit lower you know and we had - we had to get more money. But essentially that was the process - that was what we called our QA dig or burial. We - we seed the items. We only knew where they were and the - and the result would be that ATI needed to find those items in the exact location. That's a test on our quality assurance on our geophysics, reacquiring and actually digging process.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

So how did it do?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

It did great.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Found every one (1)?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Every one (1).

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Okay. This is kind of in conclusion. A few of the things when we get finished we're going to clean up, remove any mistakes and stuff that we put out, identifying the grids and ah demobilize our equipment, personnel. Ah I've added to this slide the information/data management. That's really an on going thing that we've got up and running now. There will also be a tool used in the future after the project's done working towards doing the final report which will summarize what we did, the activities that took place, the results of those activities, ah and that will ultimately lead to the Corps publishing of the Clearance Certificate based on what we've been able to get done with the removal. Yes?

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

Can you leave it on this slide for a minute?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Sure.

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

I didn't get the web site.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Oh I'm sorry. I was hoping to be able to demonstrate that. I thought I could tie into the network and actually pull that site up and I couldn't - couldn't make it work. So I will demonstrate it to anybody that wants to see it after the meeting if we've got time. They close at nine (9) but if we've got time to get on a computer I can show you ah - ah some of the information that's on the web site. The web site is designed to be a management tool for ATI and the Corps and our sub-contractors. There's certain portions of the site that are available to the public and to other sections and data that will become public as the information is - is ah processed. So some of the sites to access it you have to have certain levels of authorization. There are some parts of the site that are only for ATI's use and only ATI people have access to certain things. That gives us the ability to ah post things

from the field and see them on a - on a real time basis. But ah as - as the information becomes available we will post it out there. Yes?

MS. KEVIN HERRON:

Earlier you had indicated something about that there were pits that were dug and items buried and burnt and covered up again. Are - is part of the reason why you think that you know you can detect them is that the soil has been disturbed there so your detection will be better in that area?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

No.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

Or is it just the amount of enormous objects that are there?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

It's a mass of metal. I mean when you -

when you see a pit with a whole bunch of metal in it it becomes one (1) big glob versus individual signal for it.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Yeah basically the metal has some - a magnetic field and a positive field. And you know a single item will have that field and then the bulk of items or fields of the - ah added in a sense that you will see a stronger signal if you've got two (2) items in the same area even if they're not touching or connected.

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

What about a drum?

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

A drum would show up pretty well.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

You can see that on the web site very clearly. Some of those signals take up two (2) grids or three (3) grids.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

And that's - I think that's the end of my presentation. I'll turn it back over to Paul.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I want to thank Glenn and Jim for coming up and providing some more technical information on the - on the clearance. (Indicating) Again this is the map that another - another map that shows the Western Parcel that is being done. You can see that the Airfield parcel was you know also considered at one (1) time to have a potential for UXO. We also cleared that. This last slide on this one (1) is the most recent schedule for this effort. It goes all the way down to the very last item on the bottom is actually when we get the Statement of Clearance and the work is complete. This schedule will be adjusted as necessary as ah additional grids are added if they're added. Because obviously if more grids are added more work will have to be

done and it will take a little bit longer. Ah it has already been adjusted out for some of the additional work that's been done, not all the work that we know that we're going to have to do today. Now that might change tomorrow. It might not. But we know it will change a little bit. What I would like to talk about now are some of the Findings of Suitability to Transfer of three (3) different parcels at the Airfield: DRMO Parcel, the Airfield Parcel and the Northeastern Parcel. We've talked a little bit about that but we have an updated status now on all of them. The DRMO parcel about five (5) - a little over five and a half (5½) acres has one (1) building in it and ah the FOST was approved back in September of the year 2000. The Army provided a deed to Mr. Ford for him to review. He signed that September of last year. It was sent up to the Pentagon, the deed was signed by the Army November 6th. The parcel was actually transferred to Mr. Ford November 26th of last year. He now owns that parcel or did. It's my understanding he has subsequently sold it. But that parcel has been transferred and this map right here (indicating) shows you the DRMO parcel right here. It's this little parcel right down there. The next ah parcel is the Airfield

parcel about seven hundred and sixty (760) acres, has just over twenty (20) buildings in it. We originally proposed that as a commercial-industrial. When I say commercial-industrial that's a level of environmental clearance, not zoning or anything else. That meets a certain standard of environmental planning for reuse. Ah we put out the original FOST back in 1999. Ah we received comments from the State and the EPA. Before we responded to those comments ah there was a change in the reuse. Mr. Ford came back to the Army and requested us to look at possibly transferring this in a cleaner state. In residential it means it would be used up to and including residential but could be used for anything, industrial-commercial, agricultural, residential, anything so it's actually a higher cleanliness area than what was being proposed before. We looked at that internally within the Army, analyzed what we would have to do or what we believed would be necessary to be done to qualify for that status and made the decision that we could go forth and do that with this parcel. That required some additional analysis to be done, some additional clean up and soil to be removed, and that was done. We came back and provided some additional information

to the State and the EPA. They had some comments in response to those. And as a result of that we redrafted the FOST for this area. That redrafted FOST was put out for comment October of last year and we requested comments towards the end of November of last year. We got comments from the State and the EPA and the community RAB members in November and December of last year and tonight I have given copies of the responses to all of those comments to the State and the EPA and the community co-chair of the RAB with a revised FOST and some analytical data that they did not have prior for some of the soil sampling. We've requested that we either receive a concurrence to the FOST or an agreement with the FOST as it's now written or an identification of outstanding issues by the first of March. (Indicating) This is a diagram, a map, that shows you the basic area of this parcel. Once the March 1st comes around we would either receive a letter of concurrence, an agreement from the community, the State and the EPA or we would - they would identify their - their outstanding issues. If there are outstanding issues we would attach those to the document. The Army would attach a response to those outstanding issues and then it would be staffed up to

then the Army Headquarters and they would analyze the document to see if in fact if there are any outstanding issues do they warrant additional work or not in their judgement? If they do not then the document would be approved and then a deed would be prepared and we would transfer the property to the Ford Lumber and Building Supply and they would pay us the going rate that they agreed to when they were the successful high bidder for the property. If the decision is made that no, you need to do more work, they would identify what that is and we would go do that, revise the document and then see if there are any other outstanding comments. Diane?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

What is the possibilities of going back and obtaining the industrial designation?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

There's no reason that I'm aware of at the present time that the Army would do that based on the fact that we have spent considerable time and effort in what we believe satisfies the criteria for unrestricted reuse for

this parcel. That does not mean to say that once the parcel is transferred, even if we have no deed restrictions on it, that the community can't do that. But that's between the community and the title holder.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

So a question that I have also Paul - of course we just got this tonight.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Un-huh (yes).

MR. RICHARD HILL:

I haven't had a chance to look at it but can you give me a - just a general idea of what kind of revisions - ah okay it says Revised FOST.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Has it been revised based on these comments?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes it has.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

And can you give me a general idea what kind of revisions it is?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well I will give you - I will give you some examples. I can't recall all of them off the top of my head. Ah there was a comment from the EPA that identified an area right up - basically right in here (indicating) where during the Archives Search Report for identification of areas that had potential for UXO that area did not - that area was not included in there. While we were digging up some soil for environmental contamination we did find some ordnance there. So the comments from the EPA was that we should say that although this parcel, this area where I have the cursor right now is not part of this parcel, that there - that area is adjacent to a - we didn't expect to find UXO there but we did find it. And so we added that into the

documentation in the FOST. Another one (1) we received from ah the State had to do with what were some inconsistencies regarding underground storage tanks. Okay. We cleared that up and made it consistent. Ah we got another one (1) from the State that said something along the lines of ah when you go into like paragraph or section three (3) of the document there is a whole listing of documentation and reports and letters and correspondences.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Oh yeah.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

What we did there instead of attaching copious copies of documents that already exist we took specific pieces of correspondence where before we just said ah letter from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management dated 15 April, 2000. We then put in parenthesis what the subject or the content or the meaning or the reason for that letter was. And all those letters are on file in the Admin Record and the State has copies, we have copies,

EPA has copies. So it gives a more full description of what those are. That's - that's some of the examples. Now I can't recall all of them off the top of my head. Did that answer your question?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Yes. Thank you.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Right now we project based on the schedule that we're looking at for the Airfield parcel that if in fact the document is either concurred to or the outstanding comments are not significant enough to require us to do additional work that the process for that parcel ending up in transfer with a deed to the Ford Lumber and Building Supply Company would probably occur sometime this summer. And that would result in the Army getting approximately fifteen hundred dollars ($1500) an acre. You can do the math. That's about what it works out to be. Ah the next parcel is in the Northeast corner of the cantonment area. It's about four hundred and sixty-five (465) acres and there's thirty-nine (39) buildings out there. And it's also

been proposed for unrestricted use. The one (1) item that we are waiting on before that FOST comes out, and you can see the bottom bullet here, we estimate that FOST will come out this April. We did go out and take some soil samples for residual soil contamination from metals and explosives because we did do a UXO clearance in this area. There was no environmental - known environmental contamination in this area so there's not an issue there. Ah that we expect to provide that information by the middle of this month to the State and EPA and the RAB members for that - the results of that residual soil analysis. Once I have that then I will be able to finish up this document and put it out in April. And that's a standard minimum thirty (30) day review time for comments on that document.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Is anybody planning to do a quick Risk Analysis based on the soil sampling?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That will be discussed in the ah - in the report depending on what they find. If they don't find

anything then the Risk Analysis is zero (0). If you get non detect on everything or what you get is so far below any level of concern a Risk Analysis would be a waste of effort. It depends on ah what they have. I know that the Corps has the results now and they're finishing up on that review right now. (Indicating) This is a map that shows you where this area is. The reason why this little dog leg is the way it is is because this parcel right in here was part of the twelve hundred (1200) acres that we transferred to Mr. Ford last summer. And there are some administrative reasons for that but basically once this parcel is transferred it will give him ah with the - assuming the Airfield is transferred and the twelve hundred (1200) acres we have already transferred, we'll be looking at probably somewhere in the neighborhood of twenty-two hundred (2200) to twenty-four hundred (2400) acres that we have finished out of about thirty-six (3600) to thirty-eight hundred (3800) that he ah bid on. Any other questions on the ah property transfers that have either happened or we're proposing right now? We have another comment/discussion period towards the end so don't hesitate. What I would like to talk about now is where we stand on the termination of the Depleted Uranium

License. Ah the first few bullets here all provide information that's already been put out. But it shows you the chronological sequence. We submitted a plan to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the 27th of June last year. We also mailed a copy to the entire mailing list for JPG. That was over two hundred (200) copies. Ah it was also made available on the JPG web site and that ah is the web site address that you can access it on. The NRC reviewed the document between July and September of last year. Towards the end of September ah they sent a letter dated to us on the 27th. They had a number of comments. We are in the process of responding to those comments, revising the document, and right now our estimated date to provide that would be the 30th of June this year. That requires additional Risk Analysis and it's going to take some time. Yes ma'am?

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

When you say revised - revising the document?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Are you referring to the document or are you referring to doing something about it?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

We're referring to the document. It depends on --

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Just changing paragraphs?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It depends on what the NRC has asked. They may ask us ah an - an easy example would be one (1) of the requirements is that you identify the name and address of the location of the facility. Well if we didn't do that that could be a comment. That's real easy to fix. But a more hard or more difficult one (1) would be, you did not analyze the potential for ah migration of Depleted Uranium via this particular stream, whether it's ground, ah soil, ah

ground water, surface water, airborne, whatever. You need to go do that. And that's one (1) of the things they've asked us to look at is a couple of additional methods of potential migration and what the risks might be. So that's why it's taking longer than it would be if it was a simple ah you didn't put your name and address on the - on the front page.

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

Paul?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes Karen?

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

When you say ah Army's responses, are you sending responses to all the people that commented or is that just on NRC - the letter that they sent you?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

There will be - we will respond to the NRC

with a combination of a revised document and a letter that will probably answer some of their questions also. It will probably be a combination of both. But once we have provided that to the NRC we will also mail it out to the entire mailing list and put it up on the web site. And it will be in the Admin Record. I mean we will do basically what we did before. We will provide it to everyone. Now as we go through this process, and I've mentioned before, this is the first time that the NRC has gotten to a point with ah a licensee that they are seeking this particular type of license termination. So we're kind of learning. Everyone is learning as we're going: the NRC, the Army, the community, everyone. As we continue to provide them documentation and information as they require this last bullet may identify or prompt them to seek ah additional information or require us to go do additional things that we don't even know about right now and they may not even know about. One (1) of the things that they provided us were two (2) handouts in the back. One (1) is about three (3) pages, kind of discusses the process in general from their prospective ads the resolution on how a license is decommissioned. And then the one (1) sheet of paper shows

you a number of - of bullets on how long it takes. One (1) thing I would like to point out up there, those numbers are work days. They are not calendar days. So when you transfer or convert that into calendar days it's longer. It's about seven-fifths (7/5) or about forty (40) percent longer than those work days. Because work days just Monday through Friday. It does not count Saturday or Sunday. So if you say one (1) work week it's seven (7) calendar days instead of five (5) work days. When I looked at that because that was just provided a couple of weeks ago by the program manager at the NRC you read that one (1) sheet of paper and some of these processes are done in series and some of them are done in parallel. I sat down and tried to figure out which ones they were, called up Tom Mclaughlin and we went over those to make sure which ones were in series until my understanding agreed with his understanding. Bottom line is that when you add up all the numbers right now from the time we submit the revised plan until the end of June it will be about six (6) years before the NRC will work through their process.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Six (6) years?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes ma'am. That's how long it will take. And one (1) of the big reasons why is they have - the NRC has to do an Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

So the license will not be terminated then?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

For a minimum.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

Until at least 2008 or 2009?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Yes ma'am. And that raised some eyebrows at the budget meeting last week didn't it Glenn?

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Yeah.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

In what way?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Because they thought it was going to be sooner than that.

MS. MARY CLASHMAN:

They could never pay for it.

MR. GLENN EARHART:

Now their objective is - their goal is to get rid of the property.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

But they can't get rid of it?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well in this case we're not getting rid of

the property but the goal is to finish the requirement, the requirement being the termination of the license.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So Paul what's the difference in monitoring between now and what happens after 2008 if you get a license termination?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

There is no monitoring requirement is my understanding.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

After 2008?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

After 2008. That's my understanding. But the NRC will make that determination. If you recall back in May of 2000 when the NRC was here they are the ones that made that statement. If we satisfied the radiological and regulatory criteria and the license is terminated there are no further monitoring requirements. But we have to satisfy

their criteria first. And that's their decision. Now this slide (indicating) basically shows ah some of the things that the NRC will be doing. It's more fully detailed in the sheets that they provided to us. I would highly encourage that if you have any comments or questions this is the person to call. And they have a toll free number. He also has an E-mail address. All you have to do is call 1-800-368-5642 and ask for Dr. Tom Mclaughlin. Just so that you understand there was a letter written two (2) weeks ago to the NRC. I authored it and requested that the NRC be here tonight. Their response was that until they get the plan they have nothing to review so they have nothing other to discuss other than handouts that they have provided ah to us to present tonight. But they also made one (1) other very interesting comment. And that comment was they have received no phone calls from the public on this issue. And that's one (1) of the reasons why we insured that the toll free number is there because I wanted to make sure that there is as few impediments as possible to have anyone contact them.

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

Paul are they saying they haven't received any calls?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Except from me.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's what they - except from Richard.

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

Well I've called.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

You're not the general public. You don't count. You're a regulator. You don't count. One (1) of the first things they would probably do if you called is they would ask you are you a member of the general public or are you a member - you know do you work for EPA or Indiana Department of Environmental Management? You know they would ask that question. I would if I were them. Because it's of interest to them to see if in fact there is interest in this issue. This is the Army's point of contact. We have a web

site that I've shown before. We have an E-mail address that you can send comments to. Ah we have a verbatim transcript of all these meetings. The NRC gets a copy of all of these meetings and all of these transcripts. They also go into the Admin Record at Hanover. We've recently obtained funding. One (1) of the things that is going to be happening is all the documents in the Admin Record are going to be put on an electronic format. They're going to be put on CDs. But in addition to that they're ultimately going to be up on the web site. So anybody who wants to can go - can ultimately go to the JPG web site and any document that is going to be in the Admin Records they can go look that. That will probably take about a year but we're in the process of doing that now. Discussion? Any additional comments or questions? Kevin?

MR. KEVIN HERRON:

You didn't mention anything about the Remedial Investigation and other activities that have taken place and where that's going. I think the community might like to know that's going on there.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Where we stand on that right now is the Corps of Engineers and their contract, Montgomery-Watson, is in the process of generating a final on the Remedial Investigation. The Army's goal is to complete the Remedial Investigation for JPG this year. That's one (1) of three (3) or four (4) goals that we have is to finish that. That will allow us to get into the Feasibility Study and the ah various phases that would ultimately get into cleaning up whatever areas are agreed that have to be cleaned up south of the firing line.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

So you're just talking about whatever else is left south of the firing line? You're not talking about north? You're not talking about --

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

No. It's just south of the firing line. That's where the Remedial Investigation addresses is south of the firing line.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

You're not talking about the landfill just north of the firing line?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Well that's part of it but that's - that was incorrectly placed in the RI. That was closed under IDEM regulations as a solid waste landfill. And we are still in the --

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Unlined solid waste.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I beg your pardon?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Unlined solid waste landfill.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

It was closed in accordance with and approved by IDEM in their closure plan. They approved it

and we have been monitoring the ground water since 1996 and have gotten no hits.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Somebody there should be hiding their head in shame. An unlined landfill with all that stuff in it.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Any other comments or questions?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Sorry Paul.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

That's all right. Richard?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

I have something I want to share with the general public. Ah I have briefly mentioned this to Paul and we've been talking about it as the community RAB members amongst ourselves, ah but I don't think we've brought it out at a RAB meeting yet. And ah that has to do with the Fish

and Wildlife Service doing a controlled burn in the DU area this spring. And what the community RAB members have been discussing ah is what the community would really like to see would be some air monitoring done during - during that burn. I've talked to a lot of people about this. Ah as of let's say right now ah the most recent person that I have talked to that ah also expressed some interest in this is ah - his name is Gary Campbell, Dr. Gary Campbell with ATSDR. What's that? Agency for Toxic Substances--

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Good.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Okay.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

You got it.

MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:

It's a center for Disease Control.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Center for Disease Control in Atlanta right. I've got it. And ah he and his chief help, physicist - I'm not sure if I got his title right but anyway Stan something. Can't remember his last name. But anyway I talked to both of them and they were very interested. They thought it would supply some good, scientific data to do that. And ah again it was a case of where this is something that had kind of crossed their minds before but they never really did anything about it because they hadn't heard anything from anybody in the public you know wanting to do this. Ah but now that they have they sounded excited about it but they're looking for some funding. Naturally. And of course this time of the burn is approaching fast.

MS. STEVE MILLER:

Probably.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Probably next month? In March?

MR. STEVE MILLER:

It's more likely to be from March 15th to April 15th (inaudible) but it could occur as early as mid February.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

That's next week.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Yeah. But we - we think it's more likely the burn will - the burning conditions will be low relative humidity probably around March 15th.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

What are the kind of conditions you are requiring?

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Ah they're set out in our - our burn plans. It allows you to - usually it's ah based on relative humidity, temperatures, ah and that usually occurs when

rainfall's been in the last seven (7) to eight (8) days. It's real hard to spell it out. Temperatures have to be between fifty (50) and eighty (80) that day. The winds have to be less than twelve (12) miles per hour. I think the ceiling on the cloud cover has to be greater than twenty thousand (20,000) feet. Now I didn't write this plan so I'm just doing this out of my head. I can provide information on that.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Just curious. It's interesting that you say that the winds have to be less than twelve (12) miles per hour because you're - ten (10) to twelve (12) miles per hour you're getting some fair conditions there aren't you?

MR. STEVE MILLER:

Well the reason we want some kind of wind there is for the oxygen for the fire but we also don't want so much wind there that it will at least plume a lot. That's what we're looking for is controlling the plume pattern.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

And how much do you, especially in this kind of situation, do you monitor the direction of the plume?

MR. STEVE MILLER:

The direction of the plume?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Yeah.

MR. STEVE MILLER:

We're more worried about getting inversion from a low cloud cover there rather than the direction of the plume because the plume is not dependent upon the ground wind speed or the wind direction of the upper atmosphere what direction there is (inaudible) So the winds above twenty (20) feet (inaudible) we don't worry about that.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Any other comments or questions?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Did I tell you what I was going to say?

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

I don't know. Did you?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

He said that he was looking for money.

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Oh yeah. And ah so far that - nothing has come through on that at all. I talked to Dr. Campbell again this past month, day before yesterday, and you know he said that they were checking into some things. Ah Representative Hill's office had contacted him ah to talk to him about it too. Ah so we'll see I guess. Ah it's an awful - like I said it's an awful short time period for something that we should have started on a year ago I guess. Ah so that's where it stands right now. Yes. Yeah.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Could money come from the NRC maybe?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Well I talked to Dr. Mclaughlin about it and ah he - he indicated that that would not happen. That - that they would not require that it be done and ah that they - they would not be interested in doing it themselves. And I took that to mean that they wouldn't be interested in paying for it either.

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

Did you talk to any --

MR. RICHARD HILL:

I talked to Barron Hill's chief of staff a head staff person a couple of times and he's passed that stuff along very well.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Anything else? Richard? Diane?

MS. DIANE HENSHEL:

No I'm just wondering - (inaudible)

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

(Showing) This next slide shows the meeting schedule for the remainder of the year. Our next meeting will be at South Ripley Elementary School in Versailles May 1st. Then the meeting after that will be back here in August and then the last one (1) this year will be up in Jennings County at the Public Library in November. This just re-emphasizes where the next meeting will be. Ah I don't have anything more. If there are any other comments or questions we have about twenty (20) minutes but we do have to be out of the Library at nine o'clock (9:00). That's - that's - I can talk for hours outside the building but at nine o'clock (9:00) we have to be outside the building.

MR. JIM DAFFRON:

Paul I've got the web site up if anybody wants to see it.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay so if anybody would like to see that

just see Jim in the back. He's got one (1) of the computers on in the Library. Again please sign the attendance sheet if you didn't. Pick up a copy of any of the handouts either for yourself or someone else if you think they would be interested. And please stay involved. Richard do you have any comments?

MR. RICHARD HILL:

Ah no. I think that's about it.

MR. PAUL CLOUD:

Okay. The hearing is adjourned.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION OF HEARING

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 February 6, 2002 in the Madison-Jefferson County Public Library, 420 West Main Street, Madison, 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 February, 2002.

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

My Commission Expires: July 2, 2007