

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

FORMER CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE

11

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

12

MAY 17, 2012

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Rantoul Business Center  
601 South Century Boulevard  
Rantoul, Illinois

24

1                   MR. CARROLL: Hello, everybody. I'd  
2 like to welcome everyone to the May 17th, 2012,  
3 Restoration Advisory Board meeting. It's about four  
4 after the hour. We have a pretty limited time to get  
5 our Restoration Advisory Board meeting done, so I  
6 apologize if I interrupted.

7                   I'd like to start with the action items, and  
8 that's on the next page. Approve the transcripts  
9 from the February 16th meeting. I'd like to take  
10 nominations for that.

11                   MS. RAWLINGS: Move to approve.

12                   MR. CARROLL: Okay.

13                   MS. WIRGES: Second.

14                   MR. CARROLL: Second. Vote?

15                   (All RAB Members vote by show of hands  
16 in favor.)

17                   MR. CARROLL: Opposed?

18                   (No opposition.)

19                   MR. CARROLL: Okay. Minutes are  
20 approved. And the other one, let's see, the second  
21 action item is risk-based cleanup goals presentation  
22 to RAB members. Dr. Schneider?

23                   DR. SCHNEIDER: Held that on May 3rd  
24 over at the village office.

1 MR. CARROLL: Okay.

2 DR. SCHNEIDER: The library user  
3 guide, we're still figuring out how to really pull  
4 that together. We have a list of what's over there,  
5 but it embodies more than just a list so you and I  
6 still have to work some of that out.

7 MR. CARROLL: Yes. Okay. We're  
8 working with that. And I forgot to go around and do  
9 introductions, which is pretty timely since Dr. Wang  
10 just showed up. I'll finish the action items and  
11 we'll go around and do the introductions.

12 The Air Force wanted to distribute the  
13 Environmental Brochure to senior leadership, and that  
14 has been done. There are copies of that still, I  
15 think, at the Village's offices. I think all of you  
16 have copies of that as well.

17 MS. RAWLINGS: Do you get any feedback  
18 when you do that, or is it kind of just --

19 MR. CARROLL: We did get some feedback  
20 from our leadership up to the Director of our agency.  
21 They liked it, and they were pretty excited about at  
22 least having that to be able to show to our senior  
23 leadership, yes.

24 And the improvement of public accessibility of

1 information, and Howard will speak on that here in a  
2 little while.

3 Let's go around and make introductions. Sorry  
4 I'm kind of getting out of order here. My name is  
5 Paul Carroll. I'm the Air Force co-chair for the  
6 Restoration Advisory Board.

7 MS. WIRGES: Lorraine Wirges, RAB.

8 MS. BECNEL: Denise Becnel, RAB.

9 DR. ROKKE: Doug Rokke, RAB.

10 DR. WANG: Ian Wang, RAB.

11 MS. RAWLINGS: Debra Rawlings, RAB.

12 MR. HILL: Chris Hill, Illinois EPA.

13 MS. GILL: Diane Gill with Shaw.

14 MR. SPARROW: Howard Sparrow, Shaw  
15 Environmental.

16 DR. BUMB: Amar Bumb, Shaw  
17 Environmental.

18 MR. DANIELS: I'm Matt Daniels with  
19 the Rantoul Press newspaper.

20 MR. CLAYTON: I'm Bill Clayton with  
21 the Village of Rantoul as the airport manager.

22 DR. SCHNEIDER: Nick Schneider, RAPPS  
23 Engineering, the TAPP contractor.

24 MR. HUSBANDS: Jim Husbands with Booz

1 Allen Hamilton, contractor for Paul.

2 MR. PASSARELLI: Pete Passarelli with  
3 the Village of Rantoul.

4 MR. TWUM: Max Twum. I'm with  
5 Illinois EPA Bureau of Land Site Remediation Program.

6 MR. TIMM: I'm Jay Timm, Illinois EPA.

7 MR. KASPER: Russ and Nancy Kasper  
8 from the Rantoul Historical Society.

9 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Welcome,  
10 everybody. We'll get right to the Air Force's  
11 update, and then Howard will talk about the  
12 performance-based contract update.

13 If you've been driving around Rantoul for the  
14 past month, you've seen something pretty big going on  
15 and that's the water towers demolition and rehab. We  
16 have contracted for, and it's already done, pretty  
17 much, the demolition of the three water towers.  
18 These two out to the west of this building and then  
19 the one out in OU-2 have been demolished.

20 The metal was taken for recycling and they're  
21 finishing up some of the plumbing work underneath  
22 those towers right now. You'll see some of the work  
23 going on, but that work got done pretty quickly.  
24 Took about three days, I think, three or four days to

1 get all of that done.

2 DR. ROKKE: That's all going to  
3 unrestricted, correct?

4 MR. CARROLL: Yes. All three of the  
5 towers that were removed are to unrestricted. Water  
6 Tower 44 that they're rehabbing now is also  
7 unrestricted, underneath the soils are unrestricted  
8 there. You see all of the little spikes coming out  
9 of that tower that they're repainting. They've  
10 already sandblasted the interior of that tower and  
11 primed it, and they're going to start as soon as the  
12 wind dies down. They may be doing it today, but  
13 they're doing blasting on the outside of that Water  
14 Tower 44 just to the southeast of here.

15 They've got a shroud that will go up that'll  
16 protect everything to make sure that the lead-based  
17 paint that they blast off of it doesn't escape from  
18 the site and they're able to pick up the paint and  
19 the chips and everything and ensure that there's no  
20 releases of the lead-based paint.

21 So that'll be going on for the next month or  
22 two. It's highly dependent upon the weather, the  
23 outside work that they're doing. So if the wind is  
24 blowing over, probably, ten or fifteen miles an hour,

1 they'll probably have to shut down their activities.

2       Okay. Dr. Schneider will be giving us an update  
3 on the TAPP contract.

4                   DR. SCHNEIDER: Hope my phone doesn't  
5 ring. I forgot to shut it off, but I'm going to do  
6 that now. I was just thinking about the towers. As  
7 a pilot, you know, you learn how to fly by -- well,  
8 by all kinds of different methods. One of them is  
9 dead reckoning. The other is just looking down at  
10 the ground and seeing where you're going. A lot of  
11 pilots without certain kinds of training will just  
12 follow a road someplace. And things like those twin  
13 towers have been associated with Rantoul so long that  
14 even us who farm by the road, you know, we can tell  
15 where we are just by looking up in the air and say,  
16 oh, there's Rantoul. I was thinking as I was coming  
17 up here today, no more.

18       Anyway, what we've done as a TAPP contractor, we  
19 continue review of technical documents. Most  
20 recently the Final Feasibility Study for Group 2,  
21 that was the public hearing that was held yesterday  
22 both at noon and then again the poster session at  
23 7:00 o'clock last night. And then I am still reading  
24 this final 2010 Annual Operations Maintenance Report

1 on Landfills 1, 2, and 3. It's 671 pages, so it's  
2 not something you take into the royal throne and read  
3 overnight or anything. Takes a while to go through  
4 that.

5 And then just other general background. For  
6 example, the Final [Feasibility Study for] Group 2  
7 can be summarized in a Proposed Plan, but you really  
8 have to go back and read -- for me, I have to go back  
9 and read a little bit more history on what those  
10 sites were. And then we did this Risk-Based  
11 Corrective Action (RBCA) presentation on May 3rd.

12 Change the slide. I'm not going to repeat it  
13 here. I asked Diane to include about three slides  
14 that kind of summarize the RBCA, as we call it. We  
15 didn't deal with any kind of specific sites here. We  
16 just talked about what it is, and what it is is a  
17 step-by-step approach towards the development of  
18 site-specific remediation objectives.

19 Go ahead, Diane. And basically what it is can  
20 be summed up in about these five points. Some would  
21 say more, some might say less, but basically it's a  
22 generic term for cleanup strategies. It's one way to  
23 approach an environmental problem in a reasonable and  
24 logical way.

1           You categorize the sites according to risk to  
2 human health and the environment. That's what you're  
3 really doing. And that allows you -- it becomes a  
4 tool for determining the urgency of action and the  
5 right amount of oversight that's necessary. Is this  
6 something we have to jump right into or is there  
7 something more important down the road? So it allows  
8 for that kind of categorization of what's important  
9 to get at, especially in an area like this, multiple  
10 sites. And that's true in most industrial places as  
11 well.

12           And the amount of oversight necessary.  
13 Oversight includes a lot of things, including  
14 continuing care and monitoring and so forth. It's a  
15 process that develops cleanup levels and  
16 consideration of actual and potential exposure to  
17 contaminants present at the site.

18           We talk about two kinds of cleanups -- around  
19 here, at least -- unrestricted, as Doug just  
20 mentioned, and then restricted. Those are  
21 essentially what we're talking about here. Can this  
22 site be cleaned up so you don't have to worry about  
23 it, as far as we know, based on today's knowledge,  
24 for unrestricted use, meaning you can build a house

1 on it, build an apartment building on it. I don't  
2 know that you want to dig down and live thirty feet  
3 down from it, but the point is it's an unrestricted  
4 use. I don't know that anybody's going to build a  
5 house underneath the redone tower out here, but the  
6 point is that the ground beneath it is now open for  
7 unrestricted use.

8 All right. The same thing, there's one of the  
9 areas out in the airfield. Could be unrestricted  
10 use, but what does that mean in terms of  
11 practicality. You're not going to build a home out  
12 there as long as it's an airport.

13 And, finally, the decisions are based on  
14 reducing the risk of adverse human or environmental  
15 impacts. And that's really the basic, just reducing  
16 the risk. There's a risk just by walking out the  
17 door. We're all in this room here, we're all  
18 breathing each other's air. What's the risk that I'm  
19 going to catch something, you know, from Chris?

20 DR. ROKKE: Really high.

21 DR. SCHNEIDER: See what I mean? So  
22 there's a risk. We just have to -- we try to  
23 evaluate that risk, and that's what this is all  
24 about.

1           Go ahead, Diane. So the point, though, is for  
2 RBCA, you don't use it as a substitute for corrective  
3 action. It's not something you use to get out of  
4 something. It's something you use to determine what  
5 it is you're going to do about the something you're  
6 faced with. And it should never, ever, be used  
7 solely to justify inaction at a site or to save  
8 money.

9           I won't get into it, but RBCA is basically, just  
10 like in Illinois we call it TACO [Tiered Approach to  
11 Corrective Action Objections], but it's basically a  
12 three tiered sort of situation. You have tier 1,  
13 tier 2, and tier 3, and each involves a certain  
14 amount of risk associated with it and each involves a  
15 different kind of path to get there.

16           And if you'd like, those of you who couldn't  
17 attend the presentation, Janet Gray in Bruce's office  
18 has a copy of the entire presentation. Well, she has  
19 it on her computer and she can print that off for you  
20 and you can have all 25 pages or whatever it was.  
21 Any questions?

22                       MR. TWUM: The additional objectives,  
23 it was based on TACO, I mean, does it meet the  
24 objective for residential use and industrial?

1 DR. SCHNEIDER: Are they what?

2 MR. TWUM: You said on TACO tier.

3 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, I just mentioned  
4 that the State of Illinois version of risk-based  
5 corrective action is what we call -- it's TACO, yeah.

6 MR. TWUM: So the objectives, what I'm  
7 asking is do they meet the objectives for residential  
8 end use or industrial.

9 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, they will if  
10 that's what you're going for. That's the evaluation  
11 you do using this process.

12 MR. HILL: At this site in particular,  
13 most of the sites have been or plan to be cleaned up  
14 to an unrestricted use level. There are a few  
15 exceptions. Paul may know those off the top of his  
16 head where they're just cleaned up to an industrial  
17 commercial standard.

18 MR. CARROLL: Four landfills and a  
19 Fire Training Area.

20 DR. BUMB: And the Skeet Range.

21 MR. CARROLL: And the Skeet Range.

22 DR. SCHNEIDER: So those will have  
23 institutional controls on them is what it amounts to,  
24 and that's usually what happens. If you can't

1 achieve  $1 \times 10$  to the minus --  $10^6$ , I should say,  $1 \times$   
2  $10^6$  risk, if it's any higher than that, then you're  
3 going to have some sort of institutional control,  
4 usually, deed restriction or whatever.

5 MR. CARROLL: I'll show you the  
6 locations of those sites. One landfill here on the  
7 southeast corner of the base, three landfills here,  
8 this Fire Training Area that was adjacent to these  
9 landfills, and then this Skeet Range here. Those are  
10 the only sites that are going to have any  
11 restrictions.

12 MS. RAWLINGS: For those of us who are  
13 number challenged, what does  $1 \times 10^6$  mean?  
14 Minus six.

15 DR. SCHNEIDER: I should have said  
16 minus. It's  $1 \times 10^6$  risk.

17 MS. RAWLINGS: So one in --

18 DR. SCHNEIDER:  $10^{-6}$ , rather.

19 MS. GILL: One in one million.

20 DR. SCHNEIDER: One in one million.  
21 I'm sorry. I didn't get the question correct. In  
22 the presentation I actually had all those zeros out  
23 there for people, and in little parentheses I put  $1 \times$   
24  $10$ . One in a million. So if you can't -- if you

1 have something that's a higher risk, and that would  
2 be one in 10,000 is a higher risk of something, then  
3 you're going to have to do something else and it  
4 cannot be unrestricted use.

5 MS. BECNEL: I attended the  
6 presentation. I thought it was very helpful, very  
7 informative, and I hope we get more of those.

8 DR. SCHNEIDER: We can do that again.  
9 If you come up with a subject matter that we can  
10 identify, I'll be more than happy to put together  
11 whatever necessary to help explain that particular  
12 issue. Thank you.

13 MR. SPARROW: Thanks, Dr. Schneider.  
14 I think you did a good job trying to explain  
15 risk-based corrective actions. That's a very  
16 difficult concept. I'm an engineer. I would have  
17 given you all these technical terms and it would have  
18 gone over everybody's head. So trying to put it in  
19 perspective that's kind of in everyday language, I  
20 think, helps a lot for everybody to understand that.

21 By the way, I'm Howard Sparrow with Shaw  
22 Environmental, and I want to give you an update on  
23 the environmental progress for the 47 sites for which  
24 Shaw has a contract to do the cleanups, a

1 performance-based contract with the Air Force.

2 I do want to mention, the Air Force does have  
3 other contractors on-site doing other actions besides  
4 Shaw. The demolition of the water towers was done by  
5 another contractor. They do have other actions that  
6 are going on. I'm just speaking specifically about  
7 the 47 sites that are in this contract that we have.  
8 So there may be a few other things that you might see  
9 or notice going on, and I'm sure the Air Force can  
10 speak to those. We're generally knowledgeable about  
11 what's going on, but they do have multiple  
12 contractors on site here.

13 The first thing I wanted to speak to today was,  
14 I guess, a request that we've had from the RAB to try  
15 to do more community outreach, more providing  
16 communications to the public in language that is very  
17 clear, concise, and easily understandable to the  
18 public. We've done several things here since the  
19 last RAB meeting.

20 The first one I wanted to mention was trying to,  
21 I guess, tell more people about what's going on. And  
22 we had a suggestion from the RAB to put a notice over  
23 in the library there, and we did do that. This is a  
24 slide just showing the notice that we have up there.

1 I think that was a good idea. It's fairly noticeable  
2 for people that do come by the library. I'm not sure  
3 if it's going to bring any additional attention or  
4 more people here, but at least more people are aware  
5 of what's going on. So I think it does have a  
6 benefit even if people don't take the time to come  
7 show up for meetings here.

8 We also provided a summary fact sheet on the  
9 Proposed Plan, you know, because some of the language  
10 is still very technical in the Proposed Plan that we  
11 have, and with this we do have a Proposed Plan that's  
12 out for the Group 2, and we did put together a  
13 summary sheet for that in kind of everyday readable  
14 language that people can understand.

15 If they want more information and detail, they  
16 can go on further into the Proposed Plan document  
17 itself and then there are further documents behind  
18 that. Like Dr. Schneider said, if you really have a  
19 case of insomnia, you can go back to some of the  
20 Feasibility Studies and things that we've put  
21 together for that.

22 Anyway, I hope that those who would like  
23 feedback from the RAB as we go along, if you think  
24 that these are good ideas, and again we want to try

1 to improve whatever we can to communicate to the  
2 public. That's the whole intent of this RAB meeting  
3 here.

4 I want to do a quick -- I know we've always  
5 talked about CERCLA and CERCLA process. I just want  
6 to give kind of a quick refresher. I know some of  
7 you have been here for many years, know and  
8 understand the CERCLA process. It's just kind of a  
9 quick refresher for particularly those that may be  
10 newer to the RAB to be able to understand first the  
11 terminology.

12 CERCLA is the law for which most of the sites  
13 that we have are being cleaned up under. It's a  
14 federal law that was enacted in 1980 and it's  
15 basically commonly known as the Superfund Act. This  
16 is the law that provides generally the background and  
17 framework for cleaning up, I would say, sites that  
18 have waste on them that may be generally termed  
19 abandoned sites.

20 It's not that the Air Force has abandoned the  
21 property, but they're no longer active facilities  
22 that are in operation. This would be -- could be old  
23 dumps, [CERCLA] started with a lot of the old dumps,  
24 chemical dumps and things like that, but again it

1 does apply for places like this where the Air Force  
2 no longer has ongoing active operations. CERCLA  
3 applies to those sites.

4 It also provides the legal responsibility. The  
5 person that generated the waste is the person always  
6 responsible for that waste and the ability of that  
7 law to go require those people to clean up whatever  
8 they created. In this case the Air Force is clearly  
9 the generator of that, and the Air Force has stepped  
10 up to do the cleanup of the waste that's still here.

11 Then there is a trust fund that was developed  
12 for that to provide monies for particularly abandoned  
13 sites where everybody's gone. You can't find anybody  
14 to clean it up. There is a trust fund for which EPA  
15 can go in and actually complete the remediation and  
16 cleanup of those sites.

17 DR. ROKKE: That's what they're doing  
18 at a whole bunch of locations now.

19 MR. SPARROW: Right, right. Those are  
20 truly the abandoned sites where everybody left and  
21 you can't find anybody that's willing to come back in  
22 and clean them up. In this case, I don't quite  
23 consider these as abandoned sites, but they're no  
24 longer active sites is what they are.

1           The CERCLA process, we always kind of speak to  
2 the CERCLA process. Again, I'm just going to give a  
3 very general overview. It's a stepwise process.  
4 This is the way the law prescribes this to go. There  
5 are guidance documents that we follow that are very  
6 prescriptive about how we go through this process to  
7 make sure that we are following a systematic program  
8 to clean up these sites.

9           The first part of this starts with an  
10 investigation phase, a Remedial Investigation.  
11 That's simply going out and taking soil and  
12 groundwater samples and running an analysis and  
13 seeing if there's contamination on these sites. Any  
14 sites where the Air Force may have, for some reason,  
15 thought that they could have spilled or may have  
16 spilled material or contaminated soil and  
17 groundwater, they went out and identified those areas  
18 and started testing soil and groundwater.

19           The Air Force has done an extensive job of that  
20 across the site here, I don't know how many, tens of  
21 thousands, hundreds of thousands of tests completed  
22 throughout all the areas of the base here.

23           The second phase of that, once they identify  
24 where there is contamination, they go through and

1 start to develop a Feasibility Study. The  
2 Feasibility Studies for most of these sites we have  
3 prepared over the last several years. In the  
4 Feasibility Study we look at the alternatives for how  
5 do we clean up this site, what things can we do to  
6 remediate these sites.

7 From that Feasibility Study, we develop a  
8 Proposed Plan. We actually have a Proposed Plan here  
9 today. We did a meeting yesterday on this Proposed  
10 Plan. We let the public know what was there and what  
11 we are proposing and how we propose to clean up these  
12 sites. There is a public comment period. The public  
13 has an opportunity to be able to say and provide any  
14 comments to that Proposed Plan that we have.

15 The Proposed Plan, there's a thirty day public  
16 comment period. After that Proposed Plan and public  
17 comment period is closed, we create a Record of  
18 Decision. The Air Force and the regulators make a  
19 final decision about how we're going to clean up the  
20 site. So the ROD is very important. It's basically  
21 the legal document that we sign that says this is  
22 what's going to be done to clean up this site.

23 Then from that point on we develop a work plan,  
24 kind of the engineering documents or drawings or

1 plans that specify how we're going to meet those  
2 goals, and then we go out and implement those goals.  
3 The Remedial Action is really the implementation of  
4 that work plan.

5 The final phase is very important, too, not to  
6 forget, the closeout of that site. We have two  
7 terminologies here, Site Closure and Regulatory  
8 Closure. Site Closure, you could generally say that  
9 Site Closure means that the site is being closed to  
10 unrestricted land use. Regulatory Closure means  
11 there may be some restrictions on that site in the  
12 future or some requirement for the Air Force to  
13 continue to monitor or to operate at that site.

14 The example would be a landfill. You wouldn't  
15 want the Air Force to abandon that landfill after it  
16 was closed and just leave the cap. They still have  
17 the obligation to continue to operate that. That's  
18 kind of a general overview of the CERCLA process.

19 We talk about non-CERCLA. Non-CERCLA means that  
20 they are not regulated under that federal regulation.  
21 The state has regulations as well that are similar.  
22 They provide a more abbreviated approach to cleanup.  
23 These are generally sites like a gasoline station.  
24 You know, you don't want to go through the expense of

1 all these processes. You still have to clean it up.  
2 You still have to meet the regulatory goals. It's  
3 simply, you can see here, we do the sampling and  
4 testing phase, we do a Corrective Action Plan, and  
5 then we go right on into the cleanup phase and then  
6 the closeout phase of that site.

7 We do have five sites here that are going  
8 through this process. Again, a slightly abbreviated  
9 process, but basically you're saying let's just --  
10 they're not as contaminated. We know the remedies  
11 that are typically used at these sites, and it allows  
12 us to do a quicker cleanup for that. Doesn't change  
13 the goals. There's no goals or standards or cleanup  
14 criteria that are any different in that program there  
15 than they are on the other program. So we're still  
16 cleaning up to the same standards, we just don't go  
17 through all the various steps to get to that same  
18 goal. The goals remain the same.

19 MS. RAWLINGS: So it would have been  
20 however the site was used that would determine which  
21 program it fits under, or known use? Can you just  
22 tell me a little more clearly how you would decide  
23 which program a site would fit under?

24 MR. SPARROW: You want to speak to

1 that, Chris?

2 MR. HILL: Well, primarily here at  
3 Chanute it deals with whether there was strictly a  
4 petroleum storage tank or something like that. You  
5 know, 950, the Building 950 area is another area  
6 where they strictly handled fuels, and so those sites  
7 are addressed under that state program, like Howard  
8 said, you know, the same regulations that people have  
9 to follow when cleaning up a gas station or something  
10 of that nature.

11 The one thing I would say about, you know, the  
12 CERCLA process is it is more long and drawn out, but  
13 typically the sites are more complicated, you know,  
14 you may have more exotic contaminants or, you know,  
15 there may be a lot of different ways that you could  
16 achieve the cleanup. And so the Feasibility Study  
17 looks at, you know, the different ways and evaluates  
18 the different alternatives.

19 There's also the public participation component  
20 of that as well. So it is a more long, drawn-out  
21 process, but at the same time CERCLA addresses I  
22 think, you know, more complicated sites; whereas, the  
23 non-CERCLA sites are typically, you know, more like  
24 the petroleum storage tanks and stuff like that and

1 you kind of know, there's been enough of those done,  
2 you know how to address them pretty quickly and  
3 whatnot. So it's a little more of a streamlined  
4 process.

5 DR. ROKKE: Could I ask everybody to  
6 speak up real loud and clear? I heard part of what  
7 Chris said, but I didn't get it all.

8 MR. HILL: Okay, sure.

9 DR. ROKKE: And speak real loud for  
10 everybody, please.

11 MR. HILL: Okay, sure.

12 MR. SPARROW: Generally, CERCLA is a  
13 federal law. The non-CERCLA sites, these are  
14 regulated under our state laws, so we're going  
15 through different laws and regulations but, again,  
16 the end goals remain the same. It's just an  
17 abbreviated process.

18 I want to mention on Water Tower 44, I think  
19 Paul mentioned briefly, but I want to make clear, the  
20 Air Force has an Accelerated Site Completion Program  
21 they went through originally. If you recall, this  
22 Water Tower 44, we were going to clean this site up  
23 to a designated land use, primarily for industrial,  
24 or if you want to call it industrial, but there's

1 other uses -- industrial or commercial use.

2 The Air Force went back at the end of last year,  
3 looked at the site and said, you know, that's a site  
4 where we think we could go ahead and provide  
5 additional funding and clean up that site to an  
6 unrestricted land use. The Air Force did go back and  
7 modify our contract to require us to take that to  
8 unrestricted land use.

9 You can see in this particular map, just to kind  
10 of give you an idea, the area in pink is the  
11 additional area of soils removal that was required to  
12 get that site to an unrestricted land use. They  
13 funded that. That Remedial Action was completed in  
14 March, and so that site is completely cleaned up to  
15 an unrestricted land use.

16 MR. CARROLL: It's kind of a gray on  
17 the overhead.

18 MR. SPARROW: Okay. So it's the gray  
19 area, the hashed area. The one in green was the area  
20 that was originally thought to be required to clean  
21 up. So it required an additional 425 tons of soil to  
22 be taken off site, but again the Air Force did come  
23 back and clean that site up.

24 The Air Force has also added eleven additional

1 sites to our contract. These are generally small  
2 either fuel oil tanks or gasoline tanks that may have  
3 been at various facilities around the site. This is  
4 a typical photo. There's actually two, a gasoline  
5 and a diesel tank that's over by the golf course. So  
6 we're going to go back and do some additional soil  
7 testing to make sure there hasn't been anything to  
8 leak into the ground and groundwater, and then we'll  
9 clean those sites up. So there's eleven additional  
10 sites.

11 So the Air Force is kind of going back through  
12 with a fine-toothed comb and looking at everything  
13 that's left and cleaning up all those remaining  
14 little small sites, wherever it may be, like a fuel  
15 oil tank for a heater for a building, and they're  
16 looking at all of those sites.

17 DR. ROKKE: These are the gas tanks  
18 over by the golf course, correct?

19 MR. SPARROW: Right. So they have  
20 added that to our contract. This is a map just  
21 showing where these additional eleven sites are. We  
22 will be doing these Remedial Actions, sampling this  
23 summer, and cleanup later on this fall for these  
24 sites.

1 DR. ROKKE: Howard, is this all going  
2 to go to unrestricted use, too, then?

3 MR. SPARROW: Generally these should  
4 all go to unrestricted use, but we haven't identified  
5 the contaminants.

6 DR. ROKKE: You don't know what's  
7 there yet.

8 MR. SPARROW: Right, right.

9 DR. ROKKE: Okay.

10 MR. SPARROW: It may not even require  
11 any cleanup. There's two questions. First, Chris.

12 MR. HILL: Go ahead, Max.

13 MR. TWUM: If you can clarify that.  
14 If you say unrestricted land use, are you saying  
15 remediated to, you know, industrial, commercial, for  
16 residential end use?

17 MR. SPARROW: An unrestricted land use  
18 can be used for any purpose that you want,  
19 residential, anything. When we say designated land  
20 use, we look at the land use that has been identified  
21 for these properties.

22 Generally speaking, the restrictions for the two  
23 properties that we have, the restrictions that are  
24 being placed on those would be no residential

1 buildings built or residential use. So you could  
2 build a commercial facility, you could build an  
3 industrial facility. There's a lot of other uses of  
4 that property. It's generally the restrictions that  
5 would be applied to those are again nonresidential.  
6 And it's not the entire site. It may only be a small  
7 portion of that site.

8 DR. ROKKE: So these basically were  
9 all storage tanks at one time or another?

10 MR. SPARROW: Right.

11 MR. HILL: I was just going to add,  
12 this is not all the tanks that were at Chanute. In  
13 the early 2000s, and even before then, the  
14 mid-nineties, the Air Force removed a lot of tanks.  
15 I mean, there were how many, 300?

16 MR. CARROLL: Somewhere between 300  
17 and 400.

18 MR. SPARROW: So you've seen this  
19 slide many times before at the RAB meeting. If  
20 you'll notice, this slide, the items across the  
21 bottom are identical to the explanation that I gave  
22 earlier about the CERCLA process. It kind of shows  
23 us the stepwise progress that we're making towards  
24 cleanup here. The good part about it, we're turning

1 green on the left-hand side.

2 The first three items here, the Feasibility  
3 Study, Proposed Plans, and Public Meetings have all  
4 been completed for all of the sites except for the  
5 landfills. We'll come back next year and do a final  
6 determination of the landfill sites there and Salt  
7 Fork Creek. So there are five more sites that we  
8 will complete for those next year, but the Remedial  
9 Actions that we're working for we've completed up to  
10 that point.

11 And then if you can also notice, the Remedial  
12 Actions are really getting to the cleanup efforts.  
13 We're about two-thirds of the way with the sites. By  
14 September 30th we want to have all of the remediation  
15 actions completed on base for which we're obligated.  
16 That's our goal, to complete those remaining sites  
17 this year, this summer.

18 Site Closure will take a little additional time  
19 because we have to continue to test and monitor and  
20 make sure that the treatments and cleanups that we  
21 have implemented remain effective.

22 The non-CERCLA sites, we went through an  
23 explanation of the non-CERCLA sites. This slide's  
24 been red for a long time, so we have been working on

1 getting the Corrective Action Plans in place for  
2 this. This slide will start to turn green this year.

3 So we're obligated to the Air Force also to get  
4 through the Remedial Actions for these sites as well.

5 We did have a Public Meeting yesterday. We  
6 talked about the CERCLA process at the Public  
7 Meeting. We had advised for a Public Meeting  
8 yesterday, and we also had had a request that we have  
9 meetings at noontime. There are people that can't  
10 attend at noontime. Hey, let's do something in the  
11 evening.

12 So our response to that was to have the Public  
13 Meeting at noon, with a question and answer session  
14 available for the general public at 7:00. So we did  
15 two different sessions to try to accommodate anybody  
16 that may or may not be able to show for those.  
17 Attendance was very light. Actually, only Dr.  
18 Schneider at noon and Jack Anderson in the evening.  
19 So even though we try to reach out to the public, you  
20 know, the response still remains very light.

21 DR. ROKKE: Thank you for doing it,  
22 though, Howard.

23 MR. SPARROW: We've done the effort.  
24 We'll continue to try.

1                   MR. KASPER: I was going to say, it  
2 did show up in the Rantoul Press, but the Rantoul  
3 Press didn't get delivered until 2:00 in the  
4 afternoon.

5                   MS. RAWLINGS: Yesterday.

6                   MR. KASPER: For the noontime stuff  
7 and last night, it's like short notice.

8                   MR. SPARROW: But it was in the  
9 previous week's Rantoul Press as well.

10                  MS. KASPER: Never saw it. I read it  
11 from front to back.

12                  MR. SPARROW: The public notice. It  
13 wasn't an article. There was a public notice in the  
14 paper.

15                  MR. CARROLL: There was an article  
16 yesterday.

17                  DR. ROKKE: There was a little blurb,  
18 you know, like you did before that we're going to  
19 have the RAB meeting, but the big article as far as  
20 yesterday was in yesterday's paper that we got like  
21 last night.

22                  MS. GILL: We don't have any control  
23 over, but the notifications were.

24                  MR. KASPER: That's probably why you

1 didn't have much show up.

2 MR. TWUM: Question. Are Thursdays  
3 the only days you have meetings here? Thursdays are  
4 the only days?

5 MR. SPARROW: Right. The RAB is  
6 typically on Thursdays; although, the Public Meetings  
7 we've done at different days and different times.  
8 Sometimes before RAB, sometimes after RAB. Sometimes  
9 not even related to RABs. It can be on --  
10 typically I think we've done them usually on  
11 Wednesday or Thursday during the week.

12 I quickly want to go over, because of the RAB  
13 members, the Proposed Plan that we have for two  
14 sites. One of the sites is a former NavAid station  
15 that is located out on the runway or near the runway  
16 here. That site, we did some additional testing on  
17 that site. It does have some perchloroethene  
18 [tetrachloroethene]. There's still some small levels  
19 of perchloroethene [tetrachloroethene] that's still  
20 at that site.

21 The Proposed Plan is to go in and do in-situ  
22 bioremediation at that site. I've got a little bit  
23 of a slide that shows you some of the results we've  
24 had for that. We've already used that same process

1 at about twenty other sites on base here, and we will  
2 clean this site up again for groundwater to the  
3 drinking water standards. There is no direct soil  
4 contamination exposure, but it will be an  
5 unrestricted land use site when we get through.

6 DR. ROKKE: It will be unrestricted?

7 MR. SPARROW: It will be, yes.

8 DR. ROKKE: Thank you, Howard.

9 MR. SPARROW: Absolutely. The second  
10 site was the Aircraft Wash Rack area. It's between  
11 Hangars 2 and 3 -- 1 and 2.

12 DR. BUMB: Hangar 2.

13 MR. SPARROW: It's right at Hangar 2.  
14 Okay. This was an area where they used to wash  
15 aircraft out there. The concern was that there was  
16 some fuels that may have spilled while the aircraft  
17 were parked there.

18 There was a Remedial Investigation phase done.  
19 Fairly extensive testing. There was only one very,  
20 very minor exceedance of groundwater standard that  
21 was found out of dozens of tests completed there, and  
22 wells were placed back and they couldn't find any  
23 contamination. So that site is going to go to no  
24 further action and it will be unrestricted land use

1 at that site. So that's the proposal for that one.

2 MR. TWUM: Do they have a groundwater  
3 ordinance?

4 MR. SPARROW: Pardon me?

5 MR. TWUM: Groundwater ordinance or  
6 restrictions?

7 MR. SPARROW: I think there is an  
8 ordinance that restricts use of the Wisconsinan  
9 shallow groundwater in the Village area.

10 MR. HILL: I believe there's a  
11 prohibition against drilling all drinking water wells  
12 within the Village, regardless of the aquifer.

13 MR. SPARROW: Even whether they're  
14 down to the Illinoian or further aquifers.

15 MR. HILL: I believe so. Is that  
16 right?

17 MR. PASSARELLI: Yeah, it's  
18 restricted.

19 MR. SPARROW: Again, there's no  
20 further action proposed at that site, and that site  
21 will be closed to unrestricted land use.

22 I mention in-situ bioremediation. We want to  
23 give you -- we have been testing and following up on  
24 the process that we did last year, the injections.

1 We do have some monitoring data back from some of the  
2 wells. We tested sixty-eight wells back in February.  
3 We're retesting those wells again to verify the  
4 performance of that. Out of sixty-eight of the wells  
5 that originally had -- most of those wells had  
6 [trichloroethene] (TCE) concentrations in those.  
7 Sixty-two of sixty-eight of those wells have been  
8 cleaned up for TCE below the remedial goal. So we've  
9 already reached the cleanup standards for TCE in  
10 sixty-two of sixty-eight wells.

11 Now, we still, you know, as we've mentioned,  
12 trichloroethene breaks down to essentially  
13 dichloroethene and then vinyl chloride. So you'll  
14 see dichloroethene on this chart. You see first  
15 trichloroethene, then dichloroethene, and then vinyl  
16 chloride. As we break down the trichloroethene, it  
17 forms dichloroethene. As that breaks down, it  
18 further forms vinyl chloride. The treatment process  
19 is a stepwise treatment process.

20 So we do expect concentrations of dichloroethene  
21 to go up for a while and then the concentrations of  
22 vinyl chloride to go up for a while. And we actually  
23 see that in this chart. You can see the  
24 dichloroethene go up as the trichloroethene goes

1 down. The dichloroethene goes up for a tiny bit and  
2 then it comes back down. And then you'll actually  
3 see some vinyl chloride appearing, and then it goes  
4 back down.

5 So in this particular well, this particular site  
6 is then now reaching remedial goals for all three  
7 components. So we completely destroyed the  
8 chlorinated compounds at that particular well. We  
9 continue to monitor those for at least a year to make  
10 sure we don't see any kind of rebound effects on  
11 those wells. But this is good news. This is very,  
12 very positive news that the treatment process that  
13 we've implemented is effective and is working. These  
14 compounds have been there for thirty years, and in  
15 six months' time they're essentially gone.

16 I mentioned there was one site, the Water  
17 Tower 44, we've completed that Remedial Action back  
18 in March. That site is now -- the remediation is  
19 complete. The Air Force is now doing the  
20 rehabilitation of that water tower itself for the  
21 repainting of that water tower.

22 This year we're planning on work at ten  
23 additional sites. We talked about these two sites.  
24 Group 2 Site [SS073], we will be doing in-situ

1 bioremediation at that site this summer. The  
2 Laundromat building, you may have gone by there.  
3 We've already torn down part of that building. We're  
4 starting the in-situ bio treatment on the groundwater  
5 at that site, and we'll also do soil remediation  
6 action at that site. So we're working closely with  
7 Lincoln's academy and making sure that the cadets are  
8 protected from the area and the work that we're doing  
9 there.

10 DR. ROKKE: Thank you, Howard.

11 MR. SPARROW: You're welcome.

12 MR. TWUM: Which contractor is doing  
13 the remediation?

14 MR. SPARROW: At?

15 MR. TWUM: Bioremediation at the  
16 former laundry site.

17 DR. BUMB: Shaw is doing it.

18 MR. SPARROW: We're self-performing  
19 that. We have our people on-site doing that work.

20 We did do a Public Meeting and we went through  
21 the process for four other sites. We call these  
22 Group 7 sites. They are sites that have petroleum  
23 hydrocarbons at the sites. The final Record of  
24 Decision has been approved for them, both by the Air

1 Force and by the State of Illinois, so we are now  
2 approved to start Remedial Action at these four  
3 sites.

4 These sites do include excavations of soils, as  
5 well as treatment of the groundwater at those sites.  
6 They're kind of scattered. There's some on this side  
7 of the Base, and then there's some on the other side  
8 of the runway down by OU-2 area on the south side of  
9 the Base. But that Remedial Action will start in  
10 June.

11 So in just a couple weeks we'll start completing  
12 the cleanup of those four sites there. And then we  
13 have the Fire Training Area 2 and the Area 130 TCE  
14 Disposal Pit that Paul had mentioned previously. The  
15 final Record of Decision has not been approved yet  
16 for that. It's under final review with the  
17 regulatory agency. Once that's approved, we will  
18 start the final cleanup at the Fire Training Area 2.  
19 I think that's all.

20 DR. ROKKE: Are those documents  
21 available on that location, the plan for cleanup?

22 MR. SPARROW: All of the documents for  
23 these plans are available at the Rantoul library, and  
24 they're also on the Air Force Web portal. We've also

1 had Public Meetings, so you probably have attended  
2 the Public Meetings for these as well, the Proposed  
3 Plans, but even the Proposed Plans and Feasibility  
4 Studies are there at the library.

5 DR. ROKKE: Okay.

6 MR. SPARROW: And they're on  
7 electronic media at the library, too. If you ask the  
8 librarian, there are CDs there. If you want to get  
9 electronic copies of those, you can get electronic  
10 copies of those as well.

11 MS. GILL: The Record of Decision for  
12 Group 8 is not because it's not final.

13 MR. SPARROW: Right, right. The  
14 Record of Decision is the only document that's not  
15 there in the library because it hasn't been approved  
16 yet.

17 And then there are two other of the non-CERCLA  
18 sites that do require remediation, and we plan to  
19 complete remediation of those later on this summer.  
20 Those were the two non-CERCLA sites that we have.

21 I did mention the Laundromat previously. This  
22 is a slide of what we've done at the Laundromat. One  
23 of the concerns was that we were going to remove part  
24 of the building. Lincoln's Challenge used that as a

1 barbershop. To accommodate Lincoln's Challenge, we  
2 agreed to go in and put in a modular unit building  
3 that the cadets can use to continue their barbershop.  
4 That's part of their training program, and so we  
5 tried to accommodate them for that.

6 Then once we completed that effort, we have torn  
7 down the other side of the building and then we'll  
8 begin the treatment of the groundwater and removal of  
9 the soil. This should be completed -- at least the  
10 soil and initial treatment will be completed -- this  
11 summer. We will still have to follow that again for  
12 a year or so to make sure that the groundwater has  
13 been cleaned up.

14 DR. ROKKE: Thank you, Howard.

15 MR. SPARROW: You're welcome. I did  
16 mention, we do have two Public Meetings left. For  
17 the Landfills 1, 2, 3, and 4, there was an interim  
18 Record of Decision that was originally issued. We  
19 have to go back and review that process, review the  
20 Remedial Actions that have been implemented for those  
21 landfills, to check and make sure primarily that the  
22 cap that was put on is still protective of human  
23 health and the environment. We will do that later  
24 on, and then there will be a Public Meeting held

1 either later this year or early next year for the  
2 landfills.

3 And then the last one is Salt Fork Creek. There  
4 have been investigations on the Salt Fork Creek, but  
5 that final cleanup and Record of Decision for that --  
6 it's not a cleanup. Just the Record of Decision for  
7 Salt Fork Creek, the regulators have asked us to wait  
8 until everything else is clean to make sure we didn't  
9 somehow mess up Salt Fork Creek. So it will be  
10 completed once we've completed all of the remediation  
11 at the other sites.

12 DR. ROKKE: Once we get to the Salt  
13 Fork Creek, how far downstream are we going to go and  
14 look and check things? It can't be at the fence  
15 line. It's got to be --

16 MR. SPARROW: I'm trying to recall. I  
17 don't remember how far the -- the investigation has  
18 already been completed there and gone through  
19 extensive review through the regulators. I'm not  
20 sure how far downstream.

21 MR. CARROLL: There were samples taken  
22 off of the base downstream.

23 DR. ROKKE: How far? I mean, find out  
24 how far.

1                   MR. CARROLL: I think we went probably  
2 a quarter to a half a mile, but we went to where the  
3 samples were clean. Samples were clean when we  
4 stopped.

5                   DR. ROKKE: Maybe we need to go  
6 farther to look to see if there's anything farther  
7 down because all of the stuff over the years had got  
8 in there and gone down, with the incredible levels of  
9 birth defects in that whole area and learning  
10 disabilities on down that way.

11                  MR. SPARROW: The Remedial  
12 Investigation has been completed. That went through  
13 an exhaustive program here. So all of the  
14 investigation has already been completed on Salt Fork  
15 Creek, so it's a matter of making sure that we didn't  
16 create something in our cleanup program that got into  
17 this creek.

18                  DR. ROKKE: I understand what you're  
19 saying, but my question is, and my concern, how far  
20 down creek have we gone? And if we've only gone a  
21 half mile or three quarters of a mile, maybe we need  
22 to go farther.

23                  MS. RAWLINGS: But how would you know,  
24 I mean, at a certain point you've got other

1 contributors.

2 MR. SPARROW: Right.

3 MS. RAWLINGS: And how would you  
4 figure that out?

5 MS. KASPER: Farmers are contributing  
6 to that with the chemicals they use on their  
7 farmland.

8 MR. SPARROW: Right. Yes, there was a  
9 whole program put together that went through both  
10 USEPA and Illinois EPA approval. They've gone  
11 through that whole program on testing. I'm just not  
12 familiar with that document now.

13 DR. ROKKE: I know you're not.

14 MR. SPARROW: So I don't know the data  
15 of that.

16 DR. ROKKE: It was done before you  
17 were here.

18 MR. CARROLL: We can get you the  
19 number of the Administrative Record document for the  
20 Remedial Investigation for Salt Fork Creek and send  
21 that to you. I can e-mail it to you.

22 DR. ROKKE: Thank you. I just have  
23 concerns knowing the history of the continued thing.  
24 What we're doing here is good, but what else because,

1 you know, when we look at other contamination we've  
2 had similar events. We've got this stuff going for  
3 miles and miles and miles where I can absolutely  
4 confirm contamination got way off of the base and  
5 we've had to do cleanup or put directives together.

6 MS. RAWLINGS: Is this a topic that  
7 perhaps Dr. Schneider could address at some point for  
8 the RAB?

9 MR. SPARROW: If the RAB --

10 DR. SCHNEIDER: Sure. Sedimentation  
11 and contamination, sure. I think you do have to keep  
12 in mind what's been said here. At some point down  
13 the potential stream, stream flow, I'll just use that  
14 term generally, you start having a number of  
15 different inputs. Separating those inputs could be  
16 very difficult because many of the kinds of organic  
17 compounds that one sees here on the base are the same  
18 kind of organic compounds that have been present in  
19 many of the pesticides and herbicides that are used  
20 by agriculture.

21 So the source becomes a real big problem. And  
22 we can talk about that. I can give you some -- you  
23 know, it's just like anything. If you start  
24 spreading way out, you start increasing the potential

1 sources of those compounds and it's very difficult.

2 DR. ROKKE: But that's the same thing.  
3 Just like you mentioned, some were definitively used,  
4 but then we have others that were definitively here  
5 that were not involved in farming operations.

6 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, as I understand  
7 what was said a few minutes ago was that they did an  
8 investigation. They got to a point where the  
9 contaminants were not found. In other words, they  
10 did not discover any contaminants associated. I  
11 didn't say I don't know that they discovered any  
12 contaminants, but they didn't discover any  
13 contaminants associated with operations on the base.

14 The question that you're asking is were there  
15 some slugs that somehow got three miles down the  
16 stream, and we can talk about the process of how  
17 sediment moves in a stream. We can talk about how  
18 contaminants break down in terms of time, in terms of  
19 residence time in the stream, in terms of residence  
20 time in the sediment.

21 DR. ROKKE: I understand exactly what  
22 you're saying.

23 DR. SCHNEIDER: We can do something  
24 about that.

1 DR. ROKKE: It's just a concern that I  
2 want to raise.

3 MR. TWUM: I work for EPA Land Site  
4 Remediation Program, and I'm wondering, when  
5 addressing this contamination, do you look at target  
6 compounds, including volatile compounds,  
7 semi-volatile pesticides, PCBs, do you address the  
8 whole TCL?

9 DR. SCHNEIDER: You look for the total  
10 suite of organic compounds.

11 MR. HILL: Inorganics as well.

12 MR. SPARROW: And that was completed.  
13 That study was completed for Salt Fork Creek. So  
14 there was an extensive study that has been completed.  
15 I just don't know the details of that study. I  
16 haven't looked at it recently.

17 DR. SCHNEIDER: A typical organic  
18 compound suite, when you're examining groundwater is  
19 some 200 individual chemicals, as I recall. Very  
20 long list of stuff.

21 MR. HILL: Yeah. I know the initial  
22 sampling of Salt Fork Creek was very exhaustive as  
23 far as, you know, looking at VOCs, SVOCs, metals,  
24 PCBs, pesticides, herbicides, whatnot. One thing I

1 would say about Chanute is that, you know, where we  
2 do see releases that have caused problems, it's  
3 primarily fuels and solvents, volatile compounds  
4 that, you know, they indeed did get in Salt Fork  
5 Creek but they're exposed to the environment and  
6 they, you know, volatilize. They're not very  
7 persistent in that type of environment.

8 It's not to say that there's not metals  
9 contamination there because there is some, but it's  
10 not a manufacturing, heavy industrial manufacturing  
11 type site where you might see some of those more  
12 persistent in sediment.

13 DR. SCHNEIDER: I guess the bottom  
14 line is I'll try to put together some sort of  
15 presentation. I'll coordinate that with Bruce and  
16 the RAB and, perhaps, you know, both with the Air  
17 Force to see how we want to handle that. But, yeah,  
18 I can do that.

19 DR. ROKKE: I'm going back, thirty  
20 year stuff that I was personally involved in out  
21 here, you know, where we're burning and blowing up  
22 stuff or doing stuff. It not only spilled into the  
23 creek, but we had incredible plumes going all over  
24 the place off of the base and going way off.

1           Sometimes when we're blowing and burning stuff  
2 out there, that I personally did, man, we had to go  
3 out, hey, guys, we got a leak. You got to get out of  
4 here because of what was going on. So that, just  
5 from my own personal knowledge of what I did blowing  
6 stuff up and burning stuff out there personally out  
7 there, you know, going back thirty odd years ago is a  
8 concern. And so, I mean --

9           MR. SPARROW: Well, I think  
10 Dr. Schneider has made a good offer for the RAB. The  
11 chapter is not closed on this. We're not going to  
12 close the chapter on Salt Fork Creek for another year  
13 because we still have to make sure that we don't  
14 release anything into there as well. So the chapter  
15 is not closed.

16           DR. SCHNEIDER: And there's a Public  
17 Meeting being scheduled for later this year which  
18 will allow us to make comments.

19           MR. TWUM: Question. What I was  
20 asking is if do you a comprehensive investigation  
21 that addresses all the chemicals on the target  
22 compound list or you do a full investigation which  
23 addresses just specific chemicals?

24           DR. SCHNEIDER: I think what they've

1 done is they've done a comprehensive investigation.  
2 The question that's really being raised, how far down  
3 the stream did they go, and I have to look at that  
4 data. I have not seen those data.

5 MR. SPARROW: Just to kind of  
6 conclude, if you remember, last year during the  
7 summer we took the RAB on-site to look at some of the  
8 actions that were complete. We had a suggestion from  
9 the Air Force that we do that at the next RAB as  
10 well. We were thinking about maybe setting up where  
11 if we're doing some of our in-situ bio treatment that  
12 maybe you might be interested in at least looking at  
13 what's going on and how that's implemented.

14 So we were thinking about the RAB meeting in  
15 August; although, we do these at the hot times of the  
16 year, for some reason, I'm not sure. If you all are  
17 interested, we could certainly try to arrange. If  
18 we've got a site where there's something going on  
19 that would be of interest to you, we could arrange  
20 that for part of the next RAB meeting.

21 DR. ROKKE: Could you put a notice in  
22 there that we'll be doing that where everybody knows  
23 to come in blue jeans and tennis shoes.

24 MR. SPARROW: Sure, absolutely.

1 DR. ROKKE: Even if the public comes  
2 they'll know we're doing that because that would be  
3 really good.

4 MS. RAWLINGS: Yeah, I'd like that.

5 MR. TWUM: How do you join the RAB?

6 MR. SPARROW: Paul, do you want to --

7 MR. CARROLL: We'll give you an  
8 application and you can fill that out. We will  
9 review it, and it'll go up for a RAB vote. Typically  
10 we're always looking for members. You have to fit  
11 certain criteria. You have to live or work in the  
12 effected area. I believe you do. I believe you live  
13 here, don't you?

14 MR. TWUM: Yes, I do.

15 MR. CARROLL: So that's a pretty  
16 simple process. It'll take a couple of RAB meetings  
17 to get you on board. Check with me and I'll see if I  
18 can find an application on my computer, print it out  
19 for you right after the meeting.

20 DR. ROKKE: Thank you.

21 MR. SPARROW: So I guess are there,  
22 kind of open topic discussion, are there any other  
23 items that the RAB members want to bring up?

24 MS. BECNEL: I just have a couple of

1 questions and maybe a comment. Someone mentioned  
2 that the information placed in the Rantoul Press came  
3 out the day before or the day of. Is it possible  
4 that we could have that maybe, I don't know, a week  
5 before, three days before, just not --

6 MR. SPARROW: Let me be clear.  
7 There's two things that were there. We always put a  
8 public notice not only in the Rantoul Press but in  
9 The News-Gazette two weeks prior to meetings. So  
10 there's a little box in there. If you go back and  
11 look in your papers, there were little boxes that are  
12 always placed there, both for a Public Meeting  
13 notice, as well as for the RAB meeting notice. So  
14 there are at least two placed in the paper.

15 There was an article that came out, I think, in  
16 this paper. I haven't seen that article myself, but  
17 it was just a news article that I think people may be  
18 getting confused. That was not a public notice type,  
19 it was just a news article. So the public notices  
20 were placed in the paper prior to that time.

21 We also placed a bulletin board about ten days  
22 ago in the library as well. So that's there, with  
23 the announcements of the meetings there as well.

24 DR. ROKKE: In the newspaper, they

1 have what's called a community calendar.

2 MR. SPARROW: This is an advertisement  
3 in the paper.

4 DR. ROKKE: No, I understand.  
5 Separate from the advertisement, just for those dates  
6 when we're having it, have it on the community  
7 calendar.

8 MR. SPARROW: Community calendars tend  
9 to get blended in and people don't look at those.

10 MS. RAWLINGS: Okay. In defense of  
11 the newspaper, we must understand that the only thing  
12 that can be dictated is a paid advertisement.  
13 Anything else is totally subjective, including the  
14 community calendars. There are times it doesn't go  
15 in. It's entirely subject to the space available in  
16 the newspaper for editorial content. So there is  
17 absolutely no way to ensure that, even if Matt wrote  
18 a story, that that would have gone in a week before.

19 And the other problem is that you can put things  
20 in the newspaper a week before. That doesn't mean  
21 people will remember the next week. I can just  
22 guarantee that.

23 MR. CARROLL: Let me also add that  
24 these Environmental Updates that we send out every

1 time before the RABs, they went out a couple of weeks  
2 ago, and this also has notice of the Public Meetings,  
3 as well as the RAB. So this went out to somewhere  
4 around 3500 people and 3200 households.

5 MR. SPARROW: Direct mailing to 3200  
6 households in the area. It's pretty hard blanket  
7 coverage everywhere we can.

8 MS. BECNEL: Does this have a notice  
9 of the Public Meeting in it?

10 MR. SPARROW: Yes. It's on the last  
11 page under milestones. It's the first little article  
12 under milestones. Yes, I think we've canvassed about  
13 as many avenues as we could on this, you know, short  
14 of TV. I think they interviewed us last month on the  
15 water towers, but we weren't able to cover this type  
16 of thing.

17 MS. BECNEL: Well, I wanted to finish  
18 my comments, and that was that I was one of the  
19 people, one of the RAB members that had mentioned the  
20 accessibility of information and the importance of  
21 it, and I just wanted to say thank you. It appears  
22 as though we're moving in that direction. And the  
23 explanation here, for example, on like the Record of  
24 Decision -- I think I was one of the people that

1 mentioned that -- it's very clear and it's the kind  
2 of information that I was thinking of when I said,  
3 you know, make the information accessible to the  
4 average person. You are definitely moving in that  
5 direction. I thank you for doing that.

6 MR. SPARROW: Sure, absolutely.

7 MS. BECNEL: Because as RAB members  
8 we're not technical people, but at least we can push  
9 for having information which is accessible to the  
10 public. And, as someone said, you know, if they  
11 don't want to attend meetings or get involved, at  
12 least they can know what is happening in their  
13 community, and that's very, very important. So thank  
14 you.

15 MR. SPARROW: Sure, absolutely.

16 Debra?

17 MS. RAWLINGS: On that same vein, I  
18 was wondering if it might be a good idea to try  
19 placing one of those posters in the high school  
20 library. You wouldn't necessarily see a lot of  
21 parents coming in there, but high school students  
22 would see it and that might pique interest. I don't  
23 know.

24 MS. KASPER: High school is out next

1 week. Graduation is this week.

2 MS. RAWLINGS: Well, true, but I'm  
3 talking about the future.

4 DR. WANG: I doubt that they would be  
5 interested.

6 MS. RAWLINGS: You might be surprised.  
7 You know, they take chemistry classes. They take  
8 biology classes. You know, they have to do projects.  
9 So why not try? And in the same vein, and maybe this  
10 is a really silly idea, I have a very scant science  
11 background and what I learned I've probably forgotten  
12 by now, but I was listening to a really interesting  
13 broadcast on WILL this morning with someone talking  
14 about the oil spill in the Gulf, and the question was  
15 asked where does the oil go. And the person was  
16 talking about it and said, well, you know, it breaks  
17 down to carbon, et cetera, and, you know, little  
18 things are going off in my mind. Oh, yes, now this  
19 is connecting what I've learned throughout the RAB.

20 And I just wondered if there might be a way to  
21 put a reading list of some sort maybe in the library.  
22 And I would be very glad to do this. If someone just  
23 kind of pointed me in the right direction in terms of  
24 resources to try to find this where we would have

1 resources available that the general public could  
2 read a little bit more up on, and maybe in the high  
3 school, too. Now, will it do any good? Will I be  
4 the only one who reads the books? Could be. Might  
5 be worth a try and, like I said, I would be more than  
6 happy to take on that work.

7 MR. SPARROW: We could certainly look  
8 and find some references that might not be way too  
9 technical that engineers and scientists want to be  
10 looking at. I know the USEPA puts out a lot on their  
11 Web portals that provide good overviews about  
12 technologies, as well as regulations. So maybe we  
13 can put together a guidance, maybe some kind of  
14 guidance thing that would be available for you to go  
15 find those references and stuff like that.

16 DR. SCHNEIDER: I would just echo  
17 that. There are a lot of what we might call easily  
18 read references about various elements in our  
19 environment that you can access. You just have to be  
20 careful when you start Googling around. You have to  
21 be careful what you're reading. You have to look at  
22 what the source is because some of them can go way  
23 off base, so to speak.

24 But, yeah, I think that's a great idea. I think

1     what you're suggesting is that if someone can  
2     understand, this radio show you heard today was a  
3     professor, or not a professor necessarily, but a  
4     researcher with the heart foundation about the Gulf  
5     of Mexico, he was really talking about the issues  
6     related to the spill, but also about natural, you  
7     know, recovery and so forth.

8             So it's important to understand those items,  
9     like what things break down to. Just like we talked  
10    about the breakdown of TCE to vinyl chloride.  
11    Actually, I'll tell you, vinyl chloride is more  
12    dangerous than the TCE was to begin with. So  
13    sometimes these breakdown products are more important  
14    to look at after than the original product itself.

15            MS. RAWLINGS: I think that's the sort  
16    of information, the sort of understanding that helps  
17    people understand what to really be scared of and  
18    what not to be scared of. And that's so hard for  
19    those of us who don't have a science background to  
20    understand. But I would be happy to review and put  
21    together a reading list and a little description of  
22    what things are and make that available.

23            MR. CARROLL: Okay. One other thing  
24    I'd like to mention before we get to anything else is

1 that Howard talked a lot about the CERCLA process and  
2 Superfund and things like that. Chanutte is not on  
3 the Superfund list. There are a lot of facilities  
4 that are on the Superfund list. It was actually  
5 proposed back in nineteen ninety --

6 MR. HILL: Two thousand.

7 MR. CARROLL: Two thousand. But never  
8 got on the list and, you know, we've made a lot of  
9 progress since then and I don't think it would ever  
10 be even proposed for the list at this time. I wanted  
11 to distinguish between Superfund and non-Superfund.  
12 We call it a National Priorities List (NPL). If it's  
13 an NPL listed site, that means that EPA would be  
14 working closely with us and, of course, EPA has  
15 deferred all of their oversight to the state now. I  
16 think that shows some confidence in the fact that the  
17 cleanup is being successful and is working. So  
18 anyway, I wanted to clarify that. Dr. Rokke?

19 DR. ROKKE: Okay. Let's go one giant  
20 leap for public awareness. Paul, I'd like to simply  
21 ask you or Howard, however you designate, would one  
22 of you like to come on my national radio show called  
23 Warrior Connection to discuss what the plan is for  
24 Chanutte, what has been done, and what the plan is to

1 do? I've got that. It's one hour a week and, Paul,  
2 you or yourself or whoever you designate would come  
3 on and just be a conversation where this is what was  
4 at Chanute, this is the plan, what we're doing at  
5 Chanute, this is where we're going, this is what we  
6 anticipate to happen.

7 MR. CARROLL: Send me an e-mail. We  
8 have to run that through our PA people, as well as  
9 our leadership, as well as my bosses. Let me know,  
10 you know, what the program is and what affiliation it  
11 has and things like that. I don't know if it'll be  
12 approved or not. Sometimes they do, sometimes they  
13 don't.

14 DR. WANG: Who is the contractor  
15 demolishing the water towers?

16 MR. CARROLL: That's Environmental  
17 Chemical Corporation, ECC. They've won that bid for  
18 that contract.

19 DR. WANG: The soils they dug up, are  
20 they safe, they can be used?

21 MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry. The what?

22 DR. WANG: The soils they dug up.

23 MR. CARROLL: Shaw actually dug the  
24 soil up and remediated the soil before they went in

1 to demolish the water towers. So the soils are  
2 certified, you know, they've been sampled. They're  
3 certified clean. And we're ensuring that the current  
4 contractor doesn't contribute any lead-based paint or  
5 anything to that by putting down visqueen, plastic  
6 and tarps, and they actually put down plywood and  
7 things like that. Jim?

8 MR. HUSBANDS: Just wanted to also  
9 add, they did take soil samples before their work and  
10 they will take soil samples after their work to  
11 confirm there was no impact to the soil throughout  
12 the sandblasting operations.

13 MR. CARROLL: Okay. So topics of  
14 interest for agenda. We're adding to the agenda  
15 items for next RAB meeting, and that will be  
16 Dr. Schneider will brief on the Salt Fork Creek  
17 investigation reports, and then Howard has  
18 volunteered to have a field trip. Anything else  
19 besides just typical updates that we give? Any other  
20 items from the floor?

21 DR. WANG: No.

22 MR. CARROLL: August 16th good for  
23 everyone? Okay. We'll adjourn. We'll meet back on  
24 August 16th. Thank you all.

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

(Meeting adjourned.)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 )  
2 COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN )

3

4 I, Janet E. Frederick, a Certified  
5 Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of  
6 Champaign, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that  
7 the proceedings held at the May 17, 2012, Former  
8 Chanute Air Force Base Restoration Advisory Board  
9 Meeting were taken down in stenograph notes and  
10 afterwards reduced to typewriting under my  
11 instruction.

12 I do hereby certify that I am a  
13 disinterested person in this cause of action; that I  
14 am not a relative of any party or any attorney of  
15 record in this cause, or an attorney for any party  
16 herein, or otherwise interested in the event of this  
17 action.

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
19 hand this 3rd day of June 2012.

20

21

22

23

24

\_\_\_\_\_  
JANET E. FREDERICK, CSR  
CSR, License No. 084-003526