

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

FORMER CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE

10

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

11

FEBRUARY 16, 2012

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Rantoul Business Center  
601 South Century Boulevard  
Rantoul, Illinois

24

1                   MR. CARROLL: Good afternoon. I had  
2 to check the hallways, make sure no one else was  
3 coming. Welcome to the February 2012 Restoration  
4 Advisory Board for Chanute Air Force Base. I'd like  
5 to begin by -- former Chanute Air Force Base. I'd  
6 like to begin by going around the table and  
7 introducing -- having the RAB members introduce  
8 themselves, and then we'll go around and introduce  
9 the other folks who are here. So if we could start  
10 right over here. Denise?

11                   MS. BECNEL: Denise Becnel, RAB  
12 member.

13                   MR. SANDAHL: Bruce Sandahl, co-chair.

14                   DR. ROKKE: Doug Rokke, RAB member.

15                   MR. FOTHERGILL: Caryl Fothergill, RAB  
16 member.

17                   MS. RAWLINGS: Debra Rawlings, RAB  
18 member.

19                   MR. HILL: Chris Hill from the  
20 Illinois EPA.

21                   MR. CARROLL: And Paul Carroll. I'm  
22 the Air Force BRAC Environmental Coordinator.

23                   MR. SPARROW: Howard Sparrow with Shaw  
24 Environmental.

1 MS. ROBERSON: Karen Roberson,  
2 resident.

3 MR. DANIELS: Matt Daniels, Rantoul  
4 Press newspaper.

5 MR. HAYWOOD: Michael Haywood, Shaw  
6 Environmental.

7 MR. STRELCHECK: Ryan Strelcheck,  
8 Shaw.

9 MR. BRUMBAUGH: Eric Brumbaugh, Shaw  
10 Environmental.

11 DR. SCHNEIDER: Nick Schneider, TAPP  
12 contractor for RAB, RAPPS Engineering.

13 MR. HOLLY: Ted Holly, Air Force  
14 Center for Engineering and the Environment.

15 MR. PASSARELLI: Pete Passarelli from  
16 the Village of Rantoul.

17 MR. HUSBANDS: Jim Husbands with Booz  
18 Allen Hamilton.

19 MS. FISH: Rachel Fish with Booz Allen  
20 Hamilton.

21 MS. KASPER: Nancy Kasper, resident.

22 MR. KASPER: Russ Kasper with the  
23 Rantoul Historical Society.

24 MR. CARROLL: Welcome. There's a

1 couple others.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Jack Anderson with the  
3 RAB.

4 MR. CARROLL: And one more.

5 MR. STREFF: I'm Michael Streff. I'm  
6 with FOTH and a local resident here at Chanute.

7 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Welcome. And  
8 Amar?

9 DR. BUMB: Amar Bumb with Shaw  
10 Environmental.

11 MR. CARROLL: All right. We'll move  
12 on to approving the action items or taking a look at  
13 the action items, several action items from the last  
14 time, including approving transcripts from the  
15 November 2011 meeting. If we'd like to have a  
16 nomination or a motion.

17 MR. SANDAHL: So moved.

18 MS. RAWLINGS: Second.

19 MR. CARROLL: Seconded. And approved?  
20 Raise of hands? All approved. Okay. Second action  
21 item we had was to provide 250 copies of the  
22 environmental brochure that we distributed at the  
23 last RAB to the Village of Rantoul, and we had done  
24 that on the 6th of December.

1           Associated action item, to provide a PDF version  
2 of that to the Village. We did that. And there's --  
3 the next one is a risk-based cleanup goals  
4 presentation to RAB members from TAPP contractor.  
5 And is that going to be done? Is that planned for --  
6 it's not planned for this RAB, is it?

7           DR. SCHNEIDER: No, I don't think so.

8           MR. CARROLL: Okay.

9           DR. BUMB: It was supposedly a  
10 separate meeting to the RAB members.

11          MR. CARROLL: Oh, a separate meeting.  
12 Has that been planned yet, Dr. Schneider?

13          DR. SCHNEIDER: Not that I know of.

14          MR. CARROLL: Okay. You all want to  
15 get together sometime after the RAB meeting and plan  
16 that?

17          DR. SCHNEIDER: Uh-huh.

18          MR. CARROLL: Okay. Distributing the  
19 environmental brochure to the community, that's a --

20          MR. SANDAHL: Yeah. Those were  
21 distributed to the Village offices, of course to the  
22 Village board. They received several items to pass  
23 out to the constituency. Library, Chamber of  
24 Commerce, not only here but also the Champaign County

1 Chamber of Commerce and Champaign County Economic  
2 Development Corporation all have them.

3 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good. Do the RAB  
4 members need any more copies of that to hand out to  
5 folks that you know? If you do, just let us know.

6 DR. ROKKE: If you've got some.

7 MR. SANDAHL: Yeah, you can get them  
8 out of my office.

9 DR. ROKKE: Thank you. That's easy.

10 MR. CARROLL: Thank you. And the Air  
11 Force was to distribute the brochure to our senior  
12 leadership. That is in progress right now. That's  
13 going up.

14 MS. BECNEL: By environmental update,  
15 do you mean this one, this brochure here, because  
16 this is called environmental update, too, the one  
17 that goes out in the mail like that one. But do you  
18 mean this brochure here?

19 MR. CARROLL: Yeah, we were talking  
20 about that brochure. The EB, environmental brochure,  
21 means that brochure.

22 MS. BECNEL: Okay.

23 MR. CARROLL: The other one that you  
24 have in your hands we do every quarter before the

1 RAB. We send that out to about 3,000 people in the  
2 local community, including the RAB members, and other  
3 interested parties.

4 Next on the agenda is an Air Force update, and  
5 this would be one slide from me. Couple of things  
6 that we've got going on that are kind of outside the  
7 purview of Shaw's contract. Howard will discuss  
8 what's going on with the performance-based contract  
9 in a moment.

10 But a couple of things that we're doing as an  
11 Air Force initiative. One is that we've got a  
12 program to accelerate site completions nationwide at  
13 all of our BRAC bases, and even the active side is  
14 doing it on active bases. We have been tasked to  
15 look at all of our sites and to determine if we can  
16 take sites to an unrestricted use. We've talked in  
17 the past about having unrestricted use versus a use  
18 that's consistent with the reuse of the base here.

19 So some of the sites, about six sites, we  
20 originally planned -- the Air Force had originally  
21 planned to leave about over thirty sites with  
22 restrictions, clean those up to a lesser standard,  
23 but that standard was consistent with the reuse.

24 Once we got the Shaw contract awarded, Shaw came

1 in and said, okay, we're good at cleaning all of  
2 these sites except for eight, including the four  
3 landfills, to unrestricted use. So we got a lot of  
4 benefit out of the initial Shaw contract that was  
5 awarded in 2008.

6 Now we've gone an extra step and we're  
7 evaluating all of these sites even that Shaw is  
8 saying that they're not cleaning to an unrestricted  
9 use, and we determined from doing a cost analysis, an  
10 analysis of the long-term benefit that we would get,  
11 and we've determined that we're going to clean this  
12 Water Tower 44 that Shaw's working on, which is right  
13 over here by the old fire station, to an unrestricted  
14 use.

15 So we're working contracting actions right now  
16 with Shaw to get those cleaned up. We're going to  
17 add actually some aboveground storage tank work to  
18 that that will also be -- those will also be cleaned  
19 to unrestricted use. So that's a good positive thing  
20 that we're adding on top of what Shaw's already done  
21 to this project.

22 DR. ROKKE: Thank you.

23 MR. CARROLL: You bet. That's a good  
24 initiative. Yes?

1                   MS. RAWLINGS: So that must be a  
2 different funding pool.

3                   MR. CARROLL: It's still BRAC funding,  
4 but it's an initiative that we've used, we're using  
5 Air Force wide. In the BRAC program we're looking at  
6 all forty of our BRAC bases and going through  
7 systematically and getting, looking at all these  
8 sites and determining which ones we can still afford  
9 within our budget. We call it a TOA, but we have  
10 like five or seven years of budget that we look at.

11                  One of the reasons we could do this is we've  
12 been awarding these performance-based contracts that  
13 are saving the Air Force money over our original  
14 budget. We're reinvesting that money into site  
15 closures. So that's one of the initiatives that's  
16 going on here.

17                  All right. So another thing that we're doing as  
18 part of the agreement we have with the Village for an  
19 economic development conveyance is to demolish three  
20 water towers, and rehab the other water tower, that  
21 are remaining on the base. So during this spring and  
22 summer, you'll see some demos going on right over  
23 here, these two twin water towers. I think we've  
24 already briefed this, but that's under contract to a

1 company called ECC. Is that correct, Jim?

2 MR. HUSBANDS: Yes, that's correct.

3 DR. ROKKE: Question. When you  
4 complete (water towers) 120, 122, and 968, will that  
5 land be left in unrestricted use status afterwards?

6 MR. CARROLL: Yes. That land has  
7 already been cleaned up underneath those towers to an  
8 un -- those, yeah, all three of those towers can be  
9 used for unrestricted use.

10 DR. ROKKE: Thank you.

11 MR. CARROLL: Yes. And then that  
12 Water Tower 44 that I just mentioned will be also --  
13 the tower will be rehabilitated, repainted, some  
14 safety improvements done on it, and that'll start in  
15 March|April time frame. Shaw is going to be out  
16 there in March, and our other contractor is going to  
17 be there rehabbing that tower this summer. It's  
18 going to be done. So you'll see some pretty visual  
19 things going on around here.

20 MS. RAWLINGS: So is that water tower  
21 currently in use or has it been kind of mothballed  
22 and then will be brought back into use?

23 MR. CARROLL: Water Tower 44 is  
24 currently in use, but when they start it will be

1 taken out of service for the time that it takes to  
2 get the water tower rehabbed, yeah. Okay.

3 DR. WANG: Another question. This is  
4 not on this agenda. On the west end there's a  
5 missile. Do we do anything about it?

6 MR. CARROLL: The missile?

7 MS. KASPER: The missile is owned by  
8 the museum. It's owned by the Air Force and it's  
9 currently under museum status. I work at the museum.  
10 We're active there. Most of that missile is  
11 concrete. They poured concrete into it years and  
12 years and years ago. We have contacted the Air Force  
13 and said we are willing to give up these items, but  
14 by saying we're willing to give it up, that says  
15 anybody who wants it has to come and get it and pay  
16 to get it out.

17 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Is that -- I  
18 guess is that controlled by the Davis-Monthan group?  
19 There's a group --

20 MS. KASPER: The museum?

21 MR. CARROLL: No, that missile. A lot  
22 of the old static displays that we've had are  
23 controlled by a certain group within the Air Force.

24 MR. KASPER: Wright-Patt Air Force

1 Base.

2 MS. KASPER: Wright-Patt.

3 MR. CARROLL: Wright-Patt.

4 MS. KASPER: Wright-Patt has control  
5 of all that.

6 MR. CARROLL: Okay.

7 DR. WANG: Yeah, that still -- that  
8 did not answer my question. I don't think we would  
9 want it; is that right?

10 MS. KASPER: You might be surprised.  
11 You might have --

12 DR. ROKKE: There's a lot of people  
13 that want it to stay there. Taking it down would be  
14 devastating.

15 DR. WANG: Okay.

16 MS. KASPER: It would be quite  
17 difficult to take it down because it is filled with  
18 concrete.

19 DR. WANG: Okay.

20 MR. SANDAHL: Then what are the plans  
21 to refurbish?

22 MR. KASPER: Right now there is no  
23 plans for it because the museum has no money for that  
24 restoration project. It has been discussed at

1 several of our board meetings. If somebody's willing  
2 to come up with some expenses, there are people that  
3 would do the refurbishing but right now there's just  
4 no money.

5 MR. FOTHERGILL: What would that  
6 budget be for refurbishing?

7 MR. SANDAHL: Probably close to  
8 \$25,000 to blast it and to do proper corrosion  
9 control and repaint it to configuration. That was  
10 the estimate we were given last time.

11 MR. CARROLL: All right. Trying to  
12 keep us on schedule. Dr. Schneider will give us our  
13 TAPP update.

14 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, first I want to  
15 say it's wonderful to read minutes from the last  
16 meeting where you've spoken. You find out just how  
17 many ers, uhs, and a word I didn't realize I was  
18 using. And I looked at this and I said they must  
19 have mistaken it. I kept using the word "stuff." I  
20 must have used "stuff" a dozen times, you know, oh,  
21 you got this stuff. And I guess I was just talking  
22 very nonchalantly, but I'll try to watch my verbiage  
23 today.

24 Anyway, first slide, please. Over the past

1 period, basically we indulged in about four  
2 activities. One of them arose from the last RAB  
3 meeting, Doug's comment about the environmental  
4 conditions that move along with certain properties  
5 that are transferred from one place to the other,  
6 from one owner to the other. Continue to look at  
7 technical documents. Talked briefly about the  
8 development of some kind of user guide for the  
9 materials that are on file at the library, kind of,  
10 you know, technical guide for dummies or something  
11 like that to be able to understand for the public if  
12 they go in there what they're reading or how to read  
13 it.

14 And then lastly we reviewed and evaluated the  
15 alternatives as presented at the last Public Meeting  
16 about a month ago relative to Fire Training Area 2,  
17 Site FT021 and the other site, WP080.

18 Next slide, please. As far as liabilities,  
19 there's laws that have changed over time, but  
20 essentially the question here in Illinois is that the  
21 law does exist on the books for residential and  
22 certain properties of that nature, multiuse  
23 properties, but, in general, the buyer is to beware.

24 So the due diligence really reflects upon the

1 recipient of any property. In other words, it is --  
2 it would be unconscionable to take a large property  
3 that you might have suspicions about without having  
4 first done some due diligence to see if that property  
5 is clean of environmental conditions.

6 Whether you do that or not, if the transferor,  
7 the person who's giving or selling you the property  
8 reveals those environmental conditions and you accept  
9 the property on that basis, then you are responsible  
10 for those environmental conditions. It's pretty much  
11 simple as that.

12 Now, specific here to the base, the former base  
13 here, I think there are some BRAC rules that apply in  
14 terms of what's stated about properties and how  
15 they're transferred, and I think that Mr. Hill, who  
16 was going to look into this also, has a point of  
17 view. So if you guys want to make a comment on this  
18 at this point, unless you want to save it.

19 MR. HILL: No. I think what  
20 Dr. Schneider is saying reflects what I found, you  
21 know, there are requirements of residential  
22 transactions for disclosure of asbestos, lead-based  
23 paints, these types of things. I'm not sure we have  
24 a specific law on the books for commercial type

1 properties, but, yeah, there's -- definitely didn't  
2 see anything in regards to compensation or anything  
3 of that nature. So I think it's a, you know, on the  
4 buyer to, you know, make their decision in light of  
5 the information they're given.

6 DR. WANG: Okay. Don't be alarmed.  
7 With my properties, I just tell you my experience.  
8 Under those reports, the environmental study, the  
9 phase one reports, asbestos reports they provided to  
10 me totally inadequate, totally inaccurate, and in no  
11 way to trace. Okay. So I said this many, many  
12 times, but I had to deal with this myself, okay?

13 So when you say, okay, you were informed of this  
14 asbestos and everything. What did they inform me?  
15 I'm not using the word misleading, but I just say  
16 it's totally, totally inaccurate, inadequate. Okay?

17 DR. SCHNEIDER: That's the hook,  
18 Doctor. The hook is that it's still upon the buyer  
19 or the receiver of the property, whether you're  
20 paying a dollar for it or a million dollars for it or  
21 get it for free, it's the due diligence. That's  
22 been -- I'm not an attorney so I don't want to get  
23 into that part of it, but that's been demonstrated  
24 very much.

1           Back in 1988 or in '89, the State of Illinois  
2 passed what was called the Responsibility Property  
3 Transfer Act. We called it RPTA. And I'm not,  
4 frankly, sure if it's still on the books, but the  
5 point is -- my colleague back there said it's not on  
6 the books. I think, in fact, it's been dropped off.

7           But about that time there was a lot of interest  
8 in these environmental property assessments dealing  
9 with property transfers of environmental conditions.  
10 And one of the first manuals that came out had the  
11 title of Buyer Beware, and that still exists.

12           So the recipient of a property, especially  
13 commercial property, and usually the banks require  
14 some sort of more thorough investigation. And that's  
15 probably true that I say here's a building that's got  
16 asbestos problems. We don't -- I might not tell you  
17 how much it's going to cost to mediate those asbestos  
18 problems or, as a matter of fact, you know, what the  
19 full extent of that is. So I'm not apologizing for  
20 anything, but that's kind of the way it works in the  
21 business community. All right. That's all I've got  
22 to say about that.

23           Next slide, please. I continued review of  
24 technical documents. I don't know. Well, Sponge Bob

1 always has a good answer for things so that kind of  
2 fits here. And basically just kept on going, reading  
3 what I can and, as I said before, there's a lot of  
4 material out there. I'm not sure my old brain is  
5 retaining every lousy page, but I try to get through  
6 it to pick up the nuances of what's been going on at  
7 this base for the last thirty years or whatever.

8       Okay. Next slide, please. There was some  
9 discussion about again putting together some sort of  
10 user guide at the library. Right now the library has  
11 this stuff. I'll use my word there. It's about  
12 fifty binders, three-ring binders. Basically --  
13 those are just examples of the kinds of reports that  
14 are in there, the Basewide Construction Quality  
15 Control Plan, the Final First (Five-) year (Review),  
16 and so forth.

17       There are several older folders that go back to  
18 1991 and '92. Meeting minutes, some exchange  
19 documents, and so forth. And then there's several  
20 public, what I call public, friendly information  
21 papers, such as these brochures and the usual  
22 material that comes out prior to a Public Meeting for  
23 the Proposed Plan of a typical alternate treatment of  
24 a particular site.

1           But, as a matter of fact, if you go into the  
2 library and say to the librarian, May I see a list of  
3 what's on the shelf? They don't have one. Well,  
4 they will have one because I prepared one and I  
5 promised the librarian I would give it to her. But  
6 the point is, still when you go in there, you walk in  
7 there and if you're just John Q Public and you say  
8 where is the stuff from Rantoul, they'll point you  
9 over to those shelves. I don't know how many of you  
10 have been there to look at them. And there's a bunch  
11 of these big thick volumes.

12           John Q Public is not going to pull -- well, they  
13 may. They may pull one out and as soon as they open  
14 it up, good-bye. They go to sleep or they just are  
15 done with. My idea is still to put together a very  
16 simple guide to those documents, which would include,  
17 first of all, a listing of the documents that are  
18 there, how to look for what you want to find and,  
19 lastly, probably as part of that bound volume would  
20 be the executive summaries or the abstracts of each  
21 of those documents so you don't have to pull out a  
22 document that's three or four inches thick. You  
23 simply can read the executive summary. And if  
24 something piques your interest, Mr. Public, ah, go to

1 that document, look up what it was that piqued your  
2 interest.

3 Most executive summaries are really pretty good.  
4 They're written because most executives don't have  
5 time to read through the rest of it. So they have to  
6 have the right points in there. Can't have all the  
7 details, obviously, but they have the salient points.  
8 And so we really -- my belief is that we need some  
9 guide of that nature, and we'll talk about that  
10 again.

11 Lastly, we looked at -- slide, please. Lastly,  
12 we reviewed from the Public Meeting the various  
13 alternatives that were proposed for these two sites.  
14 My colleague, Mike Rapps and I, independently found  
15 that we saw absolutely no problem with the preferred  
16 pick for Site WP080, which is Alternative 5, based on  
17 the information we have available to us. And then we  
18 have no problem with the Preferred Alternative 3 for  
19 the old Fire Training Area 2 site (Site FT021).

20 However, two things. We noted -- both of us  
21 independently looked a little back at the proposed  
22 two foot soil cover final grade. We believe that  
23 needs to be reassessed for any number of reasons.

24 Now, we understand that, and this is all in our

1       comments which actually Bruce has a copy of and  
2       perhaps, Bruce, you could e-mail that to the board.

3                       MR. SANDAHL:   Yes, I can.

4                       DR. SCHNEIDER:  Thank you.  And which  
5       will be submitted to Shaw tomorrow.  But what we --  
6       we understand that some of the more deeply excavated  
7       areas are going to be backfilled with something,  
8       presumably clay or other good soil.  And so then that  
9       final grade means two feet of top soil over the top  
10      of that, but that's not over everything because not  
11      everything's the same out there.  So we're just  
12      asking that it be reassessed to see if two feet  
13      should be the proper soil cover.

14                      We would suggest, based on what we know about  
15      from the literature and about this area of the  
16      country, that it certainly ought to be -- it ought to  
17      exceed sixty centimeters, two feet.  Most covers,  
18      certainly over landfills and over hazardous waste  
19      materials, you know, include several layers of  
20      different types of soil.  There's about a sixty  
21      centimeter, two foot, top layer.  Then usually a  
22      thirty centimeter of subdrainage layer that many  
23      times overlays the geomembrane.

24                      I don't think we're suggesting any of that.  In

1 fact, we're not suggesting anything specific. We're  
2 just asking that Shaw revisit the soil cover issue  
3 and make a decision on that, report back to us.

4 The other thing was at the end of the public  
5 hearing last month, one of the RAB members mentioned  
6 to me, well, you know, this is going to be a limited  
7 use site, in other words, it's going to have  
8 institutional controls on it. Can't build houses.  
9 Can't reside on it. What about agriculture?

10 Well, I'm not going to comment on my opinion  
11 about that, but we need to pass that back over to see  
12 if there is appropriate use of some appropriate  
13 agricultural use. As we put in our comments, no  
14 particular type of agriculture was proposed, and it's  
15 not clear if agriculture would be an appropriate use  
16 following treatment of groundwater and soil. But we  
17 ask that it be reconsidered, and that's what we've  
18 done in our comments. That's all I have. Yes?

19 MS. RAWLINGS: If you go back to the  
20 user guide, are you envisioning that as being cross-  
21 referenced, too, because one of the things when I  
22 used to be a reporter for the Rantoul Press is that  
23 you can go back and look at information, but you may  
24 not clue into the fact that that information has been

1       superseded by something more recent. So will there  
2       be something like that?

3                     DR. SCHNEIDER: I suppose we could do  
4       that. I didn't have that in the airwaves here, but  
5       now it is. You've just made that comment, so we  
6       could do that.

7                     MS. RAWLINGS: And another thing for  
8       the future, I think, is when this is finished there  
9       should be like a historic overview done.

10                    DR. SCHNEIDER: That could be -- well,  
11       we have that comment now, I think. There's certainly  
12       enough material that's been built up over the years  
13       to make that a reasonably easy process, I would  
14       think. Yes, Denise.

15                    MS. BECNEL: Okay. I'm not sure if I  
16       should mention this now or mention it under RAB  
17       members topic of interest, but, as you know, my  
18       concern has been the fact that there's a general lack  
19       of access in terms of usable information for the  
20       public. I think there's a great deal of information.  
21       It's good information. It's great information.

22                    The problem is that the audience who it's for is  
23       more technical and not layperson, and I find that to  
24       be an enormous problem because the Village of

1 Rantoul, the community of Rantoul, has a right to  
2 know what has taken place.

3           There's been a lot of good work done over the  
4 years. They have a right to know, but the  
5 information that now exists is not in an accessible  
6 form for the average person, as you mentioned. Now,  
7 under your -- you mentioned several public friendly  
8 information papers, and you give Group 8 Proposed  
9 Plan and Group 7 Proposed Plan.

10                   DR. SCHNEIDER: Those are just  
11 examples.

12                   MS. BECNEL: Right. Those are --  
13 that's actually some of the things that I would want  
14 to mention. I don't think that those group Proposed  
15 Plans are in the accessible form to the average  
16 person, and I can give you examples of what I mean.

17                   Something which I would feel would be very  
18 accessible to the public would be information that's  
19 written at newspaper level. Okay. Newspaper level  
20 information is written for wide distribution. No  
21 newspaper who wanted to sell a newspaper would put  
22 acronyms and all kinds of technical information and  
23 references in that document. Okay. So my reference  
24 point is newspaper-like information.

1           And I find that these documents that are sent  
2 out to, Paul said, 3,000 people, this is the most  
3 accessible information that I've read. Okay. The  
4 Proposed Plan, if you look at any Proposed Plan, now  
5 it is accessible to, let's say, someone who's a  
6 technician, who has technical background. People who  
7 have technical background can look at this and, you  
8 know, understand it pretty, you know, regular,  
9 ordinarily. But the average person would be lost in  
10 a document like this.

11           The problem that I have is that we keep saying  
12 that we're inviting the public, but this is not a  
13 user friendly document in and of itself. Okay. So  
14 my concern is that there's a lot that's being assumed  
15 in terms of accessibility to information for the  
16 public.

17           And I really think that we should take a look at  
18 that because we have done a lot. Shaw has done a  
19 lot. The Air Force has done a lot. But all of that  
20 information is not available to the public as  
21 available as this document is, which is very simple.  
22 Okay.

23           Let me just give you an example. Anyone who has  
24 this document, the second paragraph, if I could just

1 take a minute to read it and give you an example of  
2 why it's good. Okay. It says here: The demolition  
3 projects will involve cutting water towers down to  
4 manageable sized pieces so that they can be hauled  
5 away for recycling. The refurbishment includes  
6 resurfacing the water tower through abrasive blasting  
7 of the inside and outside to remove lead-based paint  
8 and allowing for repainting of the water tower. The  
9 water tower will be painted to match other water  
10 towers in the Village. To contain dust and abrasive  
11 blasting materials, workers will install a temporary  
12 protective shroud and vacuum containment system over  
13 Water Tower 44.

14 This is the last sentence: The containment  
15 system will ensure contamination from blasting  
16 operation that does not escape outside the work area.

17 Okay. Now, the reason why that's a great  
18 paragraph and accessible to anybody who could read it  
19 is that it's clear, nontechnical. It tells you what  
20 the problem is, what's being done, what safety  
21 measures are being taken, and it also gives a simple  
22 criteria.

23 It says that the water tower is going to be  
24 enclosed or shrouded, so if any of us pass there and

1 see blasting material fuming out, you know, the  
2 average person can say, oh, okay, I thought they said  
3 that they're going to cover it, when all this  
4 material is just blasting out all over the place. So  
5 even the average person has a criteria for deciding,  
6 okay, everything's all right. I mean, they're doing  
7 what they're supposed to do or they're not doing what  
8 they're supposed to do.

9 I'm saying that this document gives all of the  
10 pertinent information in accessible language, and I'm  
11 saying that anything that you're going to give to the  
12 public as informational has to be at this level, not  
13 this level.

14 DR. SCHNEIDER: Let me not disagree  
15 with you, but let me point out something. There are  
16 two basic differences with those two documents, their  
17 particular purpose. Public knowledge aside, one is,  
18 as you pointed out, is a very simple explanation of  
19 what's going to take place. But prior to that,  
20 someone has to lay out what they want to take place,  
21 and that needs more explanation.

22 One of the things, I still believe that these  
23 plans, these documents that are produced for a Public  
24 Meeting like Group 8, like we had last week, is that

1     there are a number of what we call inserts or windows  
2     in them which do talk at that level. They do speak  
3     to, you know, what is this and what is that.

4             So they're trying to combine both the  
5     information that they need to get out, the more  
6     technical information, as well as some of the  
7     explanation for what's contained within that.

8             Now maybe what has to happen, for example,  
9     once the -- let's use this Group 8, these two sites.  
10    That comment period closes tomorrow. Shaw and the  
11    Air Force have to respond to any comments that come  
12    in. We don't know how many other comments there  
13    might be or not, but we know there's going to be one.  
14    They're going to respond to that and then they're  
15    going to move forward.

16            That may be the time when that decision is made  
17    to put out one of those four page things that says  
18    here's what we're doing. I'm not telling them to do  
19    this, I'm just saying that may be the point where now  
20    you know what you're going to do. This is what's  
21    going to go on at this site and this is going to be  
22    the end result. That would be the time to do a  
23    project like that. And that's something you'd have  
24    to work with the Air Force on.

1                   MS. BECNEL: Okay. In response to  
2 what you're saying, right, I understand that there  
3 should be some kind of technical document at this  
4 level. That's fine. I'm not negating that there  
5 isn't a need for that. What I'm saying is that even  
6 with this document, perhaps there can be some kind of  
7 a one page overview. See, a lot is assumed in terms  
8 of background knowledge when someone reads a document  
9 like this.

10                  And for the public to know, okay, where does  
11 this document fit in the total thing that's going on  
12 here, I think that kind of information needs to  
13 precede this, maybe a first page or whatever, for the  
14 public so that they can go into this document and  
15 make some kind of sense of it.

16                  DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, what you're  
17 saying is let's -- those documents should have a,  
18 quote unquote, executive summary or John Q Public  
19 summary?

20                  MS. BECNEL: Yes.

21                  DR. SCHNEIDER: That's what you're  
22 saying.

23                  MS. RAWLINGS: I agree. And I'll tell  
24 you, after years of wading through these documents

1 and these meetings and trying to interpret it for the  
2 public as a newspaper reporter, it was incredibly  
3 difficult to go beyond -- to go from that, from the  
4 newsletter to that. I'll leave it at that.

5 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, this appears to  
6 be a recommendation being made to the Air Force.

7 MR. SPARROW: Yeah. Let me just  
8 add -- I don't know, Paul, if you want to. We had  
9 kind of through this process tried to balance out the  
10 need to make sure we communicate the information.  
11 Like Dr. Wang had mentioned before, he wants to make  
12 sure the information is communicated. So there's a  
13 lot of detail that's in here to make sure that if  
14 there is somebody that's interested they can get that  
15 detail.

16 I understand your viewpoint, maybe from the  
17 general public that it's difficult to read, it's  
18 difficult to understand. We, again, originally we  
19 were actually requested to provide much, much more  
20 detail in these documents. Some of the earlier ones  
21 were -- one of them, I think, was a hundred pages  
22 thick. That was requested.

23 So we're trying to find a balance act between  
24 what's useful for the public and what conveys

1 information that should be revealed. So we want to  
2 make sure we reveal the information to them. I think  
3 maybe your suggestion of a one page summary might be  
4 appropriate that we could produce when we have one of  
5 these that we could come back and you could read  
6 simply in a newspaper article fashion what it's  
7 saying and what the intent and what's going to be  
8 done with that. I think that's a simple -- it's a  
9 good recommendation.

10 Again, some public plan or Proposed Plans have  
11 been produced where there are only one or two pages.  
12 Again, we were balancing the requirement to make sure  
13 we revealed the information, but we don't want to  
14 make it so thin that people can't, that really need  
15 to know, can't get that information out.

16 So it's a good suggestion. And I think maybe  
17 even going back to some of the existing documents and  
18 providing a synopsis of that one page, yeah, this was  
19 the plan, this was what was done. We're maybe going  
20 to dig the soils from underneath the water tower so  
21 the site will be clean where people can live there,  
22 if that's what the synopsis is. So it's a good  
23 point.

24 DR. SCHNEIDER: I think, as I

1 explained the last time, too, this paper here is how  
2 many pages, Howard?

3 MR. SPARROW: Remember, this is a  
4 summary of the technical document. This is not the  
5 technical document.

6 DR. SCHNEIDER: This is 21 pages. The  
7 one I've got is 4,705 pages.

8 MR. SPARROW: It's trying to condense  
9 a huge amount of information down to an  
10 understandable format.

11 MS. BECNEL: Okay. As I struggle to  
12 understand like what the big picture is in terms of  
13 the procedures and so forth, I was reading this  
14 document here that was sent through the mail, the one  
15 that I keep referring to that's in a, you know, a  
16 form which is accessible to the public. On the last  
17 page it mentions, I don't know, and, you know, you  
18 guys can correct me if I'm wrong or not, but it seems  
19 to list like a procedure that maybe the public should  
20 also know about or maybe should be mentioned or  
21 something like that when we begin a meeting or even  
22 when we have the Public Meetings.

23 Okay. It mentions, is it, CERCLA requires the  
24 completion of, and it lists several, I don't know,

1 steps, if you want to call them that, Remedial  
2 Investigation, Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan, a  
3 Public Meeting, a Record of Decision, remedial  
4 design, and remedial action. Okay. That sounds like  
5 some kind of a procedure that's part of this whole  
6 thing that, I don't know, I guess everyone just  
7 assumes that somebody's supposed to know. But maybe  
8 it would help if the public could be told like some  
9 kind of overview, okay, this is what the whole  
10 cleanup, environmental cleanup, is all about and this  
11 is how we're going to go about doing it in simple  
12 language.

13 A Remedial Investigation. Okay. What is  
14 that? What does that mean? Feasibility Study,  
15 Proposed Plan, you know, Record of Decision. What's  
16 that? Remedial design. Nobody even knows what those  
17 things mean.

18 MR. CARROLL: In the past, and we  
19 probably need to do it again, we need to do it in our  
20 public visibility document.

21 MS. BECNEL: Right.

22 MR. CARROLL: We used to show this  
23 chart that had that process lined out, and up above  
24 the chart it would say, okay, collecting data,

1 investigating a site, you know, in layman's terms  
2 what we're doing at each phase of the project. So we  
3 can incorporate that back in.

4 MS. BECNEL: Okay. But I just thought  
5 that this was really explanatory. The only thing  
6 that's left out is what they actually mean. I mean,  
7 you can't assume. Sure, I mean, you know you know  
8 the meaning of feasibility, but what does it mean  
9 here in this context? So I think that this is a good  
10 explanation. It's just that, you know, it needs to  
11 maybe go like a step further or something like that.

12 DR. SCHNEIDER: Just keep in mind,  
13 Denise, and again I'm not being apologetic for  
14 anything, but having worked in science for a long  
15 time, you wanted something simple, just a few pages.  
16 As you start expanding, those pages get longer and  
17 longer. And the more pages there are, the less  
18 likely they're going to read. So there's a real  
19 compromise in science. I find that all the time.

20 One of the things I've done over the years, the  
21 firms that I've been with on my own, we were always  
22 like third party. One of the reasons I'm kept on at  
23 the city, the town of Champaign-Urbana, is I help to,  
24 my firm helps to, translate these technical documents

1 into language that, you know, city manager or the  
2 mayor or somebody can actually understand.

3 And there's a limit to how far you can go  
4 because at some point it just -- you run out of space  
5 and run out of time. So there is a compromise. I  
6 think they're good suggestions. I hope that the Air  
7 Force and Shaw take them up. Anything else?

8 MS. KASPER: I have one thing. We  
9 receive the public address one, and it states Water  
10 Towers 120, 122, and 968. I was on this base for six  
11 years. We never referred to them as Water Towers  
12 120, 122, or 968. Water towers out by the north  
13 gate, water towers in the 900 area. So maybe a  
14 little explanation of where these are located because  
15 when I looked at that map, I didn't have a clue.

16 MR. CARROLL: How about all of them  
17 except for the one by the fire station?

18 MS. KASPER: That would be better than  
19 giving me a number because I don't know.

20 DR. SCHNEIDER: Anyway, thank you.  
21 And, again, please feel free to contact me. You  
22 know, you have my contact information. If you have a  
23 question, I can't respond or think ahead for you, and  
24 so if you ask these questions ahead of time I can at

1 least come up with "I don't know," if it's necessary,  
2 you know. I learned that in my orals from my PhD.  
3 Somebody -- they set me up for it. They do that in  
4 these orals. They set me up. I started going off  
5 and finally someone said stop. Just say "I don't  
6 know." So I don't know. Thank you.

7 MR. CARROLL: We always appreciate  
8 this input because we sometimes get focused on what  
9 we do and not really think about how everybody else  
10 understands it. So all this is good feedback. We  
11 appreciate it.

12 DR. ROKKE: Can I ask a question?  
13 Based on the information that you were able to find,  
14 okay, as far as the laws and everything for transfer  
15 of property, very, very clear, if an individual  
16 purchases any property structures on Chanute or  
17 within the structure of what was Chanute Air Force  
18 Base and that property is then transferred from the  
19 Air Force to them, once they accept that property  
20 they then become liable for all asbestos, lead, or  
21 anything associated with that property and the Air  
22 Force and then, therefore, after the transfer what  
23 you found is that the Air Force has no liability then  
24 for the cleanup of that property? Is that what you

1 found?

2 DR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. I'm  
3 not an attorney. So you're asking actually a legal  
4 question there. From the information that's in the  
5 literature, one would suggest that it's buyer beware,  
6 that if you purchase the property, or take control of  
7 it through a lease even, you accept whatever goes  
8 along with that property. The only way you get out  
9 of that, let's say, is if the property was  
10 transferred under a cloud, meaning they knew that,  
11 knew that there was asbestos in the building and  
12 didn't say. They said, aw, it's a clean building.

13 But now you're stuck with a legal situation  
14 where you would have to go to court to get that  
15 cleared up. The idea of cradle to the grave business  
16 goes back to Super Fund or CERCLA. In terms of waste  
17 repository, when somebody abandons the landfill,  
18 let's say, walks off, leaves it to the state or the  
19 federal government, so the state or federal  
20 government then go to find out who put stuff in that  
21 landfill and they try to go back to the original  
22 owner.

23 But if you clearly take title or take control of  
24 the grounds, you become responsible. And the reason

1 for that is actually for the next one on down. If  
2 you knowingly take on, let's say, a property that has  
3 an underground storage tank in it, we'll just use  
4 that as an example, and that underground storage tank  
5 still has material in it and continues to leak out  
6 and the neighbor calls up and says, hey, your stuff  
7 is leaking onto my property, guess who's responsible?  
8 You are because you did not clean that up. You kept  
9 the source.

10 Now, we've been through this with Illinois  
11 Department of Transportation. They're very careful  
12 about that because if you accept property that has  
13 contaminants on it, you are well advised to clean it  
14 up because it now becomes a new source. So even if  
15 it's -- let's say the tank leaks off to John next  
16 door. Somebody comes in or takes away the tank.  
17 Maybe they even took away the tank. All right. Then  
18 they sell this property. If there's no contaminants  
19 there, it's not your problem. So John would have to  
20 go back to the original owner of the tank.

21 But if you accept the tank and then it leaks,  
22 that stuff that was in there, which you didn't put in  
23 there, is still yours. You purchased the whole kit  
24 and caboodle.

1                   DR. ROKKE: Okay. So then you,  
2 hypothetical, as an environmental consultant, if Joe  
3 was thinking about purchasing this large structure  
4 for his thing and they knew at the time, based on the  
5 design and everything, that there was asbestos and  
6 lead paint in it and he came to you and said, okay,  
7 separate name, Dr. Smith, would you advise me to  
8 purchase this structure or accept this structure  
9 given that the prior owner has not removed the lead  
10 or asbestos, or should I just walk away, what would  
11 your recommendation be?

12                   DR. SCHNEIDER: Do your own  
13 investigation. It's going to cost you \$72,000 just  
14 to look into it, and then you decide whether you want  
15 to walk away from it or spend the \$72,000 to find out  
16 if you even want to purchase it. That's the real  
17 answer. That's how you do it in real life.

18                   So you say, hmm, the building might be worth a  
19 million. I can get it for a hundred thousand. Let  
20 me spend the 72. Seventy-two comes back and says  
21 it'll cost you 500,000 to clean up the building.  
22 Then you can say, well, I spent \$572,000. I got the  
23 building; it's worth a million. I clean it up and  
24 I've got a million dollar building. Then you can

1       decide whether you want to walk away or gamble what  
2       you spent a million dollars for. Hope that answers  
3       your question.

4                   MR. CARROLL: Okay. I think I'm back  
5       up for a second, introduce Pete. Pete Passarelli is  
6       going to talk about the infrastructure assessment  
7       update.

8                   MR. PASSARELLI: I think I gave a  
9       little bit of an update at the last RAB meeting. Was  
10      that in November? Back in August of 2011, we began  
11      the second phase of an infrastructure assessment of  
12      the wet utilities on the former Chanute Air Force  
13      Base. We hired Burns & McDonnell, a consulting  
14      engineer, to do that assessment. They finished that  
15      assessment up in the late fall, early winter. They  
16      provided us a report last month in January. We've  
17      shared that information with the Air Force. We were  
18      sort of basically doing our due diligence of the  
19      utility systems that we're going to get from the Air  
20      Force.

21                  Really the bottom line is the systems show their  
22      age. We didn't find any catastrophic deficiencies,  
23      but there are some big costs associated with those  
24      utility systems. So that's pretty much it in a

1 nutshell.

2 That work that we did was funded by the Air  
3 Force through the Office of Economic Adjustment and a  
4 Department of Defense agency. Roughly little over  
5 \$500,000 project to look at all of those wet  
6 utilities. That's where we're at.

7 MR. STREFF: I have a question for  
8 you. On the RFQ that just came out on Flessner  
9 Drive, are you going to be extending Flessner Drive  
10 out to Route 45? Is that what's going on?

11 MR. PASSARELLI: Yes.

12 MR. STREFF: So we're going to have a  
13 new intersection there on Route 45 --

14 MR. PASSARELLI: Yeah.

15 MR. STREFF: For Flessner Drive.  
16 Okay.

17 MR. CARROLL: And for those of you who  
18 don't know, the infrastructure assessment that we  
19 were working with the Village to do is part of a  
20 larger plan to work with the Village and do some  
21 things to help them to be able to submit an economic  
22 development application for the remaining property  
23 here on the base.

24 And I know most of you know about all of these

1 things that we're helping them with, working with  
2 them with, and you'll see some pretty good changes in  
3 the landscape over the next couple of years,  
4 including these water towers, some demolition of some  
5 buildings coming up that will be very visible, and  
6 then the construction of the Lincoln's Challenge  
7 campus which is scheduled to begin next winter or the  
8 following spring. Major changes in the landscape of  
9 this former base. Okay. Howard?

10 MR. SPARROW: Thanks, Paul. By the  
11 way, before I get started, my name is Howard Sparrow  
12 with Shaw Environmental. I'm the Project Manager for  
13 the environmental cleanup. Previously some of the  
14 RAB members, I know some of the folks have taken a  
15 look at the map up there. We do have some handouts,  
16 11 by 17s of these maps. If there's any members of  
17 the public that want some copies of them here, you're  
18 more than welcome. I'll pass a few around here.  
19 I've distributed them once before, but I want to make  
20 sure to pass them around. So if I refer to some of  
21 the sites, at least you'll have a map that you can  
22 look at some of the sites that are there.  
23 Just want to try to give you a brief status  
24 update of really where we're at on the

1 performance-based contract. Again, the contract has  
2 forty-seven specific sites currently. The Air Force  
3 is in the process of adding eleven additional sites.  
4 Those are generally AST sites, aboveground storage  
5 tank sites. They're usually some smaller fuel oil  
6 storage tanks or gasoline tanks that may have been  
7 used around the facility for which they either want  
8 to remove those tanks or complete the remedial  
9 actions. It may have already been started, but they  
10 haven't been finalized.

11 So the Air Force is looking to add eleven more  
12 cleanups or finalizations of those eleven AST sites  
13 in addition to the forty-seven sites. I want to  
14 concentrate just on the forty-seven sites that we  
15 have here today, and hopefully the other eleven sites  
16 the Air Force will be able to complete those actions  
17 this year as well.

18 You can see on our chart here that we've used  
19 previously, the objective is to try to show you the  
20 phases of the process. This does show the phases of  
21 the cleanup process here as we go along. The ones on  
22 the left are the study phases. The ones getting  
23 further to the right are the cleanup actions that  
24 we're taking on-site.

1           You can see the study phases are getting  
2 completed. As a matter of fact, the feasibility  
3 study is the last. Substantial feasibility studies  
4 have been already submitted to the Air Force for  
5 reviews and approvals. We do have -- the remedial  
6 actions are the ones that I want to kind of  
7 concentrate on for this.

8           We've completed twenty-two remedial actions.  
9 There's thirty-four of the forty-two sites for which  
10 we have to do some remedial actions. Remedial  
11 actions mean do the cleanup of the environment. Our  
12 intent, our purpose is to complete the remediation,  
13 the cleanup of those remaining twelve sites this  
14 year. So by the end of this year we will have  
15 completed all thirty-four of the cleanup actions  
16 required.

17           You will see the last column over here, the site  
18 closure. Some of these sites take two, three, or  
19 four years to be able to get the final cleanup and  
20 determination that all the groundwater contamination  
21 has been removed. It's normally the groundwater that  
22 takes the longest.

23           So we will have implemented the cleanup  
24 technology. We have to monitor it, so we'll go into

1 a monitoring phase and that monitoring phase will  
2 continue for two or three more years until we can get  
3 site closure. Site closure is when we got the final  
4 data that shows that the groundwater and soils have  
5 been remediated to the required standards.

6 So this last bar will remain red. We do intend,  
7 I think we looked at this, this year I think there  
8 are five sites for which we will get additional  
9 closures completed on this year. So we are making  
10 progress. I think the performance-based contract  
11 really is working here at Chanute, as well as many  
12 other Air Force bases.

13 There are two -- there are five non-CERCLA sites  
14 that are regulated under a different regulation.  
15 These are regulated under the State of Illinois  
16 regulations. And we do have some remedial actions.  
17 These are the last ones. We've put these on the last  
18 to be cleaned up, but it is our intent to clean these  
19 sites and complete the remedial actions on these  
20 sites this year as well.

21 As I mentioned, there are actually twelve sites.  
22 This has eleven sites identified. There's one  
23 additional site that's included in one of these that  
24 we have some remedial actions to complete. But I'll

1 give you kind of a picture view of what we're going  
2 to do at these sites.

3 So these are the actual cleanups that we're  
4 going to get completed this year. And again I go by  
5 groups just to make reference on that map. That  
6 handout that I have, you see the groups of sites. So  
7 a group of sites may have anywhere from one to seven  
8 sites or nine sites combined into that one group.  
9 They're grouped because they're all similar types of  
10 characteristics to be cleaned up.

11 The first one is the Group 2 sites. I'll give  
12 you a list here, and then I'll go through these in a  
13 little bit more detail. But, again, you can see the  
14 schedule that we have on here. This is a schedule  
15 for which we currently anticipate actually getting  
16 on-site and starting the cleanup on these sites. And  
17 I'll describe to you briefly what we're going to do  
18 at these sites.

19 The first one is the Group 2. It's the NavAid  
20 Station. It's actually out by the runway. We did do  
21 some testing, additional testing, over the winter to  
22 determine whether -- there was originally found some  
23 small residual amount of groundwater contamination.  
24 We went back out, put in some new wells, tested.

1           We did determine that there is still some  
2 groundwater contamination at that site. We will  
3 implement the in-situ bioremediation technology, just  
4 like we did for all the other sites last summer, and  
5 we will complete remediation of that site to achieve  
6 cleanup to drinking water standards for the  
7 groundwater.

8                   MR. KASPER: Could you tell us what  
9 you found in that particular site?

10                   MR. SPARROW: That particular site was  
11 perchloroethene (aka tetrachloroethene [PCE]). PCE  
12 is a typical solvent that may be used in cleaning  
13 operations. Perchloroethene is also used for dry  
14 cleaning operations. So it's the same thing that  
15 your dry cleaner uses to clean your clothes with.

16                   MR. KASPER: Because the last time  
17 that site was used, it used to be the old gas chamber  
18 where we used to train everybody for nuclear chemical  
19 and biological warfare out there. That's why I'm  
20 curious.

21                   MR. SPARROW: Okay. I'm not sure what  
22 the source of the perchloroethene would have been.

23                   MR. KASPER: It wouldn't have been  
24 from any of our --

1                   MR. SPARROW: May have been from some  
2 kind of cleaning operation that was done out there.

3                   MR. CARROLL: A lot of times these,  
4 where they had electronics, they did a lot of  
5 cleaning of the electronics and we find in a lot of  
6 our bases that there are releases of TCE or PCE at  
7 these locations.

8                   MR. SPARROW: Also, to give you a  
9 quick status update again, I mentioned we've already  
10 done remediation at twenty-two sites. I think  
11 there's about sixteen of those sites, somewhere in  
12 that number, where we are doing in-situ  
13 bioremediation. We are in the monitoring phase for  
14 those sites already that we did last summer.

15                  We are collecting, going back and collecting  
16 data from those sites to prove that those sites are  
17 being remediated. I hope by the next RAB meeting  
18 we'll be able to present some of that data so we can  
19 show you the progress, the real data that we're  
20 collecting there, and you can see the cleanup of the  
21 groundwater and the progress of that.

22                  The next slide is the Water Tower 44. As Paul  
23 mentioned previously, this is the site for which the  
24 Air Force is going to -- it was previously determined

1 to clean the site up to a designated land use. The  
2 Air Force has looked at this, and they want to clean  
3 this up to an unrestricted land use.

4 And so this area that's shown on here, the area  
5 of soils removal, was the amount that was required to  
6 be cleaned up to the designated land use to get to  
7 unrestricted land use.

8 That area will expand probably two or three  
9 times that. We've already done the testing of the  
10 soils out there. Basically, we'll go out and we'll  
11 remove the surface soils that are there. Again, the  
12 contamination came from lead-based paint from that  
13 site. So that site will be remediated to an  
14 unrestricted land use, and the work on that is  
15 actually scheduled to start in March. So as soon as  
16 we can finalize information with the Air Force, we're  
17 going to move fairly quickly to get that site  
18 remediated.

19 The Laundromat site we've mentioned several  
20 times before. We have agreements with land owners.  
21 We are in the process of starting the remedial work  
22 on that site. It does consist of a partial  
23 demolition of the building initially, some soils  
24 excavation, followed by an in-situ bioremediation

1 process. So it will take several years for the  
2 bioremediation process to undergo.

3 The ultimate disposition of that building is  
4 that when Lincoln's Challenge facility is constructed  
5 and completed, then that building will be demolished.  
6 So that's part of our agreement with the owner is to  
7 demolish the building when the cadets are -- when  
8 Lincoln's Challenge no longer needs to use that  
9 facility.

10 I know it's a little past 1:00. I'm going to  
11 try to move through these. Again, I'm willing to  
12 stay longer and give you more information, if you  
13 would like, on any of these.

14 Group 7, there are four sites within this Group  
15 7. I think -- have we indicated all four of these in  
16 here?

17 MR. BUMB: Yeah, they're in there.

18 MR. SPARROW: So all of the sites are  
19 shown. These are sites for which there were various  
20 fuel type contamination, maybe in either soil or it  
21 may be in groundwater, and they are mostly on the far  
22 end of the site, what's called the Operable Unit 2.  
23 I think you can see them all there. They're kind of  
24 all grouped together. It's where they had engine

1 test stands, and some of the fuel lines may have  
2 leaked or there may be a fuel tank that may have  
3 leaked there.

4 DR. ROKKE: Can we go back for a  
5 moment? On the Laundromat, once the Lincoln's  
6 Challenge building, the whole building, comes down,  
7 at that time, whatever the bio in-situ remediation  
8 had not been completed, the rest of that soil, if  
9 there's anything remaining, will have the completion  
10 of bio in-situ remediation?

11 MR. SPARROW: The soils that's  
12 contaminated is underneath the far end. The original  
13 dry cleaning operation was on the far end of the  
14 building.

15 DR. ROKKE: If you go to demolish it,  
16 if you find any at that time, then --

17 MR. SPARROW: We remove that soil  
18 that's contaminated there. What we're trying to  
19 treat on the long term is not just soils, it's the  
20 groundwater. We will be treating the entire  
21 groundwater in that area.

22 DR. ROKKE: Okay. So, in other words,  
23 the entire site has been cleaned up to unrestricted  
24 use?

1                   MR. SPARROW: It will be cleaned up to  
2 unrestricted use, that's correct.

3                   DR. ROKKE: Thank you.

4                   MR. SPARROW: So these are again  
5 pictures generally showing the areas where we may be  
6 conducting excavations. So in this Group 7 sites we  
7 do have to excavate some of the soils, and we do have  
8 to do some in-situ bioremediation. In-situ  
9 bioremediations are generally shown on the green  
10 area, and that's where we will treat the groundwater  
11 that's within those areas.

12                  Again, we install monitoring wells, just like we  
13 have before, to verify that the treatment process is  
14 working and to verify that the contamination hasn't  
15 migrated somewhere else on-site.

16                  The Group 8 Fire Training Area 2 is the one  
17 that, you know, we did have the Proposed Plan and  
18 Public Meeting approximately a month ago. We have  
19 gotten some comments in on the Proposed Plan for  
20 this.

21                  Generally speaking, the Proposed Plan for this  
22 is to remove sediments that are within this area and  
23 to do in-situ treatment for fuels that are remaining  
24 on-site and then to completely backfill the site.

1           The final detail of the cap, the soils have not  
2       been worked out yet. That will be worked out in the  
3       remedial design, but again the general process is to  
4       treat the groundwater and soils, and then backfill  
5       that entire area and have that area available for  
6       reuse for designated purposes, which means anything  
7       nonresidential.

8                     DR. ROKKE: Once that's complete, what  
9       designated purposes would be possible?

10                    MR. SPARROW: Anything nonresidential.  
11       So agriculture is not precluded from that site.

12                    DR. ROKKE: Pardon me?

13                    MR. SPARROW: I say agricultural use  
14       is not precluded. So you could farm that land if you  
15       wanted to. Generally speaking, when you backfill an  
16       area, you kind of -- you got such great farmland out  
17       here that the farmers really, once you kind of  
18       backfill an area, they really don't like to go back  
19       and --

20                    DR. ROKKE: So corn and soybeans for  
21       human consumption could be grown on that once this is  
22       completed?

23                    MR. SPARROW: It's not precluded from  
24       any agricultural use, that's correct. There's

1 another site that's right adjacent to that. It's  
2 what was the TCE Disposal Pit. Again, I want to  
3 highlight the fact that the TCE Disposal Pit was  
4 excavated a number of years ago. There is some --  
5 after all that excavation and backfill was complete,  
6 the Air Force came back and did some additional  
7 testing.

8           There is some residual amounts of chlorinated  
9 solvents on that site, and we will go back and do the  
10 in-situ bio treatment for those chlorinated solvents  
11 on that site.

12           And then finally I want to mention, we mentioned  
13 Group 2. I kind of mentioned that NavAid Station.  
14 That's a Group 2 site. There is one additional site  
15 in Group 2. There will be a Public Meeting and a  
16 Proposed Plan. We will try to do the summary for the  
17 Proposed Plan for that meeting so that it would be  
18 in, if you would, a newspaper article type. So we'll  
19 have a summary sheet. But, again, there will be an  
20 additional Proposed Plan and Public Meeting, we're  
21 anticipating, this spring.

22           So the Feasibility Study has been submitted to  
23 the Air Force for review. Once the Air Force  
24 completes their review, the State of Illinois will

1 complete their review and then we will develop the  
2 Proposed Plan for that and then hold a Public  
3 Meeting. I would anticipate sometime in April doing  
4 that meeting, so it will probably be before the next  
5 RAB meeting.

6 A couple of comments we did receive on the  
7 previous Public Meeting. One was a request to do the  
8 Public Meeting at night, in the evening. Not  
9 everybody's available to attend at noon. We've done  
10 some Proposed Plans in the evening with very poor  
11 attendance. The meetings at noontime appear to allow  
12 more people to be able to participate.

13 We are willing to hold an informal session to  
14 make sure we cover both bases, both those that can  
15 attend and can't attend at noon. We can do one,  
16 would like to propose doing one at noon, the formal  
17 meeting at noon, and then an informal meeting at  
18 7:00 o'clock in the evening so we can accommodate  
19 both people or anybody that can't attend.

20 DR. ROKKE: I'd like to make a motion  
21 that we do so for the next meeting.

22 MR. SPARROW: All right. If we do the  
23 official Roberts Rules here, do we have a second?  
24 Somebody seconds that motion?

1 MR. SANDAHL: Second.

2 MR. SPARROW: Okay. All in favor?

3 (RAB Members vote by show of hands in  
4 favor.)

5 MR. SPARROW: Okay. So we'll do two.  
6 It'll be informal. Won't be quite as formal, but we  
7 will be willing to make ourselves available for that  
8 meeting.

9 There was also another comment that we had  
10 received, I guess, in terms of public outreach. I  
11 think, Denise, you had made the comment about trying  
12 to meet with other groups to make sure we get  
13 information out. The Air Force and Shaw have talked  
14 together. We are willing to go to any other groups  
15 that may be interested. We do, again, send out  
16 thousands of newsletters for people.

17 Sometimes it's hard to get people to become  
18 motivated to get interested, but what we would like  
19 to do is ask the RAB members to solicit. If there's  
20 some group that you would like us to go out to or a  
21 way that you think we could participate and provide  
22 additional public participation, we would be more  
23 than willing to do that.

24 The only request that we would ask is that we

1 don't do multiple meetings every week for two or  
2 three or four people or small groups. There are Air  
3 Force people, as well as Shaw people, that have to  
4 come in and prepare information for that meeting.

5 We're more than willing to sit down with  
6 community groups, whoever, and if you have some  
7 suggestions let us know and we would be glad to do  
8 that.

9 But, again, expect another Public Meeting, one  
10 more Public Meeting. This would be the last  
11 significant major Public Meeting that we have. There  
12 will be some additional Public Meetings a few years  
13 from now because we have to do some conclusions of  
14 the work that's been completed.

15 So one example is the landfills. So we will  
16 have another Public Meeting in maybe a year from now  
17 on landfills to conclude that the remedial actions  
18 that were put in place are still protective of human  
19 health and the environment. But for right now this  
20 would be the last Public Meeting, the last Proposed  
21 Plan that we'll see for the next year.

22 MR. KASPER: Sir, one thing we haven't  
23 heard about these publically in quite some time is  
24 what is going to happen with the old Steam Plant.

1                   MR. SPARROW: I think I'll let Paul  
2 address that.

3                   MR. CARROLL: Yeah. The Steam Plant  
4 is one of those buildings that you should see some  
5 progress on in the next couple of years. It's not  
6 written in stone yet, but once we get to a point  
7 where the Village and us have an economic development  
8 conveyance application and that's approved, the Air  
9 Force has agreed that we can go ahead and take care  
10 of the Steam Plant.

11                  MR. KASPER: Tearing it down?

12                  MR. CARROLL: Yes, with the focus of  
13 abating the asbestos problems in that building.

14                  MR. STREFF: Does that also include  
15 White Hall, too, Paul? Is there a schedule?

16                  MR. CARROLL: Yes, White Hall is also  
17 included in that. I want to stress, though, that  
18 there's -- we have to reach this milestone before we  
19 can say yes, we're going to do this. We have not --  
20 we made a commitment to the Village if the Village  
21 provides us the economic development conveyance  
22 application and we get it approved that we will do  
23 these things. We have made that commitment.

24                  MR. SANDAHL: Those things have been

1 published in various news media and brought out by  
2 several different meetings.

3 MR. CARROLL: Yes.

4 MR. SANDAHL: The agreement that we  
5 have with the Air Force includes, like you said, the  
6 Steam Plant, steam vaults, also demolition of White  
7 Hall, to include, of course, the water towers as part  
8 of that Memorandum of Agreement, and several other  
9 more minor items but to include the Infrastructure  
10 Assessment for the water utilities. So all those  
11 were part of an agreement that we did almost a year  
12 ago.

13 MR. CARROLL: Almost a year ago.

14 MR. SANDAHL: And it's been in various  
15 publications in news media. Maybe we need to get it  
16 out again.

17 MR. KASPER: We've heard quite a bit  
18 about White Hall. We just haven't heard anything  
19 about the power plant in a while.

20 MR. CARROLL: There's still some risk  
21 to all of that happening, so I'm going to be hesitant  
22 to say it's definitely going to be done until we get  
23 to that point. That is in the plans. We hope --  
24 we're doing everything we can to move that direction.

1                   MR. STREFF: Paul, is there a  
2 tentative schedule, though, for the demolition of  
3 those structures?

4                   MR. CARROLL: The contracting action  
5 will begin as soon as we get the application  
6 approved, which is planned for May through June of  
7 this year, and that contracting action will take a  
8 few months. The actual demolition will take about a  
9 little over a year.

10                  MS. RAWLINGS: I want to go back to  
11 ask Howard something, but first I want to say I am  
12 hoping for a personal invitation when White Hall  
13 comes down and a front row seat. I've been waiting  
14 for this for a long time. Just want to ask --

15                  MR. CARROLL: You and a few others.

16                  MS. RAWLINGS: Yes. And you may have  
17 answered this and it may have been addressed at the  
18 Public Meeting, but twice today there's been mention  
19 of finding contamination in an area that had been  
20 previously cleaned up and so I'm wondering why was  
21 that not caught before and so -- and, thus, will  
22 monitoring of whatever sites that's ongoing in the  
23 future, will it be in some way more comprehensive so  
24 that this isn't missed on another site?

1                   MR. SPARROW: Yeah, I'm not sure if I  
2                   stated it that way. I think the example was the  
3                   NavAid Station site. And there was an investigation  
4                   done of that NavAid Station I think around 2005.  
5                   They did find some contamination there. It was a  
6                   small amount of contamination. We came back to check  
7                   it to see whether it was still there.

8                   Normally this contamination, it goes through a  
9                   natural process of degradation. We thought that  
10                  there had been adequate time that it would have  
11                  dissipated. We came back to check it, but there is  
12                  still some residual there. So we do have to go back  
13                  in and do that.

14                 I didn't want to state that that site had been  
15                 cleaned up and then became recontaminated. There are  
16                 certainly some times, like I think the TCE pit I had  
17                 mentioned they did the excavation for that. After  
18                 they did the excavation, the Air Force came back and  
19                 did a final check of the groundwater that was in  
20                 there and they did find some residual in that  
21                 particular site.

22                 It was -- the excavation doesn't necessarily  
23                 take care of all of the groundwater. So there was  
24                 checking. In the sites we have, we do have

1 groundwater monitoring wells that are there. So we  
2 do have to prove that we get the remedial goal, and  
3 that the remedial goal stays in place for at least a  
4 year. And that's to make sure that there's not some  
5 rebound or some additional contamination that we  
6 didn't find in all of these areas.

7 Generally speaking, there's monitoring wells  
8 placed within the contamination and then outside of  
9 that to make sure that we're not pushing it somewhere  
10 else.

11 MS. RAWLINGS: So it was a matter of  
12 it degrading more slowly than had been expected?

13 MR. SPARROW: Right, right.

14 MR. CARROLL: Let me make a very  
15 important point here. This is what I really love  
16 about this performance-based contract. We're  
17 covered. If this had been the Air Force, we would  
18 have said, oh, we found some unexpected  
19 contamination. Guess what? We're going to have to  
20 go see if we can find the money first to clean this  
21 up. Right now the budget's not good.

22 There might have been a year or two delay in us  
23 doing what Shaw has already started doing. We're  
24 covered in more ways than one. We're covered by the

1 Shaw contract, but Shaw's contract is covered by  
2 insurance. So (if) Shaw expends all of the money  
3 that we have given them to do the project. We have  
4 insurance to cover that much money again to clean up  
5 the site. So the main point I want to get across is  
6 we're covered.

7 MR. SPARROW: The Air Force has put  
8 the monkey on my back.

9 MR. BUMB: And to take that example of  
10 the TCE Disposal Pit. That soil excavation happened  
11 when the Landfill 3 was capped. So it was good  
12 potentially for them to move those soils (from the  
13 TCE Disposal Pit) which are right next to it  
14 (Landfill 3) and move it and then come back and do  
15 the investigation. That is, are there any  
16 groundwater issues left? So soil issues were taken  
17 care of. It was not left behind. Groundwater issues  
18 were left intentionally behind after we take out the  
19 soils.

20 MR. CARROLL: Moving forward. Topics  
21 of interest from the floor?

22 MS. BECNEL: I just have one quick  
23 one. It just falls under the category that I was  
24 speaking to before, accessibility of information.

1 One of the things that I mentioned in the Public  
2 Meeting, another suggestion for your consideration,  
3 for the group's consideration, could we have some  
4 kind of a -- not presentation, but an easel  
5 presentation at the public library, either before a  
6 Public Meeting and before a RAB Meeting, something  
7 which is public friendly?

8           We've already talked about the difference  
9 between the technical and the public friendly. Maybe  
10 a map, okay? But maybe not this map because, as this  
11 lady mentioned, she looks at this map and she's been  
12 a long time resident and she can't even figure out  
13 what these things are. So some kind of public  
14 friendly presentation at the public library right in  
15 the front as people are coming in the door.

16           I took the liberty of speaking to the head  
17 librarian there and one of the other librarians, and  
18 they were, you know, receptive to the idea. Let's  
19 say two weeks before a RAB meeting or two weeks -- or  
20 definitely two weeks before a Public Meeting where  
21 the public could come in and, you know, look. Maybe  
22 some public friendly brochures like this one, okay?  
23 All public friendly information there.

24           A map, maybe like an overview of, you know, what

1 has taken place. Twenty-two years of progress,  
2 whatever, some kind of catchy title where the public  
3 could, you know, be exposed to this information and,  
4 therefore, you know, maybe that might generate more  
5 interest in coming to the meetings and finding out  
6 more about what's going on.

7 MR. CARROLL: That kind of dovetails  
8 into your recommendation to have a friendly, like an  
9 executive summary. We can definitely place those  
10 things at the library.

11 DR. ROKKE: We can get a bulletin  
12 board over there real easy.

13 MR. CARROLL: Okay. And we can  
14 actually have the posters that we provide here at the  
15 Public Meeting in advance.

16 MR. SPARROW: I kind of thought about  
17 that, but they're kind of technical so that might go  
18 over some of their heads so it might not be --

19 MS. KASPER: But it might lead to a  
20 question.

21 MR. SPARROW: Pardon me?

22 MS. KASPER: It might lead to a  
23 question that they wouldn't even think to ask.

24 MR. SPARROW: We could present it in a

1 way that would be understandable. We want to make  
2 sure it's understandable, too.

3 MR. CARROLL: Maybe include this  
4 statement: "For more information, please attend our  
5 Public Meetings so we can explain what's going on."

6 MS. KASPER: When I left the military  
7 and went into the finance world, I used a lot of  
8 acronyms because that's what I was accustomed to.  
9 COB, NLT. And I typed up a letter to someone who was  
10 getting a mortgage loan with all these little  
11 acronyms in it and they said, "What does this mean?"  
12 I was so engrained in using them that I knew what  
13 they meant; the average person doesn't. So I had to  
14 change my way of thinking.

15 When I was in the military, I was administration  
16 management officer and in the 1980s the Air Force  
17 came down. They started dummifying down their  
18 regulations. They were written so heavily. I had  
19 just come out of college and could barely understand  
20 them. They were dummifying them down to the third  
21 grade level. And I can tell you right now, we have  
22 fifth graders that can't read at the third grade  
23 level. So because their parents --

24 MR. CARROLL: That's a whole other

1 topic.

2 MS. KASPER: She's saying making it  
3 public friendly. You have to think about the  
4 education level of these people. Most of them don't  
5 have college educations. You have to think about the  
6 education level when you're writing things.

7 MS. ROBERSON: May I say something?

8 MR. CARROLL: Yes, ma'am.

9 MS. ROBERSON: I'm a resident here in  
10 Rantoul, new to Rantoul about eight months now. I  
11 was born and raised in Champaign; however, very  
12 familiar. My husband was from Chanute. But it's  
13 been twenty years, and it just doesn't seem like,  
14 with me coming new back to the community, it just  
15 seems like there's nothing much happening here. And  
16 when I get this information in the mail, I don't have  
17 a clue and I do have a college education. I don't  
18 know what you're talking about, so I decided you  
19 better go check this out and see what they are doing,  
20 you know.

21 But I agree with this young lady 100 percent.  
22 You've got to do better than what you're doing as far  
23 as communicating with the public. Most of Rantoul  
24 has just totally, you know, just divorced from this

1 process because they don't understand it, and I can  
2 see why they would feel that way. But I'm just a  
3 nosey individual. This is my community and I'm going  
4 to come out and see what's happening.

5 And 12:00 o'clock is not a good time. I'm  
6 retired. Federal government, so I know, you know, we  
7 can do better on that, okay? You have to reach out.  
8 If you're going to have an outreach to the community,  
9 then reach out to the community. You're not  
10 succeeding very well in that.

11 I'm sure this committee has done excellent work,  
12 but I don't know because you haven't communicated  
13 that to me. All I know is when I ride on base, it  
14 looks the same way it did in '93, you know, when  
15 everybody was gone. It doesn't look any different.  
16 I don't see any progress. So, you know, I'm just --

17 MR. CARROLL: Did you at least get the  
18 gist that there's a lot going on environmentally here  
19 that we just talked about?

20 MS. ROBERSON: I do by coming to this  
21 meeting.

22 MR. CARROLL: At this meeting. That's  
23 what I was asking.

24 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. I do by coming

1 to this meeting, but a lot of people, when they get  
2 that material, they look at it and they say, well,  
3 like, what are they? It's so above their head that  
4 they're not going to bother about it because they  
5 figure if they go to the meeting they're not going to  
6 understand it either.

7 MS. RAWLINGS: If I may make one more  
8 comment. I think in terms of public apathy, those of  
9 us who, and I've only been here since '96, but those  
10 of us who have been here, you know, since the base  
11 closed or shortly afterward or long before, I would  
12 suspect there's kind of a general feeling of the sky  
13 hasn't fallen yet and it's probably not going to.  
14 Somebody's taking care of this. I don't need to  
15 worry about it. So I would think that's part of it,  
16 too.

17 Great idea to try to get more people here.  
18 Public participation is always good. I just don't  
19 know that it's going to make much difference. We get  
20 a few people, that'll be great, but don't be  
21 surprised if you hold night meetings and nobody  
22 comes.

23 MR. BUMB: We had one Public Meeting,  
24 nobody came -- zero.

1 MS. BECNEL: Well, even if there  
2 isn't -- even if there aren't people coming to the  
3 meetings, you can still let people know what's going  
4 on. I mean, there's a number of things, additional  
5 things that could be done. You know, there's radio.  
6 There's local programming. There's the school. I  
7 mean, there's a number of things that could be done  
8 just to increase awareness of what is going on.

9 Maybe everyone would not want to come here.  
10 Maybe they don't have the time, they work two jobs or  
11 whatever, but at least let people know, the community  
12 know, what is going on in a form that they can  
13 understand.

14 MS. RAWLINGS: Sure.

15 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Let me move us  
16 on. I apologize. We're almost thirty minutes late,  
17 and I take responsibility for that. I'm sorry.  
18 Agenda items for the next meeting? Anything?

19 MR. SANDAHL: Paul, this might be a  
20 little bit off track in this meeting, but it was  
21 brought up prior to the meeting starting that there  
22 has been a couple of cemeteries located on base or in  
23 close proximity. Do we have or do you have any  
24 information on that?

1 MR. CARROLL: I wasn't aware of that.

2 MR. KASPER: Here's what we know.

3 MR. CARROLL: I'd be glad to talk to  
4 you guys about that after the meeting.

5 MR. KASPER: There was one cemetery  
6 located right here.

7 MR. CARROLL: On the north boundary.

8 MR. KASPER: Yeah. The supply  
9 squadron had overrun that back in the early twenties.  
10 But there was reports of another cemetery on base  
11 surrounded by a white fence. We've got the names of  
12 the people that were buried there. It was in the  
13 second land acquisition that Chanute had done, but we  
14 have never been able to actually locate where the  
15 cemetery is. We could not find it on any of the  
16 aerial photographs from the teens through the  
17 seventies.

18 MR. CARROLL: Okay. I tell you, let  
19 me meet with you after the RAB. It's really not an  
20 environmental issue, but I would like to meet with  
21 you after the RAB and we'll talk about that. We have  
22 a listing of cemeteries on all of our closed bases,  
23 so we want to keep up with those for sure. Let me  
24 discuss that with you after.

1           So besides the normal things that we're going to  
2 be talking about every RAB, the next RAB is scheduled  
3 for May 17th. Any ideas on if that date's okay with  
4 everyone? We'll just -- that's our scheduled  
5 meeting, so we won't need a vote for that.

6           Anything else from the RAB members? Okay. Move  
7 to adjourn.

8                                 (Whereupon the February 16, 2012, RAB  
9 meeting was concluded.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 )  
3 COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN)

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 February 16, 2012, RAB  
8 meeting were taken down in stenograph notes and  
9 afterwards reduced to typewriting under my  
10 instruction.

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

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
18 hand this 20th day of March 2012.

19

20

21

22

23

24

---

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