

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

FORMER CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE

10

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

11

NOVEMBER 15, 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: Hello, everybody. It's  
2 three after 12:00, so I figured we'd go ahead and get  
3 started. This is the November 2012 Chanute  
4 Restoration Advisory Board. Welcome, everyone.  
5 Looks like we have most of the RAB members here, or a  
6 good portion of them. I know Bruce is out for a  
7 family visit. His family is visiting him today, and  
8 he said he didn't know whether he'd make it or not.  
9 Hopefully maybe he'll make it to one of the other  
10 Public Meetings, but he'd try, he said.

11                   So, first of all, I'm Paul Carroll. I'm  
12 the BRAC environmental coordinator for Chanute, for  
13 the Air Force. Some of you may have noticed in some  
14 of our headings and things like that, the Air Force  
15 Real Property Agency merged with two other Air Force  
16 agencies recently, last month. Now we're called the  
17 Air Force Civil Engineer Center. We still have the  
18 same responsibilities. I still have the same title  
19 and everything.

20                   However, you can notice in the headings and  
21 things like that that our name has changed. Our  
22 address is still the same. If you're addressing  
23 something to me, you know, it'll still get to me.  
24 Shouldn't be much difference as far as anybody else

1     can see. It's just the way we operate, and we  
2     combined three agencies to gain efficiency in the Air  
3     Force. As all of you know, budget issues have  
4     pressed the need for this thing to happen and the Air  
5     Force has been working on this, actually, even before  
6     budget needs came up. So it's kind of the new Air  
7     Force way of doing things.

8                 So, anyway, I'd like to first of all go  
9     around the table where the RAB members are sitting to  
10    let you guys introduce yourselves. Then we'll go  
11    around the outside of the room and introduce the  
12    members of the public.

13                MS. WIRGES: Lorraine Wirges, RAB  
14    member.

15                MS. BECNEL: Denise Becnel, RAB  
16    member.

17                MR. FOTHERGILL: Carl Fothergill, RAB  
18    member.

19                DR. ROKKE: Doug Rokke, RAB member.

20                MR. ANDERSON: Jack Anderson, RAB  
21    member.

22                MR. HILL: Chris Hill from the  
23    Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

24                MR. CARROLL: Okay. We'll start right

1 here.

2 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Pete Johnson. I'm a  
3 retired local farmer, stroke problems, and also I'm  
4 on three different drainage commissions here so I've  
5 got a big concern about drainage on the base. I've  
6 been involved with that real heavy. We used to farm  
7 the ground out here for 15 years. I've been before  
8 the Village board and everything trying to get things  
9 done.

10 MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

11 MR. SPARROW: Howard Sparrow, Shaw  
12 Environmental.

13 MS. GILL: Diane Gill, Shaw  
14 Environmental.

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

17 MS. BUMB: Raj Bumb, visitor.

18 MS. STEPHENS: Cindy Stephens, United  
19 States Air Force.

20 MR. DANIELS: Matt Daniels, Rantoul  
21 Press newspaper.

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

24 MR. FARACI: Paul Faraci, Illinois

1 Department of Commerce.

2 MR. STREFF: Michael Streff, Foth  
3 Environmental Engineers. I'm an environmental  
4 engineer and also a resident at 12 Pace Setter Drive.

5 MR. PASSARELLI: Pete Passarelli,  
6 Village of Rantoul.

7 MR. WUBKER: Travis Wubker, Shaw  
8 Environmental.

9 MR. HAYWOOD: Michael Haywood, Shaw  
10 Environmental.

11 MR. STRELCHECK: Ryan Strelcheck, Shaw  
12 Environmental.

13 MR. HOLLY: Ted Holly, Air Force Civil  
14 Engineer Center.

15 MR. TIMM: Jay Timm, Illinois EPA.

16 MR. HUSBANDS: Jim Husbands, Booz  
17 Allen Hamilton.

18 MR. KASPER: Russ Kasper of the  
19 Rantoul Historical Society.

20 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Have a good group  
21 today. Thank you all for coming out. First thing on  
22 the action items is to approve transcripts from the  
23 August 16th, 2012, meeting. I know Lorraine has a  
24 proposed change, and if anybody else does we'll

1 follow her.

2 MS. WIRGES: On page 6, line 21, where  
3 it gives me credit for Helen Lewis' comment. Should  
4 be Mrs. Lewis. Thank you.

5 MR. CARROLL: Anyone else have any  
6 comments or input on the RAB transcript? With that  
7 change, I propose that -- can we have a --

8 MS. WIRGES: I so move.

9 MR. FOTHERGILL: Second.

10 MR. CARROLL: Okay, seconded. Thank  
11 you. All in favor?

12 (All RAB members vote by show of hands  
13 in favor.)

14 MR. CARROLL: Anybody opposed? Okay.  
15 We're good. The next item on the action items is  
16 Dr. Schneider was going to help us produce a library  
17 user guide.

18 DR. SCHNEIDER: I can talk about that  
19 in my section, if you don't mind.

20 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good deal. The  
21 third one is provide an update -- actually, this is  
22 also Dr. Schneider -- to provide an update to the RAB  
23 on Salt Fork Creek Remedial Investigation results  
24 coming up, and also to provide a reading list of

1 environmental topics to the RAB members.

2 Ms. Rawlings was going to assist on that. That's in  
3 progress. I know that we have a draft of that, and  
4 it should come out to the RAB soon after the RAB  
5 meeting. We should have that, right?

6 MS. GILL: Yes.

7 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good. Anything  
8 that anyone knows that we've missed? All right. I  
9 have one slide about an Air Force update. The first  
10 item on that agenda is that we wanted to recognize  
11 the service of Helen Lewis, who has been here since  
12 the early nineties, I believe. Maybe the  
13 mid-nineties. I don't remember the date she started  
14 working with the RAB, but she'd been here for several  
15 years.

16 As of the last RAB she announced she was  
17 moving to Florida, and she has moved. We are getting  
18 a letter signed by the director of our agency to  
19 Ms. Lewis to recognize her. That letter will go out,  
20 and we'll send everyone a copy of that. We certainly  
21 appreciate Ms. Lewis' service to the RAB. She always  
22 had good input, and she's been helpful in helping  
23 guide this program along. We appreciate that.

24 DR. ROKKE: Paul, could we send

1 something to the Rantoul Press so they could put it  
2 in there, too?

3 MR. CARROLL: Yes, we can definitely  
4 send a copy to the Rantoul Press and make sure that  
5 gets in there.

6 DR. ROKKE: Because she's a pretty  
7 incredible lady.

8 MR. CARROLL: Yeah, she definitely  
9 will be missed around here at the RAB. All right.  
10 The next item is the status of the property transfer,  
11 two items, two upcoming property transfers that we  
12 have plans starting this winter. One is about 40  
13 acres that are going to transfer through the FAA  
14 sponsored public benefit conveyance. That's going to  
15 the airport, so that's planned for after the first of  
16 the year. We've already started the work on that.

17 The other big issue is the Economic  
18 Development Conveyance application. That application  
19 was provided to the Air Force by the Village earlier  
20 this year. We've been going back and forth with the  
21 Village talking about the application, making some  
22 recommended changes. We meet with the Village,  
23 actually, once a week to talk about that EDC  
24 application.



1           We're at a point now where we're ready to  
2   start finalizing the language of the actual EDC  
3   approval that will get staffed up to the Department  
4   of Defense, Office of Secretary of Defense for  
5   review, and that goes to the Office of Economic  
6   Adjustment, which is an office that basically  
7   oversees BRAC actions. Then it will go back to our  
8   secretary, our deputy undersecretary of the Air  
9   Force, for signature. We plan that sometime after --  
10   it'll go on through about April or May. We hope to  
11   have it signed by then, if not earlier.

12           So once that Economic Development  
13   Conveyance is signed, we can transfer some pretty big  
14   pieces of property. About half of the remaining  
15   property is going to be ready to transfer by the time  
16   that EDC is signed. The remaining half of the  
17   acreage is mostly in OU-2 on the southeastern part of  
18   the base that has the groundwater cleanup. That will  
19   require some more monitoring to ensure that we're  
20   going to meet operating property and successfully  
21   requirements that EPA sets forth before we transfer  
22   that property. Probably be around 2014 before the  
23   final transfer occurs here, though.

24           Thanks to all the work Shaw has been doing,

1 we're right on track with that and we may even be  
2 gaining ground on the original schedule as we move  
3 forward. We don't know that for sure yet, but it's  
4 looking pretty promising that we're going to at least  
5 meet the schedule and maybe beat the schedule in some  
6 cases on the environmental cleanup. Any questions on  
7 property transfer? Okay. Dr. Schneider.

8 DR. SCHNEIDER: Okay. Go ahead and  
9 change it. Thank you, Diane. I'll make this fairly  
10 brief because we have a lot to discuss today and  
11 there's a 1:00 o'clock Public Meeting which we want  
12 to get done by. Number two, I've got to run right  
13 after this meeting because I've got to meet some of  
14 the EPA folks over at the old Champaign landfill at a  
15 last minute visit that they decided to make, so I got  
16 to get over there and explain what's going on over at  
17 that place.

18 We got three things going on here. Review  
19 of documents, and since the August meeting I think  
20 we've got about a half a dozen, five or six  
21 documents, came through our office, CDs that look at  
22 the various progress that's being made. If I'm wrong  
23 on the number, Howard, you can tell me. It's  
24 something like that.

1           Most of it is the finish off of a lot of  
2   these projects that have been started, and I've  
3   reviewed them to the extent that I don't see any  
4   obvious flaws. I haven't gone through all the data  
5   and all that kind of stuff because there's not enough  
6   time, but they seem to be okay.

7           We got the user guide to environmental  
8   documents, a draft prepared. I had hoped to pass it  
9   out at this meeting. All the text is done, but we at  
10   RAPPS have been fooling around with the format, and  
11   what we think we need to do is to have another RAB  
12   study session like we did on Salt Fork Creek where we  
13   get folks in. We'll get this out to you before that  
14   meeting. We can sit down and hash over what's good  
15   about it, what's bad about it, what you don't see,  
16   what you need.

17           I know Denise is very interested in working  
18   on this, and that'll be an opportunity to clean it up  
19   so that we can prepare a final draft copy for the  
20   February meeting and get it out to the public.

21           So I'm going to spend some time here on  
22   Salt Fork Creek. We had a meeting on October 11th.  
23   Seven of the RAB attended that meeting, and we talked  
24   about various things regarding Salt Fork Creek.

1     Probably the most -- the primary object was future  
2     use, what happens after everybody leaves this place  
3     in terms of modifications to the creek.

4             Central Illinois, as a lot of the Midwest,  
5     has mostly been drained by channelization. So every  
6     time, you know, if there's a land use change, you can  
7     expect that something's probably going to have to  
8     take place with some of the drainage in the area.

9             Salt Fork Creek, in fact, here, you know,  
10    you've got this part here, this is, of course, the  
11    base part, off base, off base. You have to think  
12    about, well, most of the studies have been focused  
13    right in here because that's where all of the  
14    contaminants of concern were centralized and that's  
15    where most of the cleaning is going on, most of the  
16    Remedial Investigation is going.

17            So there are some data from off base or  
18    upstream, and there are some data from downstream.  
19    In fact, Jacobs went all the way down to the  
20    confluence of the Upper Salt Fork Creek. And, by the  
21    way, there are so many Salt Fork Creeks in Illinois  
22    you can't begin to imagine.

23            So this is Salt Fork Creek. This is Upper  
24    Salt Fork Creek. Down by the old Urbana landfill

1     it's called the Saline Ditch. They all end up at the  
2     same place, over at the Vermilion.

3             So I looked at data mostly from the last  
4     two investigations, the Jacobs Engineering, which was  
5     published in 2002, and URS was published in 2008.  
6     One thing in terms of collecting -- and they took  
7     several types of samples. They took water, you know,  
8     regular surface water samples. They took samples  
9     from the creek from the outfalls. In other words,  
10    the drainage that goes into the creek from various  
11    places on the base, and even off base here.

12            They took sediment samples. They took  
13    dredge spoil samples and, of course, they collected  
14    some fish and took fish tissue samples to look to see  
15    what kind of uptake that the ecological receptors  
16    were having and what was going on.

17            One of the things you have to keep in mind  
18    is that generally when there's water in this creek,  
19    which is most of the time, if not all of the time,  
20    it's doing what? It's not standing still. It's  
21    moving. So if you go to take a sample, the sampler  
22    goes over here, takes a sample, picks all of the  
23    stuff up or her stuff up, and they move to the next  
24    spot and the next spot and the next spot and the next

1 spot. All the time the volume of water that they  
2 took here has now moved down here. If they went fast  
3 enough, maybe they could catch up and resample the  
4 same volume of water. So you see the problem.

5 If, let's say, the good Lord were taking a  
6 sample, he'd just take a bunch of samples all at the  
7 same time or all at the same instant, and we could  
8 have an instant picture of what's in the water that  
9 flows through the creek. So you see that there's  
10 kind of a problem in that alone.

11 Secondly, what you want to really know is  
12 what's the quality of the water upstream and what's  
13 the quality of the water downstream and has anything  
14 in here where all of the sources, the known sources  
15 of contaminants are, have they changed the water  
16 quality.

17 This is very difficult because, for  
18 example, I'm going to show you some comparisons of a  
19 couple of constituents of concern. To do that, I  
20 wanted to look at some constituents that were present  
21 throughout the entire system. One of the things I  
22 discovered in looking at all of the data, there's a  
23 lot of stuff, bingo, it's above human health  
24 screening levels here, then you never see it again.

1 Or it's even some other one is above here, you never  
2 see it again. The point is that they are fleeting.  
3 They are moments in time, and nothing is just staying  
4 there except some usual stuff.

5           Next slide, please. You've seen this map  
6 before. You'll see it again in different  
7 configurations. It's a nice layout about what's  
8 going on on the base, and it shows -- in this  
9 particular case you don't need to read anything.  
10 That's not the point. Originally I was going to use  
11 one, if you recall from the Jacobs study, they had a  
12 lot of these big long tables sticking out from sample  
13 points. Couldn't read them. I couldn't read them.  
14 I had to go to the original data.

15           But this is just surface water and outpost  
16 samples where the results are above human health  
17 screening levels. So they're just showing particular  
18 points where they found a particular constituent of  
19 concern that was above that human health screening  
20 level.

21           Next slide. This is a little different.  
22 URS did this in 2003. I thought it was a very  
23 interesting way, a qualitative way to show what's  
24 going on, in this particular case, downstream. So

1     this is where they went all the way down to the  
2     confluence, they went above the confluence of Salt  
3     Fork Creek that comes out of the base and downstream.

4             Basically you can see here that they also  
5     analyzed for PCBs and VOCs, and none were detected in  
6     all of that. These other things that were detected,  
7     like semi-volatile organic compounds, PAH --  
8     actually, PAHs are semi-volatile organic compounds.  
9     Keep that in mind.

10            And in case everybody remembers what PAHs  
11     are, if you grill your steak, you know, on your  
12     Weber, you have just created and you're going to  
13     ingest some PAHs. Just keep in mind that sometimes  
14     we get a big long name like polycyclic aromatic  
15     hydrocarbon and we think it's going to zap us. But,  
16     in fact, we are encountering them all the time, and  
17     some pesticides and so forth and so on.

18            Next slide, please. I also wanted to talk  
19     a little bit about the values that are in these  
20     documents. I couldn't put them all here. I just  
21     picked a couple of pairs, one from the 2002 group,  
22     one from the 2008 report, and a couple of pairs that  
23     had data that were relatively consistent downstream.

24            This is something that folks don't look at



1 necessarily, but this is just a reproduction of the  
2 kind of way that Jacobs showed the data. They had a  
3 single, for example, page just for this particular  
4 sample location, RV-1009, and they gave us what it  
5 was, a PAH or a metal, in this case a  
6 benzo(k)fluoranthene. In this case, barium. The  
7 result, they have a validation quality, the units,  
8 these are parts per billion, micrograms per liter,  
9 the detection limit and the reporting limit.

10 Now, that's important because detection  
11 limits are the limit of their instrumentation to find  
12 that particular constituent, that compound or that  
13 element or whatever it is. But that's not a  
14 real number -- there's a lot of variability there.  
15 So they use what's called a reporting limit, which is  
16 something you can depend on.

17 Detection limit, you know, they'll detect  
18 things that are in blanks. I mean, that's the reason  
19 why when they collect samples, they carry a blank  
20 with them. The blank has nothing to do with  
21 anything. It just goes in the truck or whatever  
22 they're driving, and when you get back to the lab  
23 they turn that in with everything else. You'd be  
24 surprised what shows up in a blank. That's why they

1 do that because you never know.

2 The famous story about the guy in  
3 Cincinnati doing a bunch of monitoring wells looking  
4 for the usual benzene group, and the people who  
5 looked at the data noticed that after a certain well  
6 the content went up in the well samples. What's  
7 going on? We have got to do something.

8 Well, what was happening, he got to a  
9 certain place, he had to stop and get gas, okay, so  
10 when he got gas -- it's like I said to the RAB the  
11 other day, how many of you put on latex gloves before  
12 you pump gas? Probably no one that I know of. But  
13 they're supposed to because what he did was he pumped  
14 his gas and then as he touched his various things,  
15 those highly volatile things like benzene, toluene  
16 and ethylene and so forth, they got into the sample.  
17 So you have to be very careful.

18 So that's what this is. You can see, this  
19 is the reporting limit. These are the results in  
20 micrograms per liter, okay, and this is the result  
21 for this PAH (pointing to the chart in presentation).  
22 You can see here, see this number here (pointing to  
23 chart), that's lower than the reporting limit. So  
24 this "F" here, that says that the analyte was

1 positively identified, but the associated numerical  
2 value is below the reporting limit; thus, it's an  
3 estimate.

4           It's not really a real number. It's a best  
5 guess. It's not a lousy number. You don't throw it  
6 away. It may or may not be an outlier once you do  
7 the statistics on it, but it's not a bad number.  
8 It's just an estimate.

9           All right. Here's URS. They did theirs a  
10 little differently. They showed it in this  
11 particular form where they showed the various --  
12 these are all on-base sample locations and the sample  
13 date for those. Couple of them were a little  
14 different. You see 11|5 here and 10|24 (points to  
15 chart).

16           There's another issue. Theoretically,  
17 technically, I suppose, in the real world, everything  
18 happens on the same day, on the same hour, on the  
19 same minute, on the same second. We can't always do  
20 that. So we have to take the data as we get it. And  
21 here you see, here's phenanthrene, which is reported  
22 in -- it's usually reported in parts per billion or  
23 micrograms per liter, and arsenic which is usually  
24 reported in parts per million or in micrograms per

1 liter.

2           So here you see the numbers, and you notice  
3 here that all of the arsenic, okay, and these are the  
4 human health screening level numbers here, so .03 and  
5 706 micrograms per liter. This is in micrograms per  
6 liter. This is in -- this is, yeah, micrograms per  
7 liter. This is in parts per billion. This is parts  
8 per million (pointing to arsenic result). You can  
9 see here, these are all F's. Phenanthrene, they're  
10 all U's, which means the analyte was analyzed for but  
11 not detected. The associated value is below the  
12 minimum detection level.

13           They actually see something they're really  
14 not sure about, but they report it. In fact, in the  
15 statistical applications we use when we look at,  
16 let's say, groundwater for the EPA, they require us,  
17 we can't just put in not detected, zero, we've got to  
18 put in a number. They specify which number we have  
19 to put in to do the statistical analysis to see if  
20 there's been some impact as a result of what we're  
21 looking at. So how do we want to see this?

22           Next slide please, Diane. I like to look  
23 at how things progress down the road. I mean, it's  
24 one way of looking at it. This scale here, this is a

1 logarithmic scale, so every line here is ten times  
2 greater than the next one. So here's all those -- we  
3 didn't have any from 2000. We didn't have any  
4 arsenic off base or downstream, but this is where it  
5 is in the stream. Here it is. Okay. So you got --  
6 I'm sorry. This is barium and benzo(k)fluoranthene.  
7 So this is barium down here. Is that right? This is  
8 benzo(k)fluoranthene. I'm backwards here. And this  
9 is barium.

10 Now, notice here we couldn't go off base,  
11 but all of these things here, here  
12 benzo(k)fluoranthene is 0.2 micrograms per liter.  
13 Here's the line. This is 0.1. So all of these  
14 values which were what? Detectable level are  
15 certainly below the human health screening level.  
16 You don't do anything after that. What are you going  
17 to do? It's below the level of risk that's allowable  
18 according to that level. Here's the barium. Even  
19 this. These are all like in the fifties. These are  
20 fifty.

21 Notice here, these two spots here (pointing  
22 to last 2 points on the cart), a little out of line  
23 here because one of them, this one here is actually  
24 upstream of the confluence and this one here is

1 actually downstream from the confluence. So where  
2 the barium comes from -- remember, this is off base,  
3 this is on the base, but where this barium comes  
4 from -- and barium, by the way, doesn't naturally  
5 occur by itself. Usually you see it with the  
6 dissolution of other rocks like limestone. It'll be  
7 a component in a limestone or a component of  
8 something, and so that's how it gets in the solution.

9 But these numbers are all in the fifties,  
10 50 micrograms per liter, okay, and barium, the  
11 screening level is 5,000, someplace up here. Okay.  
12 So this is all below, but what's interesting is the  
13 Upper Salt Fork Creek, it's coming down from the  
14 north, just north of the confluence a level was  
15 measured at about 11 parts per billion. And  
16 downstream from the confluence there was a number  
17 about, I remember exactly in my head, about 19 parts  
18 per billion.

19 Oh, the base has done something to this.  
20 Well, perhaps, but the barium is equal all through.  
21 There's really no change here. It's, I would call  
22 it, equilibrium with the stream water at the time  
23 these things were taken.

24 So here we go here, yes, it is lower here.

1 And I can cite examples from my own experience and  
2 from the literature where that's true in many places.  
3 This could be much higher than this. It all depends  
4 what the geology that water is running through and  
5 the residence time the water spends in contact with  
6 that geology in terms of what's going to be in it.

7           If this were boron, for example, you know,  
8 then we should see a spike here. But even then, one  
9 of my studies done at the Urbana landfill, they were  
10 concerned about boron. The EPA was very concerned  
11 about boron in that Saline Ditch, and they thought it  
12 was coming from -- there's a sewage treatment plant  
13 just upstream. And boron, one of the sources for  
14 boron is coal ash or cinders. Boron is very easily  
15 mobilized by water. If it's there and water comes in  
16 contact with it, it becomes a solute. Just that  
17 quick.

18           Well, we couldn't figure out what was going  
19 on because we couldn't see anything in the stream  
20 itself. We did upstream samples. We did downstream  
21 samples. We did midstream samples. There's no boron  
22 there. But I did some groundwater seepage samples,  
23 all streams have some base flow capacity, and, lo and  
24 behold, the groundwater that was seeping in was high

1     in boron. I couldn't understand that until I found  
2     out that in the old landfill the roads were paved  
3     with cinders, old cinders out of the power plants and  
4     stuff.

5                 So it was a good roadbed material, but now  
6     that the groundwater came in there, it would go  
7     through this upper, we call it, Henry formation, just  
8     simply the latest alluvial that sits on top of the  
9     geology around here, and it hit that first tight clay  
10    that we all talk about here, the Tiskilwa. It hits  
11    that, and it goes along that thing and comes into the  
12    stream.

13                Okay. So that was the source of the boron.  
14    The trouble is, it was four or five times higher in  
15    concentration than what was in the stream. What  
16    happens when it gets to the stream? You've all heard  
17    that terrible phrase, dilution is the solution, and  
18    that's one of the problems. It's no longer there at  
19    any kind of level.

20                The next slide, please. So then this is  
21    from -- this is the data that I thought I was looking  
22    at first, arsenic and phenanthrene, and again this is  
23    arsenic as reported in parts per million. But the  
24    numbers, as you saw, you go back to that slide of the



1 table, you saw they were 0.0003. Okay.

2 And again they were all -- they were all  
3 here, but look what happens. There's a couple of  
4 jumps in here. Then they kind of stabilize out.  
5 This is on base, and now it goes off base and it  
6 increases. What's that? Is this something to do  
7 with what's on the base? Well, I don't think so.

8 Arsenic is a component of almost every soil  
9 and rock that we have here in Illinois. It's one of  
10 the problems they have tapping some of the water in  
11 the Bloomington area. It's really high in arsenic.  
12 I will tell you that years ago when I was at the US  
13 Geological Survey, I had a group going around taking  
14 samples. I wanted to get an idea of what was in the  
15 upper soil. And we went around, we took samples, and  
16 the purpose was so that we could calibrate a  
17 particular type of instrument for looking at soil.

18 I had them take samples from pristine areas  
19 and industrial areas, and we were amazed because the  
20 pristine areas were spiking in arsenic. That was  
21 1992, and I said, you know, watch, we're going to  
22 start seeing this in groundwater as the  
23 instrumentation gets better to analyze for arsenic.

24 Sure enough. Guess what happens about ten

1     years later? There's arsenic in everything. There  
2     should be, especially if it's groundwater, because it  
3     had to percolate down through that stuff.

4             You see here again it's very, very low.  
5     This number here, 0.03 parts per million, that's up  
6     here someplace, too. Way up here. This is a PAH  
7     here. You see within the base some high parts here.  
8     As it gets closer to the boundary, it drops down, and  
9     then we go off base and we got a peak again. Again,  
10    it's basically below human health screening levels.

11            The point is this: It's very difficult in  
12    an environment that's changing by the second.  
13    Remember, stream water, even stream water going slow  
14    is traveling at feet per second, unlike groundwater  
15    which is, you know, centimeters or less per second,  
16    and it's going in a fairly straight line down the  
17    streambed.

18            The other thing is that the constituents we  
19    worry about the most, like the PAHs or some of the  
20    organics, what do they like? They don't like water  
21    that much. If they're forced into it, subsurface,  
22    there's no place to go. But as it gets to the  
23    surface, there's two things fighting it. Number one,  
24    they like to cling, chelate or cling, to particles of

1 soil that have an electronegative aspect to it. So  
2 clay is great for that. You know, that's one of the  
3 things about having a clay soil is that if you spill  
4 something on it, a lot of those guys and gals that we  
5 really don't want in the environment get attached.  
6 They're stuck there.

7           If you want to get rid of them, you got to  
8 dig them up and do something with them, cook them or  
9 volatilize them somehow. The other enemy of these  
10 things, and water is up there, it's a star called  
11 Sol. It's our sun. That UV breaks this stuff up a  
12 lot quicker than you think. The point being that by  
13 the time, as we've cleaned up -- not we've cleaned up  
14 but as cleanup has gone at this base, it keeps  
15 eliminating the source of those contaminants of  
16 concern, and that will be true in the future.

17           Go ahead. Next slide. So when we had this  
18 briefing we talked about -- one of the concerns was  
19 really interesting, future modifications to the  
20 streambed or the banks. If land use changes, let's  
21 just say southwest of the base someone wants to come  
22 in there and build a city or build an industrial  
23 complex, that's going to turn into some impermeable  
24 surfaces and there's going to be runoff. It's going

1 to change the dynamics of that stream, and it'll  
2 change it such just adding more water at higher  
3 levels through time, after a precipitation event, a  
4 big storm, may end up in entraining some of those  
5 sediments and moving them downstream. That's how  
6 streams work.

7 Well, most of those sediments, if they had  
8 been cleaned, no problem. There are some issues, I  
9 guess, one of the landfills, have been in the past.  
10 Well, what happens there? Most of that's been  
11 channelized. So this stream has been well modified,  
12 as have many of the streams and ditches in this neck  
13 of the woods just for that purpose.

14 Impacts to wildlife. I think Carl, you  
15 know, he sees a heron standing in the creek and  
16 drinking from the water. You know, is that heron  
17 safe? Yes. The studies that look at the risk here  
18 look at both human health and they look at ecological  
19 health, and ecological health means the fish, the  
20 herons, the birds, and so forth.

21 Next slide. So one of the things we talked  
22 about at that meeting, and I continue to say, most of  
23 the contaminant sources are being removed or reduced.  
24 Now, by removed we're not removing all of them

1 directly. Some of them are being removed indirectly  
2 through this in-situ process, of fertilizing the bugs  
3 at depth to chomp on these various constituents that  
4 we don't want in the environment and changing them to  
5 more reasonable kinds of products.

6           There are minimal residence times. I mean,  
7 the water is -- it doesn't sit there. Heritage Lake  
8 is different. Heritage Lake is a pond. It doesn't  
9 really have any drainage. I think -- is it not  
10 served by a well? Yeah, so it's pool level.  
11 Elevation is not actually -- doesn't even depend on  
12 mother nature directly. Kind of indirectly from  
13 groundwater. So if somebody were to dump a five  
14 gallon container of gasoline in Heritage Lake, you  
15 got a problem. You know, you'd be exceeding -- I  
16 don't know what the volume of Heritage Lake is, but I  
17 can tell you five gallons at five parts per billion  
18 would contaminant a lot of water. So that's a  
19 different issue than this stream which is just moving  
20 water through here.

21           And I've said before that -- and natural  
22 attenuation is another thing. Once a product gets  
23 out and exposed to the sun and exposed to oxygen,  
24 high oxygen levels in the atmosphere, a lot of that

1 stuff gets oxidized pretty quick or develops into  
2 other things. And so the risk level as -- I didn't  
3 do any calculations of risk level. That was done by  
4 Shaw and its contractors, but I can't see any reason  
5 why not to accept those results at my level. I don't  
6 know if the EPA has a problem with it. I don't think  
7 so.

8 So the risk is acceptable. I think that  
9 human health was two in a hundred thousand, which was  
10 a manageable risk, I think, for the Salt Fork Creek,  
11 if I've got that right. Yeah. And the ecological  
12 receptors, there was really no problem.

13 I think that's my last slide. Yeah. So  
14 what I'm saying -- and, by the way, as far as I'm  
15 concerned my comments can go forward onto the Public  
16 Meeting since I've got to run. Are there any  
17 questions? Can I answer any questions to make  
18 something clear? Thank you very much.

19 MR. SPARROW: Thanks, Dr. Schneider.  
20 Appreciate that briefing to everybody. My name is  
21 Howard Sparrow. I'm the project manager for Shaw  
22 Environmental, and we're the contractor responsible  
23 for the environmental cleanups that the Air Force has  
24 been doing for the last few years out here.

1           I'd like to just clarify a couple of  
2 points. We actually have two meetings planned for  
3 today. We have the Restoration Advisory Board  
4 meeting here. We are planning to have a Proposed  
5 Plan Public Meeting, directly after this meeting  
6 here, regarding Salt Fork Creek. That meeting will  
7 go into more depth and more detail about Salt Fork  
8 Creek and what the Air Force is proposing for their  
9 solution for Salt Fork Creek.

10           So in the handouts up front, there were two  
11 handouts. There was one that's labeled the  
12 Restoration Advisory Board. There was also one  
13 labeled Public Meeting. So that Public Meeting will  
14 be directly following this.

15           Dr. Schneider gave us a good briefing on  
16 his opinion about the Proposed Plan for Salt Fork  
17 Creek, and we wanted to do that as part of the  
18 Restoration Advisory Board. The Public Meeting is  
19 actually sponsored by the Air Force, and we'll do  
20 that presentation. We will give you some  
21 information, a little bit of additional information,  
22 during the RAB meeting about Salt Fork Creek. If you  
23 want, you can stay for the more detailed meeting  
24 later on. If you feel that you don't need to, then

1     you don't have to attend that meeting as well.

2                 So there's two meetings here. There were  
3     also two sign-in sheets that were out there. I think  
4     there's a little bit of confusion, so we would like  
5     to pass those sign-in sheets back around and make  
6     sure you're aware of the two meetings. If you're  
7     here at the Restoration Advisory Board, make sure  
8     you're signed in on that Restoration Advisory Board  
9     sign-in. If you plan to attend the Public Meeting,  
10    then sign your name in on that one as well.

11                There will be two different records that we  
12    will produce that will go into the final decisions  
13    and into the public records for each one of these  
14    meetings, and we want to make sure that your name is  
15    identified with each of the meetings that you attend.  
16    So is there any confusion with that? I know it's  
17    kind of confusing, and I apologize for that. We'll  
18    pass those two sign-in sheets around. So if you're  
19    here at the RAB, make sure you sign that one. If you  
20    plan to stay and|or if you wish to speak at the  
21    Public Meeting, you can also indicate so on the  
22    sign-in sheet for that.

23                DR. BUMB: First one I'm passing  
24    around is the current meeting, and then I'll pass



1 around the other one.

2 MR. SPARROW: We can do the Public  
3 Meeting right at the beginning of the Public Meeting  
4 so there's no confusion about which sheets to sign.

5 So first I'd like to give you a progress  
6 update of the environmental cleanup for all 47 sites  
7 for which the Air Force has contracted us. Those are  
8 really the remaining sites on base to be cleaned up.  
9 One of the things that we have been working on and  
10 giving you updates on is our progress over the past  
11 several years at reaching the goal of completing the  
12 restoration of these sites.

13 One of the major milestones that we were  
14 contractually obligated with by the Air Force, which  
15 we've been working extremely hard on over the past  
16 several years, is to achieve an accomplishment that  
17 the Air Force terms Remedy-in-Place. Remedy-in-Place  
18 means that we have gone to each one of the sites, all  
19 47 of the sites. We have addressed the concerns that  
20 are at each site, and we have implemented the  
21 remedial actions that are necessary to clean each  
22 site up.

23 So in the case of where we're going to do a  
24 soil excavation, that means we've gone out there,

1 we've sampled the soils, we've excavated the soils,  
2 and we put clean soil back in place. Where there's  
3 groundwater treatment sites, it means that we've gone  
4 out and we have treated the groundwater, but that  
5 treatment process is still ongoing. It's going to  
6 take us a couple of years to treat that groundwater,  
7 but we have the remedy-in-place now that will result  
8 in the final cleanup of these sites.

9           So as of September 27th, that was a big  
10 milestone for us. It's a big milestone for the Air  
11 Force. Again, it shows the environmental progress,  
12 the promises that we made to the Air Force, and the  
13 obligation the Air Force wanted to make to the  
14 community that they would get out and get those  
15 remedies in place. That was accomplished on  
16 September the 27th.

17           Our crews were working almost nonstop to be  
18 able to get that completed, and that did include some  
19 very large scale remediation work, particularly at  
20 the Fire Training Area site that we talked about  
21 before.

22           There is a map that we made available.  
23 This map right here we have available for you. It  
24 shows our current progress, where we're at with these

1 sites. It's color coded. Hopefully you can see that  
2 a little bit easier. The dark green and light green  
3 sites are sites for which we have already completed  
4 all of the environmental requirements, and those  
5 sites are what we call closed sites.

6 The regulators and the Air Force have  
7 agreed that there's no additional concerns at those  
8 sites or the remedies have been established at those  
9 sites. Those sites, the property is free to be sold,  
10 whatever. There are no environmental considerations  
11 other than one site where we put some restrictions so  
12 that they cannot build houses on that site. The  
13 sites that are shown in blue are sites for which we  
14 are doing groundwater remediation, but we are  
15 anticipating those sites to reach cleanup goals this  
16 year.

17 We have, I think, 13 sites for which we've  
18 closed with no restrictions. There's only one site  
19 that has a restriction on it that's been closed.  
20 We're looking at closing eight more sites this coming  
21 year, 2013.

22 MR. HILL: Howard, there are blue  
23 areas just to the east of Landfill 3 and just to the  
24 west of Landfill 4 that don't appear to be labeled.

1 I believe they're probably just part of the  
2 landfills, but can you kind of explain why they're  
3 different?

4 MR. SPARROW: In some of the  
5 landfills, when the consolidation work was done, the  
6 footprint of that landfill was excavated, put  
7 underneath the cap. The area that's underneath the  
8 cap will have to be maintained by the Air Force at  
9 least for 30 more years. A long, long time. Those  
10 areas for which we took that material and put it  
11 underneath the landfill cap and put clean soil back,  
12 those soils or that area will be released for any  
13 future land use without restrictions.

14 So that's the reason why those areas are  
15 shown in blue, and those areas should be released  
16 this year. So if somebody wants to come back and  
17 farm that property or whatever they want to do, build  
18 a house, whatever they want to do, that property will  
19 be available.

20 The red properties, just to let you know,  
21 those are properties again which we have to complete  
22 the environmental groundwater treatment, you know,  
23 we've already put the remedy-in-place. The  
24 biological in-situ treatment is ongoing. It just

1 takes several years for that to be completed. Those  
2 are to be completed by the end of our contract  
3 period, which is 2016, but we hope we get some  
4 completed in 2014 and 2015.

5 We've actually gone back to some of these  
6 sites to try to expedite that cleanup as quickly as  
7 we can. We want to get it cleaned up, meet the  
8 remedial goals, close those sites, and move on. I  
9 think that's a good part about these performance-  
10 based contracts. That's where the performance part  
11 of this really comes in. It's incumbent upon us to  
12 meet those performance goals, and we want to expedite  
13 that performance. So that gives you a good idea of  
14 where we stand right now with our progress on-site.

15 This bar chart we've used for a number of  
16 RAB meetings here. I hope -- I wouldn't say I hope,  
17 but I'm glad that I think this will probably be the  
18 last time that we present this bar chart. The bar  
19 chart is almost all green, meaning that we have  
20 accomplished the requirements for each and produced  
21 each one of these documents.

22 There are a few items in here that show  
23 that we have to do some more Proposed Plans and  
24 Public Meetings and RODs. That's for the four

1     landfills, and I'll discuss a little bit more in  
2     detail about that here in a minute. Then the red on  
3     the far right are the in-situ groundwater sites  
4     that'll still take us one to four more years to get  
5     that treatment complete at those sites.

6             The next slide was for what we call the  
7     non-CERCLA, the tanks, the sites that are associated  
8     with a petroleum underground storage tank. We have  
9     completed the remedial actions for those. Actually,  
10    they're called corrective actions in this case. It's  
11    the same basic cleanup process, but we've completed  
12    the cleanups for those. We will be producing the  
13    documentation to show that those sites have been  
14    cleaned up.

15            There is one in-situ biological treatment,  
16    there's one of those sites that will take several  
17    years to clean up. The other four of those sites  
18    will be closed out next year. Some of the actions  
19    that we've completed since the last RAB meeting, the  
20    Fire Training Area, I mentioned that earlier. That  
21    was one of the major sites on base here. There was  
22    some soils, contaminated soils, that were excavated  
23    and taken to a secure landfill and placed in a secure  
24    landfill. The big excavations that were out there

1     were all backfilled with local soils and then we  
2     implemented the in-situ bio treatment.

3             There's still groundwater beneath the Fire  
4     Training Area that does contain some of the fuel  
5     components that were used when they did the fire  
6     training exercises, and we are now treating that  
7     groundwater with the in-situ technology. That site  
8     will probably take two or three more years, at least,  
9     to be able to meet groundwater treatment standards  
10    for that.

11            I mentioned earlier the Group 11, the fuel  
12    sites, the non-CERCLA sites, if you would. We did  
13    complete the in-situ bio treatment. There's one of  
14    those sites that will require several more years for  
15    us to monitor to make sure that the treatment was  
16    effective and make sure that it stays effective. So  
17    we have to look for rebound in the groundwater.

18            Once we meet the goals, we still have to  
19    monitor for at least a year to make sure that the  
20    treatment was effective and that there's not some  
21    rebound effect, that it was not just a fleeting  
22    sample that we took. So we have to take additional  
23    samples to prove that.

24            It leads us to what's left for us on-site

1 here because, again, we have the remedy-in-place for  
2 all of these sites. There's a couple of things that  
3 we will be working on over the next several years.  
4 First, coming up next year we're looking to go back  
5 to Landfill 4 and implement the evapotranspiration  
6 buffer.

7           The planting of the trees around the  
8 landfill, we have a report that we've produced for  
9 the study that we did at Landfill 3 that shows how  
10 these trees have prevented any contamination from  
11 migrating through the groundwater from the landfill.  
12 We feel that that study justifies going back at other  
13 locations and implementing that technology.

14           Particularly Landfill 4, we're going to go  
15 back and plant -- we want to go back and plant trees  
16 around there. Those trees, the roots and the  
17 structures uptake the water and the contaminants and  
18 prevent that from leaching out, off the site  
19 somewhere. So it's a containment technology for the  
20 Landfill 4.

21           Then the remaining efforts will be to go  
22 back to all of the groundwater sites and continue  
23 first to monitor those sites and, where necessary, we  
24 will go back and re-implement additional groundwater



1 treatment. So we'll be looking at the data and  
2 determining whether we've met remedial goals, whether  
3 we need to expedite those remedial goals and, you  
4 know, where we may want to come back and do in-situ  
5 injections again.

6 We do anticipate doing that. We actually  
7 have come back to, I don't know, maybe 15 or 20 sites  
8 and reinjected already. We did that in October and  
9 November. So we're trying to expedite again the  
10 cleanup process on base.

11 The big dig and hauls where we have sites  
12 with soil contamination are pretty much complete, so  
13 you shouldn't see any major construction type  
14 activities, trucks and hauling going on over the next  
15 several years here.

16 One of the things that the Air Force did  
17 do, they were going back to the base. They went, did  
18 a study, went back to the base and identified where  
19 there may have been some aboveground storage tanks  
20 that they don't have all of the proper documentation  
21 or have not properly gone through and tested the  
22 soils at those sites to make sure there was no leak  
23 from those aboveground storage tanks.

24 There were 11 areas, tanks that were

1 identified. We have gone back and sampled soils.  
2 There was data required to go back at four of the  
3 sites. We went back and sampled the soils at those  
4 four sites. All of the soil samples came back  
5 essentially below our screening criteria.

6 We did remove one aboveground storage tank.  
7 It did have fuel oil in it. So I guess it had been  
8 sitting out there for, I don't know, 10, 15 years.  
9 There was no leak from that tank. The soil was  
10 clean. We recovered the fuel and reused the fuel and  
11 removed the tank at that site. We will be working on  
12 closure reports for those sites to document that they  
13 are clean and have met that requirement.

14 We talked a lot about Salt Fork Creek. We  
15 will immediately following this go into more in-depth  
16 discussions on Salt Fork Creek, but I'll kind of give  
17 you the answer to Salt Fork Creek here. It's really  
18 a very, very brief summary about Salt Fork Creek. I  
19 guess we do have this map. I think Dr. Schneider  
20 presented that previously.

21 There's another poster over here that shows  
22 the locations of the study areas that were done  
23 during the Remedial Investigation for Salt Fork  
24 Creek. So I want to emphasize the study area of Salt

1 Fork Creek is not just that that's on base, it goes  
2 to the reaches that are upstream, as well as the  
3 reaches that are downstream of Salt Fork Creek, and  
4 all the sampling and environmental testing that was  
5 done through that entire reach of the Salt Fork  
6 Creek.

7 Just one minor point I want to make is that  
8 this is really a tributary to the Upper Salt Fork  
9 Ditch. We use the terminology Salt Fork Creek. Salt  
10 Fork Creek actually is much further down south, down  
11 around the Urbana area. This does flow into the Salt  
12 Fork Creek, but the area that we're talking about is  
13 a tributary to the Upper Salt Fork Ditch, if you look  
14 on maps and want to identify that. Amar, did you  
15 have --

16 DR. BUMB: You have three minutes.

17 MR. SPARROW: Okay. Three minutes. I  
18 can close. Just again to briefly mention, the human  
19 health risk assessment was done for all of the  
20 environmental studies, and the human health risk  
21 assessment indicates that the site does not pose a  
22 level of risk that requires action by the Air Force.

23 Basically all the soil samples, water  
24 samples, all of the samples and the health

1 assessments say that there is not a risk that  
2 requires an action or cleanup. There's no evidence  
3 of adverse impacts to the surface water.  
4 Dr. Schneider kind of went into that earlier. We'll  
5 go into more detail in just a few minutes.

6 They did address ecological receptors, all  
7 the fish, birds, mammals that may be in the area, and  
8 that there is no impact to ecological receptors that  
9 may be living along Salt Fork Creek.

10 The Air Force basically proposes that there  
11 will be no further action required for Salt Fork  
12 Creek. That does mean that there will be no  
13 long-term controls. It will be unrestricted.  
14 There's no restrictions on what you can do for that,  
15 and there's no requirement for protection for fish or  
16 anything else. The Salt Fork Creek is below and  
17 acceptable for both ecological and human health risk.

18 Again, we'll go into more detail, if you  
19 really want us to, through the Public Meeting. We do  
20 plan, I mentioned earlier about the Public Meetings  
21 coming up and the Proposed Plan. The four landfills  
22 initially had an interim Record of Decision that said  
23 that the Air Force should go out and put a cap on  
24 these four landfills. The Air Force has done that.

1 That was an interim Record of Decision.

2 There still needs to be a final Record of  
3 Decision that comes back and reviews whether that  
4 action is protective of human health and environment.  
5 So we would anticipate a Public Meeting coming up in  
6 May 2013 for the proposed action that will address  
7 the final remedy for Landfills 1, 2, 3, and 4, and  
8 that will be the last Proposed Plan, the last Record  
9 of Decision required for the base cleanup. I think  
10 that's it for my presentation. Are there any  
11 questions that anybody has?

12 DR. ROKKE: Yeah. Howard, since we've  
13 got all of these remedial actions, you know, in-situ  
14 remediation coming off all around here where the  
15 creek is flowing through, okay, will we be continuing  
16 monitoring the consequence of this stuff and any  
17 outflow or what is getting into the creek as a result  
18 of your in-situ bioremediation activities?

19 MR. SPARROW: We're monitoring the  
20 groundwater. Where this is, we're monitoring the  
21 water that's there, the contamination, and then the  
22 down gradient from there. So we're trying to pick it  
23 up before it even gets into the creek. So we do have  
24 to monitor that.

1 DR. ROKKE: That's my main concern  
2 because, you know, what Nick had gone through and  
3 what he explained, but, I mean, with all these  
4 activities we have happening that are bordering the  
5 creek where it's flowing through, my only concern is  
6 that we continue to monitor those and maybe withhold  
7 a final determination on the creek and the outcomes  
8 on the creek until such time as you complete all of  
9 this, you know, the area where you got all the red on  
10 here which is around that. As you're saying, you're  
11 monitoring now and it doesn't look like anything's  
12 happening, which is, you know, hog heaven.

13 MR. SPARROW: Well, the primary  
14 concern for Salt Fork Creek, and we can go into that  
15 in a little bit more detail in the Public Meeting,  
16 but the primary concern was all the soils that we  
17 were digging. So did we do some action that picked  
18 these soils up and caused them to get transported  
19 into the creek? So we protected and made sure that  
20 none of that happened.

21 The groundwater we're monitoring before it  
22 goes into the creek. So we're monitoring it before.  
23 We are not monitoring the creek, we're monitoring the  
24 water before it goes into the creek. That's down

1     gradient.  Chris, do you want to --

2                   MR. HILL:  I was just going to suggest  
3     that Dr. Rokke make that a formal comment as far as  
4     the Public Meeting.  Making it a comment in this  
5     form --

6                   DR. ROKKE:  I think Howard's got it  
7     covered, but it's just, you know, yeah.

8                   MR. SPARROW:  Right.  So with that,  
9     Paul, do you want to close this meeting?

10                  MR. CARROLL:  I've got a couple more  
11     slides to close out with.

12                  DR. ROKKE:  I've got one other thing I  
13     want to bring up.  Towards the end of the year here,  
14     my kids and I and other members of the family, we  
15     spent a lot of time canoeing and kayaking in Heritage  
16     Lake.  Okay?  I mean, the lake is getting choked out  
17     by weeds and everything, which is nice, you know,  
18     interesting.  But the other thing, what we notice,  
19     because we've been doing this and going out there, I  
20     don't know, ever since the lake was there, we went  
21     out there canoeing and kayaking when the base was  
22     alive and well and everything else.  We just always  
23     did it.

24                  One thing that we've always done, which was

1 interesting, we always took bread and peas out there  
2 to throw in the lake because the kids from the time  
3 they were real small loved to watch the fish come up  
4 around the canoe and the kayak and everything and eat  
5 the stuff.

6           At the end of the summer, and again we had  
7 a real unusual summer, real hot weather and  
8 everything else and a lot of weeds out there, we  
9 didn't get any fish response at all out there. The  
10 number of fish that were coming up was virtually  
11 none. I mean, hardly any at all because we're  
12 canoeing every inch of that lake, all over. We go  
13 out there and spend hours all over just canoeing all  
14 over the place. And as we're doing it all over the  
15 lake, we're throwing bread and peas in, and there  
16 were no fish. Now, we did have one gigantic, I mean  
17 really, really massive catfish that we found dead out  
18 there, and he was in the middle of the lake and then  
19 we hauled him over to the shore and got him out of  
20 the water one day.

21           Other than that, and it was just really  
22 strange, and again the weather was really unique with  
23 the heat and everything else and the weeds drowning  
24 everything out, the number of fish that were in there



1 was virtually nothing. And that comment was made.  
2 So a lot of guys were fishing, too, and we're fishing  
3 from in the canoe and out on the banks and nothing  
4 was happening. So, I mean, it just, you know, I  
5 mean, there's a lot of factors that come into this.  
6 Doesn't mean there's anything in there, but it was  
7 just really unusual to have that experience.

8 MR. SPARROW: I haven't been out on  
9 Salt Fork Creek, but I know the fish in the hot  
10 summer and the heat, they dive down deep in those  
11 ponds and they don't come back up. Travis?

12 MR. WUBKER: As somebody that works  
13 right next to Heritage Lake for the last two years,  
14 for such a small pond, that does receive a lot of  
15 fishing pressure. There's a lot of people that go  
16 back there fishing. It could be to the point where  
17 it's overfished. If people aren't taking the catch  
18 and release, you know, they're just taking everything  
19 out they want, that could be an issue as well.

20 DR. ROKKE: I think you're probably  
21 right on that because the individuals who were out  
22 there fishing, they're fishing, they're taking  
23 everything. Anything they catch they were taking and  
24 cleaning.



1     been done. We've got a whole manual that's been done  
2     for a long time for a lot of different types of  
3     constituents. The one that you would be concerned  
4     about would be if there was a radioactive. The  
5     component that we have seems to conform.

6                   MR. FARACI: Metals or anything like  
7     that, any small metals at all?

8                   MR. SPARROW: No. The only metals  
9     that we have are arsenic at low levels which are  
10    background, like Dr. Schneider said.

11                  MR. CARROLL: Okay. Got to wrap up.  
12    Any recommended items for the next RAB meeting?

13                  MR. ANDERSON: If appropriate, when  
14    will we start looking at dissolving the RAB since the  
15    base is starting to come to a point where there's  
16    less being done?

17                  MR. CARROLL: It is the appropriate  
18    time. Probably at the next meeting we should  
19    probably have a briefing on what criteria the DOD,  
20    Department of Defense, sets forth to start thinking  
21    about adjourning a RAB. We could definitely schedule  
22    a briefing on that, go through what those criteria  
23    are. I'll tell you right now, we've pretty much  
24    gotten really close to meeting those criteria, all of

1 the remedy decisions have been made, property  
2 transfers close to being done, and we can do that for  
3 the next RAB meeting.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. If we could  
5 review it, then we could discuss timelines based upon  
6 what it looks like as far as what's required.

7 MR. CARROLL: Okay. All right, Jack.  
8 Carl?

9 MR. FOTHERGILL: To follow up on your  
10 point, instead of dissolving the RAB, why couldn't we  
11 reduce the number of times we meet per year from  
12 three to one?

13 MR. CARROLL: To one time?

14 MR. FOTHERGILL: One time per year.  
15 Since the agenda items are slowing down, we don't  
16 need a briefing every three months.

17 MR. CARROLL: I don't know if you've  
18 already looked ahead at the last page, but we are  
19 making a recommendation for the next RAB not to occur  
20 in February but in May because we really don't have a  
21 whole lot of active things going on this winter.

22 DR. ROKKE: There's nothing to do in  
23 the winter.

24 MR. CARROLL: Yes. Last winter and

1 the winter before, Shaw was extremely busy all  
2 through the winter doing documents, preparing for  
3 some of their field work in the summer. There won't  
4 be as much of that going on this winter. We'd like  
5 to make that recommendation to at least on this case,  
6 maybe not --

7 MR. FOTHERGILL: End of the summer  
8 right now. Like a year from now?

9 MR. CARROLL: We'd like to recommend  
10 next May because we want to have a Public Meeting at  
11 that time, our last Public Meeting for our last  
12 Record of Decision. If that's okay with you all, we  
13 can do a RAB at that same time and get that done, and  
14 then we can have the briefing on what criteria we  
15 should meet to adjourn a RAB. Then we can talk about  
16 having it once a year or having a public availability  
17 meeting once a year after that.

18 MR. FOTHERGILL: If I'm not mistaken,  
19 the Shaw contract is good until 2016.

20 MR. SPARROW: That's correct.

21 MR. CARROLL: Yes. You know, we're  
22 fine with whatever you all want to do, if you all  
23 want to have a meeting once a year, but we'd like to  
24 kind of formally go through what it takes and what we

1 want to recommend basically.

2 DR. ROKKE: I think this makes sense  
3 to have the next meeting in May, given where we're at  
4 and what's happening and the slowdown for the winter.

5 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Motion?

6 MS. WIRGES: I so move.

7 MS. BECNEL: Excuse me, Paul. I'd  
8 just like to -- one last item, please. I'd like to  
9 really emphasize the need for us to have  
10 informational resources for the public, and I think  
11 that that should probably be an agenda item for our  
12 next meeting or even sooner than that. Last meeting  
13 we had a tour, and the tour was cut short because of  
14 weather concerns. I really think that we need to  
15 look at maybe having tours for the public coming up  
16 next year. Maybe three or four.

17 My concern is that the public has  
18 information which is accessible to them. I've said  
19 this several times already. And I'd like something  
20 formally done. I don't know, maybe a meeting, but  
21 there's an enormous amount of information and things  
22 that have been done regarding the project. The  
23 public needs to know what those are and it needs to  
24 be in some kind of presentable source that they can

1 quickly access.

2 And I think that we need to do some kind of  
3 outreach to community members, whether it's  
4 organizations, churches, the schools, you know, one  
5 last effort at least, you know, maybe next year focus  
6 on that outreach to make sure that people know, you  
7 know, this is what has happened, this is what we've  
8 done, you know, in some form which is accessible to  
9 them. I'm really, really concerned about that.

10 MR. CARROLL: We're all for that. We  
11 are all for that, and we can definitely look into --  
12 we can discuss that at the next RAB, and we can maybe  
13 plan something next summer during that time frame.  
14 We might even do it before the next RAB to try to  
15 work something in for that time frame of the year.

16 I know we've got some pretty big things  
17 coming up: This last Proposed Plan, this last Record  
18 of Decision. We also have the Economic Development  
19 Conveyance that we have planned for this spring which  
20 is a big deal for us and for the Village to get this  
21 property transferred over into the Village's hands.  
22 We would love opportunities to reach out to the  
23 public. I always love field trips. I'm really kind  
24 of saddened by the fact that we had a thunderstorm in

1 the middle of that last one. We did a pretty quick  
2 one.

3 MS. BECNEL: Right, yeah. And it  
4 looked like a really good presentation. I was  
5 looking forward to it, and I really believe that some  
6 members of the public would be interested in seeing  
7 physically where things are, what was done and that  
8 kind of thing. And I'm interested if, when something  
9 is organized, I'm definitely interested in being a  
10 part of that, whatever that happens to be. I think  
11 we need to pool the resources and have something  
12 available for the public that they know about and we  
13 make, you know, a great effort to reach out to them.  
14 If they don't participate, at least we've done our  
15 part.

16 MR. CARROLL: Dr. Schneider is about  
17 wrapped up with his reading list, so we can kind of  
18 combine some of this information. Shaw has their  
19 information they want to provide, too, so we should  
20 next spring have something going on like that. That  
21 would be a really good outreach.

22 DR. ROKKE: What's the status on the  
23 demolition of White Hall?

24 MR. CARROLL: That is the same story.



1     Once we get the Economic Development Conveyance  
2     approved, the Air Force is still planning on moving  
3     out on that. We still have the agreement with the  
4     Village to move forward with that. So it needs to  
5     wait until that agreement is signed and done. Okay.  
6     Nothing really different from what we've been  
7     discussing for the last year on that.

8                 Okay. The recommendation to have the RAB  
9     meeting on May 16th instead of February 21st, motion?  
10    Lorraine, I think, motioned a while ago. Anybody  
11    second?

12                MR. ANDERSON: I do.

13                MR. CARROLL: Okay. All in favor?

14                (All RAB members vote by show of hands  
15    in favor.)

16                MR. CARROLL: All right. I think it  
17    carries. Good.

18                DR. ROKKE: I guess as long as you  
19    keep us informed through the time if there's anything  
20    that shows up between now and then, just keep  
21    everybody informed, the community and all of us.

22                MR. CARROLL: Okay. Anything -- what  
23    do you mean?

24                DR. ROKKE: Any changes or anything

1     that comes up that's important. Just so we have  
2     information that we need to get out to everybody  
3     between now and then.

4                     MR. CARROLL: Definitely. Okay. Will  
5     do.

6                     MR. FOTHERGILL: Like this (holding up  
7     Air Force Chanute Newsletter).

8                     MR. CARROLL: We'll get that out, too.  
9     We'll decide whether to do that -- we may do that in  
10    the interim, too. We usually do them every quarter.  
11    We may go ahead and send one out if it needs to be.

12                    DR. ROKKE: Yeah, these are good.

13                    MR. CARROLL: Yes, they are. Thanks.  
14    All right. We are adjourned.

15                    (RAB meeting adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1     STATE OF ILLINOIS     )  
                                  )  
2     COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN )

3

4

5                     I, Janet E. Frederick, a Certified  
6     Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of  
7     Champaign, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that  
8     the above-captioned meeting is a true record of the  
9     proceedings and was taken down in stenograph notes  
10    and 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.

14                    IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my  
15    hand this 10th day of December 2012.

16

17

18

19

20

---

JANET E. FREDERICK, CSR

21

22

23

24