CHANUTE AFB
ILLINOIS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3364.1

File: D.H. 25A

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN)

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

IN RE: CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE)

PUBLIC MEETING HELD

December 10, 1998

Aviation and Development Office
One Aviation Drive
Rantoul, Illinois
7:00 p.m.

Affirmative Reporting Company
1478 Glenn Drive Decatur, IL 62526
(217) 875-1414 (800) 886-DEPO FAX (217) 875-1472

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN)

BEFORE THE

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

IN RE: CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE)

PUBLIC MEETING HELD

December 10, 1998

Aviation and Development Office
One Aviation Drive
Rantoul, Illinois
7:00 p.m.

AFFIRMATIVE REPORTING COMPANY
1478 Glenn
Decatur, Illinois 62526
(217) 875-1414 or (800) 886-DEPO
Fax (217) 875-1472

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. SUITS: I apologize. I forgot my clear of the agenda. I'll go from the sheet if all of you will go from the sheet. I would ask first of all as far as introductions are concerned, Barb, introduce yourself.

MS. RAUCH: I'm Barbara Rauch. I'm a resident.

MR. SUITS: And was Jackie coming?

MS. RAUCH: I don't know.

MR. SUITS: Okay. Until several more of the RAB members show up, if they show up, we'll go along and introduce our guests. Rather than doing that, I think first of all, I'll introduce the news media, Tim Mitchell from News Gazette and Debby Webster for the Rantoul Press. Were you here last time, Kim?

MS. HOLLIS: Yes, I was.

MR. SUITS: You've been introduced. There's several more new faces. Why don't you just go around and I'll let everybody introduce themself? Otherwise, I'm sure I'll forget somebody.

MR. RUNDELL: I'm Bryan Rundell. I work

for Jacobs Engineering. I'm one of the contractors that work out there on the project for the landfills.

MR. MASON: I'm Tom Mason. I work for Jacobs, as well. I'm the field team leader. I'm in charge of site activities.

MR. IANNACONE: I'm Al Iannacone. I'm a chemist with Jacobs.

MR. LOFTIN: Al Loftin, AFBCA in Washington.

MR. SETTLE: Kerry Settle, Grissom AFBCA.

MS. DELGADO: Sylvia Delgado, University of Illinois, Division of Environmental Health & Safety.

MR. ADAMETZ: My name is Robert Adametz. I'm also with the University of Illinois Transportation Research Lab out on the south side.

MR. WARMBIER: Kurt Warmbier, AFBCA.

MR. BRADY: Dan Brady. I'm the field engineer for AFCEE watching the contractors perform the cleanup out here.

MR. THOMAS: I'm Craig Thomas with USEPA.

MR. VILLNOW: I'm Jeff Villnow with The Environmental Company.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm Dean Williams. I work for Jacobs Engineering. I'm a contracting officer for Chanute.

MR. NUSSBAUM: Steve Nussbaum, former Illinois EPA project manager.

MR. BOUDREAUX: I'm Ray Boudreaux I'm with the Village of Rantoul.

MR. RICE: I'm Charlie Rice, team chief for AFCEE, taking the place of Cynthia Kroll.

MR. KUHN: I'm Kevin Kuhn. I'm in charge of the chemistry and risk assessment out at AFCEE.

MS. RAUCH: I'm Barbara Rauch, resident.

MS. PANZER: Betty Panzer, resident.

MR. SUITS: I'm Virlon Suits. I'm the environmental coordinator here at Chanute.

MS. WIEGES: I'm Lorraine Wieges, Rantoul Garden Club.

MR. SCHAFER: Gary Schafer, USEPA project manager.

MS. HOLLIS: Kimberlee Hollis, Illinois EPA project manager.

MR. MITCHELL: Tim Mitchell, News Gazette.

MR. SUITS: Very well. Thank you.

Welcome to the new people here. At this time, I have passed out the minutes from the last meeting. I would ask that you review those. And at the next meeting, we'll take action on those to approve those just the way they're presented if there are no corrections. If from the Village of Rantoul side of the house, if the review is made to Ray, please call in the corrections to me. And also, Barbara, I do have extra copies here so in the event that Jackie and Carl don't show up, I'll certainly give you a few extra copies. Give me a call, and we'll make those corrections. These are taken from the court reporter minutes from the last meeting, so we do hope that they are accurate.

The minutes from the meeting before, I had gone ahead and passed those out. I didn't have any comments back on those. I guess that would be back from the August meeting. So if no one had any corrections on those, I guess I would call those approved as they are put together.

Third slide I have here and to basically start off before we start in on the projects is to have our new team chief come up and say just a few words about quality assurance and the work that we

do.

MR. RICE: Again, I'm Charlie Rice. I work for the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence. I've taken over for Cynthia Krall who is leaving on maternity leave shortly to have her baby.

I just want to say a few words about the data that we're generating for Chanute Air Force Base and emphasize what we're trying to do with that data. One of the things we want to be sure we have is quality data, data that won't be rejected for any reason down the road. All of the work that we're doing is based on the data that we generate. This is the most important thing about what we do.

And having said that, I'll let you all know that we are in the process of reviewing our quality procedures in making sure that data we do generate is acceptable, and we plan on having our review of that of those procedures provided in phases starting at the end of this month and in early January, too, both EPA and IEPA.

That's basically it. I just wanted you all to be aware that is what we're striving for with the program at Chanute Air Force Base.

MR. SUITS: Charlie, one thing I want to add to it is the main reason that we're really after quality on this is because of the OU-2. This was one of the big issues.

MR. RICE: We would be after that anyway.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're really getting a microscopic look at that. If there's any questions on that, I'll open myself up here. The data has to be able to be used and to justify and analyze the risks associated with what we find in our conclusions. If it's not good data, everything we have done is just a waste of time and money. We want to make sure that does not happen with the cooperation of IEPA and EPA.

MR. SUITS: Thank you, Charlie. The fourth item on the agenda is that of the landfills, and Brian Rundell is with us again. Brian, you're on.

MR. RUNDELL: I've got a copy of the slides. I'm going to be brief and try to accommodate Ray. Basically, the landfills I spoke last time about the documents that we're doing to insure that the data we collect meets the

objectives of the remedial investigation. Those documents are prepared, and then they're given to the regulatory agencies for review after AFCEE has reviewed them.

One of the bigger documents that really governs what we do in the remedial investigation for the landfills, that's been completed. Also the background investigation work plan has been completed.

We have two more documents that currently are in review by USEPA and IEPA, the field sampling plan. It focuses on the actual procedures of the field that we use to collect the data. Then the Quality Assurance Project Plan which is a document that basically dictates the quality procedures that the laboratory will use to insure as Charlie indicated that the data is of acceptable quality to use for risk assessment and other purposes that are necessary to achieve the objectives of the RI.

And also just to let you know, starting in January of this year, you probably see -- I think TEC already has some rigs out there -- you'll see some more drilling rigs. We're going to start doing what we call pallet borings. I spoke

about this in the last meeting, but I'll go over it really quick.

Basically, to determine where a well screen should be placed and to determine where the best location is, both in the shallow at the site and the Illinois, before we put those wells in, we're going to drill borings and look at the pathology. The borings will have continuous soil samples, and that will allow us to determine the most appropriate place to put our monitoring walls to monitor the site and to determine flow directions and basically provide that data for the RI which is necessary to characterize the hydrogeology and geology of the site. So that's a pretty major activity that will be taking place in January. That's a necessary precursor for going ahead and getting into the real meat of the RI.

I guess that's pretty much a summation of the landfills at this time, the work that we're doing. I would ask if there's questions about the information I presented or other issues.

MS. RAUCH: What does DPT mean?

MR. RICE: DPT stands for Direct Push Technology. All that basically means, in the last

ten or so years, there's been some innovations in drilling techniques. I think the CPT which is kind of the grandfather of this has been around for a while, but it allows us to push a tube into the ground, a hollow tube, without actually using a drill rig. A fairly small rig can be brought in to push a tube into the ground to check soil samples to a depth up to about 60 to 70 feet under ideal conditions.

It's a way for us to go into the in the shallow aquifers and quickly drill a lot of holes and get soil samples at a reduced cost. It's a fairly innovative technology that has been really widely accepted under new methodology in doing these RI investigations.

In contrast, the Illinois borings will be a little bit more conventional drilling, although it's a rotosonic (phonetic) technique which is a more advanced technique. It's more of a rigorous methodology which requires a much larger drill rig and more time and effort to do the work. Is there other questions?

MR. SUITS: Very well. We'll go into the other portion of the work which is located in the

OU-2. And for the benefit of the new folks that are here, the area beginning right here on around is considered Operable Unit 2 consisting of roughly 427 acres. The rest of the base is another 1,700 acres roughly. That's all Operable Unit 1.

For the benefit of the folks that are new here, the landfills which Brian just spoke of are located in this location, this location, this location and Landfill 4 over here. There's four landfills consisting of about 80 acres, and the other two projects that are associated with landfills which Brian has with his contracts are the Salt Fork Creek which winds its way through basically Operable Unit 2 and then also Heritage Lake here since it is in close proximity with the base.

The other areas which Jeff Villnow with The Environmental Company will be briefing here as Agenda Item No. 5 are also located in this area. At any rate, you can go ahead and point those out if you wish to help the people out.

MR. VILLNOW: Let me start by just quick agenda with some of the things that I would like to talk about for five or ten minutes tonight, an

overview of some of the work we've been doing out here for the last month or so. These are things we talked about at the last RAB meeting. I'll kind of bring you up to date on what we've been doing, our accomplishments and then some of our plans for the next several months, as well.

As Virlon said, we have been referring to this as the OU-2 7 sites remedial investigation. We actually have ten buildings in our scope of work that we're looking at, and we're taking a very comprehensive look at all the potential sources of contamination in all ten of those buildings. It's probably more accurate to put OU-2 sites RI or the OU-2 RI instead of the OU-2 7 sites. Just as a point of clarification, there are more than seven sites involved.

I thought it would be beneficial just to reiterate before I give you an overview of what we've done to remind everyone what it is that we're supposed to be doing. The scope of work in our contract calls for a remedial investigation at these ten sites. The objectives of an RI are to determine the nature and extent of the contamination completely, to do a risk assessment

and from using that information to figure out what we need do to clean the property up.

Normally in an RI when you start one of those, the assumption is there's a lot of background information available that you can use to design remedial investigations. As we've gone along in the last year that our team has developed and Brian's and other people, we've found that we needed to know more preliminary information about these sites before we could really do a good job with the RI.

Two months ago at the RAB meeting, we presented what we were calling a field screening investigation work plan. That's designed to help us gather additional preliminary information that we can use to focus on the RI. Ultimately we'll do the whole job quicker, cheaper and get lots better data out of the effort.

Right now, we're in the field screening stage. We're doing things with less than full RI quality techniques. It makes it quicker, faster, cheaper and helps us focus to the real investigation a little later on.

Again as a reminder, our field screening

activities are really five major efforts involved. What we have been calling source identification, a geologic investigation followed by a hydrologic investigation and then an investigation of the shallow unsaturated soils which is typically from the ground surface to 5, 6, 7, 8 feet, something like that, and then an investigation of the shallow Wisconsin and groundwater, again all with very rapid field screening types of techniques that is somewhat different than what you would use in a full-blown remedial investigation. So that's what we've been working on. The source identification and the geologic investigation are the activities that we've been working on over the last six weeks out here.

In terms of the source identification tasks, that primarily consists of record searches, which we did last summer. Then we've done geophysical studies more recently initially in August of last year or this past summer. We did surface geophysical work at our original sites. We've since gone back in and done additional geophysics work except for two.

EM stands for electromagnetic

conductivity. Magnetometer surveys are kind of complimentary surveys that we can use. We drag instruments across the surface of the ground. It helps us find subsurface anomalies like buried pipes, possible tanks, buried pieces of metal, things we might be concerned about when we're doing an investigation. We can do that very quickly and cheaply from the top of the ground without digging holes. It helps us get an idea of what we might be dealing with out there.

So again, we've completed both of these activities. We'll be back out next Monday for about another week to do magnetometer surveys on the expanded grids that we started about three or four weeks ago. That's all just recent so I don't have any information I can actually give to you and show you what we found, but those are some of the activities that we've accomplished.

The other major thing that we've done is to work on our geologic investigation. Again, the objective there was to determine what we were dealing with in the shallow subsurface so that when we come back in the RI, we know exactly where to drill wells. We know exactly where we want to put

well screens. We know where to go look for the water when we're doing a groundwater investigation. This activity was designed to help us figure that out beforehand.

We did penetrometer surveys earlier in the year. As Brian said, that's kind of a technique where you can quickly push a rod into the ground and get an indication of what the geologic formation is like. You can tell whether you're pushing through clays and sand for example. We did that work more recently again in the last couple of weeks.

We've been out with drill rigs and drilled 65 holes to help confirm what we saw with the CPT survey. As a part of that effort, we collected samples as we went along. We've been running those samples through our field screening program, up to six different analytical screening techniques. That work is still in progress.

I don't have any information to share about what our status is on it except again that we've collected 237 samples. We're in the process of screening through those. 49 of those we've submitted off site to determine grain size of the

formations. That helps us design good wells later on. We take 13 of those samples. We send them off to an off-site laboratory. The results we get back, we compare to what our field screening data are telling us. It helps us to check to make sure the field screening approach is working. In addition, 18 that we've sent off strictly is quality control kinds of samples. We'll rinse our equipment with blank water, send that off to a laboratory and make sure that our equipment is clean when we're doing our work. That's again a quick summary of what we've been up to.

My last slide, what are we up to next? We expect to be back out in early January to do reconnaissance and records search activities at Buildings 923 and 937 which are brand-new buildings for us. And towards the middle or the end of the month, weather permitting, we'll be back out to start our hydrologic work and our shallow soil zone work and our Wisconsin and groundwater work. At that point in time, we expect we'll have 10 to 15 people and a couple of drill rigs going to give you a sense of the level of effort and kind of activities that we have planned. Any questions?

MR. SUITS: A few of the things here that are also physical things that you may or may not see out in the field have to do with the fire training area, too, and with the Building 932 sites. Both of these sites for the benefit of the new people are what they call acronym EE/CA sites, Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis, and those are located at the 932 site in this area.

And as I brought out before, the fire training area site is here. We will be working on securing for these two particular sites for this particular year and along with that Fire Training Area 2, work that will start fairly quickly, and I'll let Tom Mason brief that for the benefit of the group. It's called the free product removal. So with that, Tom, you're on.

MR. MASON: Like Virlon said, the first project on status is a time critical removal action, FTA-2. The activity that we've completed to date include the installation of a temporary site dewatering system. There are three holding ponds that contain water. We've removed that water from the site and then conducted the slug tests from which we determine the hydraulic conductivity

at various locations on the site from piezometers that were installed last year.

Based on that information, we selected locations. These are planned activities. Based on that information, we plan on conducting free product recovery tests. And based on that slug test data, the hydraulic conductivity data, we selected 12 locations. Hydraulic conductivity is the way water flows to the site, the speed at which water flows to the site and the properties by which the water flows to the site. And so after collecting these measurements to determine which locations are proper for conducting the free product recovery test...

The free product recovery test is something I want to spend a little bit of time on. That involves bringing some heavy equipment on site, an excavator, actually opening up a small pit. The folks that will be performing that activity will be wearing personal protective equipment, wearing a mask, a respirator with cartridges to protect them from potential organic vapors that may exist from the contaminants that we're investigating. I guess the objective of this

activity is to determine product thickness and to determine the concentration of any product that we might find.

MR. BOUDREAUX: The free product is mostly JT-4, jet-type fuel, but they did burn other things. Mostly it's jet fuel.

MR. MASON: Free product means visible fuel product as opposed to just a water layer. So a sample will be collected of that free product. Tests will be conducted to determine the thickness of that product. And all this information is going to come together, and we'll utilize that to design a free product removal system. This system will be designed in the spring and then installed in the summer, and that's what's the plan for FTA-2. Any questions on the time critical removal action?

I have just one other slide I wanted to mention about what's going on with the EE/CA that was mentioned earlier and quick status on the tasks that have been completed at FTA-2 and Building 932.

We conducted field screening and step-outs on a grid. By step-out, I mean that test kits were used. When a positive result was

detected, we continued to step out on the grid until a non-detect was accomplished, and that information is utilized to define lateral extent of contamination on the site and will be utilized later in the EE/CA report which is being generated right now.

Other activities that were completed, soil gas samples were collected. A geotechnical investigation was conducted. On the same grid note, samples were collected and sent off for geotechnical analysis to better understand the geology on the site and the geotechnologies of the soil. And then finally, samples were collected for chemical analysis, and I stated this data is being combined right now into an EE/CA report where determinants are being selected for those two sites.

MR. BOUDREAUX: How big was your site after you did your sampling? How far out did you go?

MR. MASON: We were using three different types of test kits for three different parameters. On 932, we stepped out nearly to the edge of the area we gridded towards the fence there, and this

information again will be presented in the EE/CA report graphically.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Did you do a similar test over at FTA-2?

MR. MASON: Yes.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Did it extend past the boundaries of the fence?

MR. MASON: Yes.

MR. BOUDREAUX: How far out did that go?

MR. MASON: Just beyond the fence perimeter. That information will be presented graphically, as well. It's better depicted with a figure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's talking about a screening technique. It changes color. You read a color in this kit. Without spending all the money on labs, you can just mix it up and look at this vial and put it in basically a spectrum.

You get a color reading out of it, and it tells you whether or not you have a contaminant there to a certain level or not. It's not definitive. It's just a good screening technique of whether it's there or not at a specific concentration.

MS. RAUCH: Once we get this done, then what are you doing?

MR. MASON: This information is used to develop the cleanup strategy, basically finding out the chemical properties of the site and geology properties of the site and then determine the fastest, cheapest, easiest way to clean up any problems that we may find.

MR. SUITS: The cleanup being referenced there would be the soil cleanup, the groundwater portion.

MS. RAUCH: So we're not to step one yet?

MR. SUITS: As far as remediation, the first step will be the soils.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're doing the free product?

MR. SUITS: That's step one.

MR. MASON: Any other questions?

MR. SUITS: On your agenda, there are two more bullet items. One is monitoring well close-out. It probably seems confusing; however, there are a number of monitoring wells that we have used and that have basically outlived their

usefulness and do need to be sealed up and closed out. That work will be ongoing this year.

Also in the last several months, there has been a remaining tank found on the base. We felt we had all the tanks out. But in some work that was ongoing, it was discovered that there indeed was another tank. That tank will also be removed shortly after the first of the year so that we get that out there shortly.

That tank is located between the caddy shack and the Building 747, the old airplane hangar. We believe it was a heating fuel tank that serviced both buildings. It's not in the parking lot. It's out in the grassed area. I'll show you on the map. Any questions relative to that?

While I've got the map, you'll recall I mentioned Operable Unit 1. Steve Nussbaum was kind enough to pass out maps to you. I did not mark on this map here. On that particular map are the current Operable Unit 1 sites. If you'll research your minutes, you'll notice I briefed basically five sites last time, and we had developed narratives and documentation on the basis of those sites.

Over the past two months with some work that we've done, research work, we have found three additional sites. One is the pistol range which is the first black circle on your list. There is a skeet range which is located in this area. Up here on the edge of the golf course, there was a rifle range. Those have been added. Also with the 1917 era base, there was a row of buildings basically located along here which also included a steam plant. It also included various other training type of facilities. That is also contained in what we are now calling I guess the World War I era base. The original base consisted of about 640 acres configuration, something like this. All the support buildings as I say are still contained somewhat by the streets that are still in place, and it's in that general area where we will focus our attention with that.

Just for the sake of pointing out the rest of them for those that were not here last time, the coal yards. Ever since the new plant was in, they stored coal up until the early '70s when the acres became available was this area here out on the ground surface. I think you'll recall last

time I indicated that there were methods of dust control that was used which involved some chlorinated solvents historically with coal piles. So we don't know that for sure. We're going to go ahead and test for that and make sure that we have that area addressed.

Back up to 747 here, there were also some groundwater tests taken just off the southwest corner of Building 747. In both rounds of sampling, we ended up with chlorinated solvents there, so those will be tested.

During some of the Air Force open house activities, one photograph here showed an area where they had like a temporary fire demonstration area set up, and that particular area will also be examined to see and investigated to see what may still be there.

At one of the Restoration Advisory Board meetings, one of the local residents that worked at the base here for a good many years called out an area out here in the apron where carbon tetrachloride was found. That's the circle there.

Lead up here in the playground. We've talked about that before. That's also going to be

in this remedial investigation feasibility study report.

Just to make sure, checking as far as the paint that's on the water towers. We know that these have at least not got paint on them now. But we're certain at some time in the past, there was lead-based paint on there because every one of the towers here was in a checkerboard fashion which certainly included the lead-based paint. The most recent painting practice involved a fairly good containment system. We certainly don't know for sure in fact 30 or 40 years ago when these were painted whether those practices were in place. Possibly not. So we have gone ahead and added those.

So all in all, that gives us ten basic sites that will be investigated in this OU-1, what we call the Operable Unit 1 remedial investigation and the feasibility study.

MS. RAUCH: Where it says scoped, what does that mean?

MR. SUITS: That's my next item. The documents that we referred to last time and with what we've added now, we will have a meeting in

January with the EPAs, and we will go ahead and we will scope out the project as far as what we will actually do in terms of numbers of tests and what we will be testing for and that sort of thing and finalize that documentation for funding to accomplish the investigation. Any other questions?

The eighth item on the agenda is the sampling of the off-base residential wells which were accomplished right at two months ago, and I have with me Mr. Kurt Warmbier who is in my office who will brief that particular slide.

MR. WARMBIER: As part of the base project to delineate groundwater around the base and see what's happening, we sampled three residential wells off base, and the findings of concern after consulting with Illinois EPA, USEPA and the Illinois Department of Public Health are listed on here.

The first one, manganese, is what used to be called a secondary water quality standard. It's generally not considered a health-based standard, but it may affect the color, the taste, the odor in the water.

The second item of concern found in one of two duplicate samples at one well was a concentration of lead above MCL. MCL stands for maximum contaminant level. It's a federal primary drinking water standard. Concentrations that exceed the MCLs are considered hazard to health. And in the final group of chemicals of concern were dioxins and furans, and a bunch of them detected all below MCL levels. Any questions?

MS. RAUCH: What does one of two duplicates mean?

MR. WARMBIER: There were two water samples taken from this well, one after the other. One sample had lead above the MCL. The other sample did not. I will be getting to some of these questions.

MR. SCHAFER: Barbara, if I could, the purpose of duplicate samples is another quality control measure. Typically, we'll collect a certain amount of samples, and there will be because of the QA requirements a certain amount of duplicates. And generally speaking, the results from the duplicate should be very close to the results of the same.

MR. WARMBIER: You should expect similar results from both samples.

MR. SCHAFER: It's the same sample poured into different bottles. That's kind of something that's kept from the lab. The lab doesn't know that. It's a good way to evaluate the laboratory's performance.

MR. WARMBIER: That could possibly indicate a problem with the lab site rather than the well site. But at this point, we don't know.

MR. NUSSBAUM: That first slide you put up, you mentioned manganese as a secondary standard for taste, odor and color. The Illinois Administrative Code 620 are health-based standards. And manganese, the concentration that we reference in our regulations is based on the reference.

MR. WARMBIER: That information was based on my conversation with the Public Health folks for the odor, color and taste.

MR. NUSSBAUM: When we promulgated the groundwater quality standards, Class I, those are drinking water quality standards. We developed that number based on a health-based standard.

MS. CLIFTON: Who was the outside agency that tested these samples?

MR. WARMBIER: Our contractor who pulled the samples or the lab who actually tested them?

MS. CLIFTON: Who was the testing lab?

MR. WARMBIER: In Chicago.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's in University Park, a suburb of Chicago.

MR. WARMBIER: They did all of the water except for the dioxin furans, and that was Triangle & Durham in North Carolina.

MS. CLIFTON: A lot of the test results because I'm one of the people that was tested are estimated. The test results because of the methods they used could not accurately determine those levels. What are you prepared to do to make sure that the right testing methods or protocol are used to make sure exactly what's in there and not just guess?

MR. WARMBIER: For your benefit, our person for AFCEE, he just described the RFS data earlier about some problems with data quality. Unfortunately, there are some data quality issues here, as well, that we will point out.

MS. CLIFTON: Was this lab previously certified before you guys sent your samples up there?

MR. WARMBIER: Yes, it was.

MS. CLIFTON: Have you used them in the past?

MR. WARMBIER: Not for work on Chanute.

MS. CLIFTON: My question is, why do you doubt their capability now after you get the test results back?

MR. WARMBIER: It's not a doubting of their capability. It actually goes to issues of instrument calibration and meeting certain quality control, quality assessment that the Air Force sets that may be higher than what the lab typically does maybe on a routine sampling for somebody else.

MS. CLIFTON: Do you search them out before you send the samples out to be tested? The only reason I ask is I have a scientific background, and I used to be a quality control manager and with push for QS9000 and especially because I have data from Edwards Air Force Base, it would seem to me that you guys would search this out before you would send these samples out to be

tested.

I guess my concern is, even if you do re-sample it, what level of confidence do we as the public have that those test results are going to be better than what they initially were?

MR. WARMBIER: No. 1, we are re-addressing the QA/QC issues and firming those up before we re-sample and go out. No. 2, unless we actually had as many people hired to go and stand and look over the shoulders of people in the lab, you have to at some point trust what the lab is doing. And a lot of this, you can't really... When the data comes back is when you really find out whether or not the lab is performing.

MS. CLIFTON: True, but it seems to me that the Air Force has test facilities that they used in the past and should have some level of confidence without going out to some new test facility.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The lab has been used for work at other air forces like Otis Air Force Base in Massachusetts on Cape Cod. It just previously hasn't been used for work at Chanute.

The lab has been audited by folks

associated with work at Chanute where both representatives of Jacobs and representatives of the Air Force have been out to conduct on-site inspections of the lab and review their QA records and that kind of oversight.

There's some concern about this particular data set, so we're going to revisit the issue with the laboratory. However, we have not seen problems across the board with this lab; otherwise, they would no longer be participating in the Air Force's program.

MR. VAN NESS: The invalidated non-detected side, any idea what the dioxins and furans are moving in on? That's highly water-soluble.

MR. WARMBIER: It's not something you would expect to find in a drinking water sample. And without more testing, there's really no way that we can actually pinpoint how they got there, where they came from, why they're there.

MR. BOUDREAUX: There's too many questions to rely on the initial sampling round, and so the only logical thing to do is go back and do it again. That's what you're planning on

doing?

MR. WARMBIER: Right. We've sent out letters to all the owners and uses of those wells requesting permission to come back to perform another round of sampling.

MS. CLIFTON: I would like to suggest that if you do that, we pull duplicate samples, and the general public be allowed to pick their own private testing service to let them also analyze.

MR. WARMBIER: In the next round of sampling, there will be splits made with both USEPA and IEPA, so there should be three separate.

MS. CLIFTON: Not pulled by you, but that we can choose on our own to be sampled by a third-party source.

MS. HOLLIS: I think if that's what she wants, she should get it.

MS. CLIFTON: The only reason I say that is I've talked to several people in this room that will go nameless, and there's some considerable concern including myself for how long the Air Force has had these results. Several of us in this room had to call and get the results only to find out that we had contaminated drinking sources. For you

people on public water, that may be fine.

My real question is, there was big debates I understand amongst this whole group as to interpretation of the results and/or what was needed to be done. The fact that we had to call and get that information and find out that we should be on bottled water, I would really like to know how long you guys have had the results and have known that and failed to share that with those of us that are involved.

MR. WARMBIER: I wouldn't say it quite that firmly about the alternate water use.

MS. CLIFTON: I would.

MR. WARMBIER: At this point to be conservative and on the safe side, we are providing an alternate source of drinking and cooking water. Until further tests are made, we don't know whether or not there is a problem in this water. That's why we need to do additional tests.

MS. CLIFTON: What if I told you eight years ago, that well was sampled and there was absolutely no contamination in it whatsoever and the fact that you failed also until I found out from another person in this room who called me that

the level of dioxins and furans was at the threshold level for my children which was also failed to be put into the report. I understand this is an area where not a lot of people know, but I don't feel you guys should be making that decision for us.

MR. WARMBIER: That's why we offered the water to you.

MS. CLIFTON: I was not given the option. I didn't find out until I got the letter in the mail. Another lady in this room didn't even know about it until she made a phone call. It's my understanding the recommendation was made from several of the health service agencies over a week and a half ago, and just today was when the water was delivered to my house after I got the registered letter Tuesday.

I really would like to know, when were these results known? And why are we just finding out about them now? It's my understanding it's been several weeks that these have been in controversy.

MR. WARMBIER: I've been involved just this week and --

MS. CLIFTON: The report was already done last week, so it couldn't have been this week.

MR. WARMBIER: I mean last week was the first week I was here at Chanute. I believe we attempted to contact you by phone last week and were unable to do so.

The Illinois Department of Public Health didn't have their assessment prepared until the beginning of last week. Until we got the data analyzed to determine valid data and potential risks after consulting with the Illinois Department of Public Health, Illinois EPA and USEPA and our own folks, we contacted all of the users.

MS. CLIFTON: Who contacted all of the users?

MR. WARMBIER: Mr. Suits.

MS. CLIFTON: No, he did not.

MR. WARMBIER: Then we followed that up with certified mail.

MS. CLIFTON: You still haven't answered my question. How long have you had the test results? And how long have you been discussing what needed to be done?

MR. WARMBIER: I don't know when the test

results came in.

MS. CLIFTON: You don't need to answer. You already gave me your answer.

MR. SUITS: The initial test results were received by our office the first week of November.

MS. CLIFTON: Okay. This is December. So a whole month you've withheld that from us. I don't feel that's right, and that's why I'm concerned about having a private third party so we can get them on a timely basis.

Even if you needed to validate it, if there was data that even suggested any kind of health risk or implication, that should have been presented forward to those people that were involved. I don't feel it was handled in a very timely manner nor in a very satisfactory manner.

MR. WARMBIER: Going on. As I said, there were some problems with the sampling quality in this data which also further underscores the need to re-test.

As I said, there were too many invalidated non-detects. Basically all the DOC, SCOC, pesticides and PCB data. There were some but far too many to be acceptable. And then

additionally, certain results resulted in flags that indicated they were merely estimates of values due to either interference from other chemicals either in the system, in the sample or concentrations that come up underneath what are called the lab reporting level where you have confidence that a chemical was detected, but you aren't sure whether or not the quantity that is theirs is accurate.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Are these samples taken from the well or from the house? How are they taken?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Two of them were taken directly from the well or a spigot right near the well. Mrs. Panzer's was taken at a spigot at the back of her house.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What percentage is too many under the protocol that you're using? Invalidated non-detect, what percentage are you using?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Really you don't want to see any especially for the drinking water. If it gets much over about 5 percent, maybe 10 percent of the specific measurements being

invalidated, that's when it starts raising a flag where something is out of control in the lab.

What I'm talking about is when the lab is sampling the data, they run the standards at the beginning and run the standards at the end. If the standards at the end don't match the standards at the beginning, plus or minus so many percent, that means that the analysis was out of control. The data is then questionable.

We have our standards, and other people have their standards. To them, a certain level of drift was acceptable. We've got the data. It was outside of our standard, so it was marked invalid.

MR. SCHAFER: I think this might go to your question, Sir. How many VOCs are compounds during the total sweep?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 32 approximately.

MR. SCHAFER: There's 32 compounds approximately in the VOC for that group. Out of that particular group if memory serves me correctly, there were 11 non-detects, 11 compounds that the laboratory had to reject as non-detects.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They were basically all non-detects.

MR. SCHAFER: The lab had to look at the data and the valid data and say, "For 11 of these, we cannot say that these are valid non-detects, and we have to reject the results." To give you some concept, that's 1/3 of the sweep.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Various other testings, they were different for the PCBs, pesticides. There were different numbers. For the drinking water samples, it's a much smaller amount. If you're talking about soil samples or surface water where there's dirt in them, you expect more troubles.

MR. WARMBIER: Due to the uncertainties of the data set, it leads us to have actually a lack of confidence in the data quality, and that's a further reason to have to go back and re-sample to actually know what's actually there.

At this point, we really don't know whether there is a hazard in the water or not. The providing of the alternative water for drinking and cooking is a conservative measure just in case the follow-up sampling does indicate a concern with health-based problems in the water.

MS. RAUCH: So you knew for six weeks?

MR. WARMBIER: I don't know.

MS. RAUCH: I find that very disturbing. I don't know how you could do that.

MS. WIEGES: Are these farms?

MR. BOUDREAUX: All around them is farmland.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Two of the properties are bordered on the north side by the base, but the other sides are farmland.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many are getting corrected by this? How many are getting bottled water?

MR. WARMBIER: All three. To reiterate, further testing needs to be done to actually delineate what is in the water.

MR. BOUDREAUX: How quickly are we going to get it done?

MR. WARMBIER: We want to get the QA/QC problems corrected. We're working with AFCEE on that. As soon as we can guarantee that we're going to have not a repeat of this -- obviously we don't want that either -- get that worked out, coordinate with both of the regulators and with the individual that wants a private sample.

MS. CLIFTON: I think it should be paid for by the Air Force because I truly believe there needs to be a separate segregated source, and maybe we can get the test results on a more timely basis.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There is a program set up through the AFBCA that will pay for that. It's called TAP.

MR. NUSSBAUM: It's available to the Restoration Advisory Board. I would suggest that the residents get on the Restoration Advisory Board and participate with the RAB at the meetings so you can stay on top of it.

MS. HOLLIS: Who dictates where their samples go to? Are they going to be going to a lab the Air Force dictates?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whoever they get as a consultant, wherever they want to take them.

MR. BOUDREAUX: They can take their own sample anywhere they want even if it's paid for by the government. The government has a lab that they will go out and do QA and QC and make sure it's good and send it to where they want to.

MR. WARMBIER: The way it's set up, we don't know where let's say the TAP samples go to.

We're going to take a sample and send it to our lab. EPA will send it to their lab, and Illinois EPA will take a split and send it to their lab. Just from ours and the two regulators' point of view, it should be potentially three different labs. I guess there could be a possibility that we could use the same lab.

MS. CLIFTON: But that wasn't done the first time?

MR. WARMBIER: Splits were not taken the first time.

MS. HOLLIS: We were not given the opportunity at the time to take splits. We need two weeks' notice. We were notified the day before that this was going to happen. It was a source of contention in our meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The resident would want a similar amount of lead time I'm sure.

MR. WARMBIER: Right.

MR. NUSSBAUM: One of the most important things to identify right now is the fact that for the resident that wants the split sample taken, you're making reference to the Technical Assistance Program. They've got to fill out an application.

They've got to make the request. There's a lot of paperwork that goes with that. That's got to get done. I don't want to mislead the residents to believe that it's going to happen. You need to get with the Air Force to make sure you fill out the paperwork and get the money to do that.

MS. CLIFTON: I guess I'm saying, why is that my responsibility for something I haven't done?

MR. NUSSBAUM: I accept that, but I didn't want to mislead you.

MS. CLIFTON: I know that, but I also know there's other people around this state that will willingly test that stuff.

MR. WARMBIER: I would also like to point out, at this point we do not know where the contaminants that are potentially in your well came from.

MS. CLIFTON: I disagree with you because I've had my well tested several times. When we bought the property and another time right before the base was closed, that well was tested, and it tested clean.

MR. WARMBIER: Typically, the standard

drinking water tests do not tests for dioxins and furans.

MS. CLIFTON: I apologize for coming in late to the meeting. But has it been discussed at all as to what other contaminants were found in the environmental area of concern directly adjacent to our property?

MS. HOLLIS: A list of contaminants from the landfill?

MR. WARMBIER: Not at this meeting, I don't believe it was.

MR. BOUDREAUX: They wouldn't be yet available. All that has been done is the surface and some of the samples.

MS. CLIFTON: So we should be looking at that too in conjunction with ours?

MR. WARMBIER: Actually, the off-base sample was part of the larger delineation of groundwater for the entire base cleanup operation. But like I say, it's not definitive whether there is contaminants in your water, and we do not know if or where they would have come from.

MS. CLIFTON: We've got a pretty good idea, don't we? I think we do. Those of us that

have lived around here know what happened. Every day, there were gallons and gallons of JP-4 used out there to burn airplanes. Everybody did it.

MR. BOUDREAUX: So when have you got them scheduled?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not scheduled yet.

MR. BOUDREAUX: What does one of these tests cost? I'm talking about a private lab.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: $5,000.

MS. CLIFTON: It will cost that much.

MR. WARMBIER: There are only two or three places that do dioxin/furan tests.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you sent a sample to the Department of Public Health?

MS. CLIFTON: Without my legal counsel here, I'm not going to tell you what I've done.

MR. WARMBIER: The Illinois Department of Public Health also sent a letter to all of the well holders on their evaluation of the data, and their evaluation actually only determined that at that time lead was the only concern they had as far as using the water.

MS. PANZER: Why didn't we get a sheet

like that on the lead? I got it on the dioxins and furans but no information on the lead.

MR. WARMBIER: They were the ones that prepared that. Call them, and I would assume they would have information on lead.

MS. PANZER: The dioxins and furans should not be there at all even if they're in the minimal level.

MR. WARMBIER: We would not expect them to be there. We thought maybe the Public Health folks would be here. They sent with their letters to the well holders, a handout on dioxins and a handout on furans.

I've got the photocopy fax of that from them. I have a few copies up here if you would like to see those. You can also contact the regulators or Public Health for additional information as well as us if you want to talk with us in more detail.

MS. RAUCH: I have a related question. This was well samples. At October's meeting, it was talked about that there were samples taken of Heritage Lake; is that right?

MR. SUITS: I don't know.

MS. RAUCH: It seems to me like that ought to be sampled, too.

MR. BOUDREAUX: That's water coming from way down. We dug a well. The city dug a well and is now pumping that water from way down.

MR. NUSSBAUM: The city dug a well?

MR. BOUDREAUX: A long time ago.

MR. NUSSBAUM: The village dug the well or the Air Force?

MR. SUITS: That well was drilled by the village.

MR. BOUDREAUX: We drilled that well in '91 or '92, and it's way down there.

MS. RAUCH: Can we have a list of the contaminants that have been found in OU-2?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mrs. Rauch was asking about when are samples from the lake going to be collected? Her recollection was that we had already done that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. You've been to almost all of the meetings. There will be two rounds collected from the lake I would guess looking at the schedule, it would be probably early spring when we would go out there and sample

those.

We told you we were going to put in a stilling well. That might be what's confusing. That's where we drive a stand pipe in the lake to measure the surface water elevation.

MR. SCHAFER: That's just a measurement of the water level to try to see how that reacts with the groundwater.

MS. RAUCH: It would seem to me that we would want to be doing that and the Salt Fork Creek, too, and not be waiting until spring. But really, can we get a list of those contaminants?

MR. SUITS: The contaminants --

MS. RAUCH: That have already been found in the OU-2.

MR. SUITS: We will provide you with those.

MR. BOUDREAUX: You need to provide some kind of levels, too, so that they understand what the levels are.

MR. SUITS: Reuse progress.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Just to change things around and talk a little bit about... I'll talk negative stuff first. (Inaudible) Windows is

closing. Everybody has seen that in the paper. That is a plastic window manufacturing plant that will be consolidating in Ohio. All of those employees are going to be working at Caradco and have been offered jobs here and will probably be gone very soon. On the good side, we have two different companies very interested in leasing it, and the building is pretty nice now. It's fully sprinkled, and it's got docks. It didn't have any before. The result of having a window manufacturing plant there has made it quite marketable.

Greyhound will be here every year for the next five years January through May and do their driver training. Their new offices will be over in the north end of the museum. You should have seen a nice article written by our friend, Tim, in the paper, and it's going to be real good.

The steam plant is shutting down after this winter, so everybody has seen a lot about that. We have already started doing the design of not only independent boilers but also design of the facilities to house these boilers because many of these buildings need to have an addition to put on

to add a separate boiler. All of that is underway right now.

The T-hanger project is coming along nicely. Look into the buildings in the hangars themselves. We're doing that right now.

Next year, we mentioned that we were hopefully going to have the 1836 runway reconstructed. Since our last meeting, we have received approval from that and funding from the Federal Government federal, state, local project of 1836 including lights and widening and new pavement, and that will be very, very good. That's all I've got unless there are questions.

MR. SUITS: Any questions for Ray?

Next one is that of community involvement. I might add at this point that the second Wednesday in January, there is a users' group meeting here. So some of the concerns that have been previously manifested here with respect to some of the facilities and conditions, they could also be brought up at that particular meeting.

MR. BOUDREAUX: We would be happy to have anybody attend that would like to come. We

normally have rolls and coffee in the morning at 9 o'clock here in this room.

MS. RAUCH: Has there been any new development about White Hall?

MR. SUITS: White Hall as I reported last time has been taken back by the Air Force. Both to contract for purchase and the lease that was in effect for a number of years have been canceled.

The Air Force has the facility back along with the people center. I reported last time that we were making the people center a more safe area so that children could not come in through the windows. So we have boarded up those holes that were in that particular building.

We are currently pursuing a contract to go ahead and to basically clean up the landscaping on the entire facility. As far as development on doing an alternative such as reselling, the Air Force has not yet undertaken that. What the Air Force is doing is working with the Village of Rantoul to see if the Village of Rantoul can find some interest in the facility before we basically make a move on it. That will determine which method of transfer that we would undertake.

MR. BOUDREAUX: To add onto that, we have shown it once, but it doesn't show very well.

MS. WIEGES: It has all of those code violations that has to be met before anybody could buy it.

MR. BOUDREAUX: Not to buy it necessarily but before anybody can occupy it. What you've got is like any building, if somebody wanted to buy it, they could do that.

But before they could use it for anything, they would have to bring it up to code and make it safe for people, and currently it is not that way. That's an issue, and that's why the Air Force is cooperating with the city to allow the city some time to find somebody who will do something with it. So that's what we're trying to do.

MS. RAUCH: It doesn't seem very feasible.

MS. WIEGES: Not at $20 million.

MS. RAUCH: It seems like something that the Air Force should take care of.

MR. BOUDREAUX: The Mayor is working with Tom Ewing to get some money. It's against Air

Force policy to my understanding to tear down buildings that are being disposed of on a closed military base; however, there are other methods to take. The Mayor is working through Congress to try to get some money to tear the building down should we not find somebody to invest in it and make it into something. The Mayor is very good at that.

MR. SUITS: Anything else on the community involvement?

The next meeting will be in two months if I remember my calendar right. I believe it is February the 11th at 7:00 p.m. of 1999. Any last things? Otherwise, the meeting is adjourned for the evening. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon the RAB Hearing was Concluded at 8:30 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF PIATT)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, TARA L. TRAXLER, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the County of Piatt, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had on the hearing of the aforementioned cause on the 10th day of December, A.D. 1998, before Mr. Virlon Suits.

I do further certify that the foregoing 56 pages are a true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid and contain all of the proceedings directed by Mr. Suits.

I do further certify that I have no interest in the outcome of this action.

Given under my hand and seal this 19th day of December, A.D. 1998 at LaPlace, Illinois.

AFFIRMATIVE REPORTING COMPANY

By:

"OFFICIAL SEAL"
Tara L. Traxler
Notary Public, State of Illinois
My Commission Expires 4/02/01

Tara L. Traxler, CSR

TARA L. TRAXLER, CSR
and Notary Public

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE