



CHANUTE AFB ILLINOIS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3340.1

D.H. 25h

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

BEFORE THE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

IN RE THE MATTER OF:
CHANUTE AFB INSTALLATION
RESTORATION PROGRAM

BOARD MEETING

Proceedings had on February 10th, 2000, at AFBCA
Public Meeting Room, 1 Aviation Drive, Rantoul,
Champaign County, Illinois, commencing at the hour of
7:00 o'clock P.M., before the Restoration Advisory
Board, before H. Lori Bernardy, a Notary Public of
Sangamon County, acting within and for the County of
Champaign, State of Illinois.

BALDWIN REPORTING & LEGAL-VISUAL SERVICES
Serving Illinois, Indiana & Missouri
24 hrs (217)788-2835 Fax (217)788-2838
1-800-248-2835

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

PRESENT:

- Mr. Tim Mitchell
- Mr. Robert Kravitz
- Mr. Tom Mason
- Ms. Pat Johnson
- Mr. Ray Boudreaux
- Mr. Harold Miles
- Mr. Gary Adams
- Mr. Gary May
- Ms. Randee May
- Mr. Mark Britton
- Mr. Scott Fowler
- Mr. Ron Steward
- Ms. Barb Rauch
- Mr. Fred Rauch
- Mr. Caryl Fothergill
- Mr. Troy Goodrich
- Ms. Shannon Fulton
- Ms. Kathy Marsh
- Mr. Charles Rice
- Mr. Steve Pitts
- Ms. Lorraine Wirges
- Mr. Leonard Wirges
- Mr. Gary Schafer
- Mr. Craig Thomas
- Mr. Virlon Suits
- Mr. Mark Hutchinson
- Mr. Dave Fulton
- Mr. John McDonough
- Mr. Tom Blair
- Mr. John Graham

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. FLEMING: We'd like to get started. One of
3 the things is, is that we've got a lot of stuff to do
4 this first hour, and then we have a follow-up public
5 meeting at 8:00 to discuss the landfill caps.

6 So, in case nobody knows who I am, which
7 you probably don't, I'm Dan Fleming. I'm the new Base
8 Environmental Coordinator assigned here, and I will be
9 here for the duration, and eventually I'm going to --
10 etc, etc.

11 Shall we go around the room real quick and
12 introduce ourselves? Gary?

13 MR. ADAMS: I'm Gary Adams, Village of Rantoul.

14 MS. WIRGES: Lorraine Wirges, Rantoul RAB Member.

15 MR. STEWARD: I'm Ron Steward with the Illinois
16 EPA.

17 MR. KRAVITZ: Rob Kravitz with the Midwest
18 Environmental Consultants.

19 MR. SCHAFER: I'm Gary Schafer with the USEPA.

20 MS. MARSH: Kathy Marsh, RAB Member.

21 MS. RAUCH: Barb Rauch, RAB Member.

22 MR. BOUDREAUX: Ray Boudreaux with the Village,
23 and a Member of the RAB.

24 MR. SUITS: Virlon Suits, AFBCA.

1 MR. RICE: Charlie Rice with the Air Force Center
2 for Environmental Excellence.

3 MR. MASON: Tom Mason, Jacobs Engineering.

4 MR. VILLNOW: Jeff Villnow, with The
5 Environmental Company.

6 MR. HASSETT: Greg Hasset with Booz, Allen, and
7 Hamilton.

8 MR. RAUCH: Fred Rauch, President.

9 MR. MITCHELL: Tim Mitchell from the
10 News-Gazette.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Pete Johnson, just a resident.

12 MR. MILES: Harold Miles, resident.

13 MR. WIRGES: Leonard Wirges, Rantoul.

14 MS. FULTON: Shannon Fulton, University of
15 Illinois.

16 MR. FULTON: Dave Fulton, Montgomery Watson.

17 MR. McDONOUGH: John McDonough, Montgomery
18 Watson.

19 MR. PITTS: Steve Pitts, AFBCA.

20 MR. MAY: Gary May, GA May General Contractors.

21 MS. MAY: Mrs. Gary May.

22 MR. GOODRICH: Troy Goodrich, Superior Services.

23 MR. FOTHERGILL: Caryl Fothergill, RAB Member.

24 MR. THOMAS: Craig Thomas, USEPA.

1 MR. FOWLER: Scott Fowler, Illinois EPA.

2 MR. HUTCHINSON: Mark Hutchinson, AFBCA.

3 MR. BRADY: Dan Brady, Air Force Center for
4 Environmental Excellence.

5 MS. OLGUIN: Chris Olguin, Environmental
6 Contracting.

7 MS. KOZAK: Donna Kozak, UNITEC.

8 MR. BRITTON: Mark Britton, Illinois EPA.

9 MR. FLEMING: Okay, great. Thank you, very much.
10 I assume the minutes were mailed out to everybody or
11 no?

12 Were there any comments or changes that
13 need to be made from the last RAB meeting?

14 MS. RAUCH: Is this where you want corrections
15 and so forth?

16 MR. FLEMING: I'll tell you what: We'll go ahead
17 and add that onto the end.

18 MS. RAUCH: All right.

19 MR. FLEMING: And then we'll do that. I do want
20 to bring up one thing of business: The Honorable Joe
21 Brown, as the Mayor, has asked to be excused as the
22 Co-Chair for the RAB, and has recommended Mr. Gary
23 Adams to replace him.

24 And I would put a Motion on the floor to

1 have Gary here be the Co-Chair for the RAB.

2 MS. WIRGES: Lorraine Wirges, I so move.

3 MR. FLEMING: All right. Any discussion?

4 (No audible response.)

5 MR. FLEMING: All in favor?

6 RAB BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

7 MR. FLEMING: All opposed?

8 (No audible response.)

9 MR. FLEMING: Done. Okay. We'll go ahead and go
10 through the program. Steve?

11 MR. PITTS: Okay. I just want to remind everyone
12 here, when you have a question or a comment, make sure
13 that you state your name clearly. Speak loudly so
14 that the reporter can properly identify you on record.

15 Does anybody have any problem with
16 videotaping this tonight?

17 MR. FLEMING: Do you want to tell them why?

18 MR. PITTS: I have a college project, and I'm
19 supposed to give a presentation. And I've been doing
20 presentations for a long time, but part of the project
21 is to give a presentation and put it on videotape.
22 Any objections?

23 (No audible response.)

24 MR. PITTS: Okay, I appreciate it very much.

1 I'll see if I can make this work. Excellent. Okay.

2 I want to start in: I want to welcome you
3 to this. This is the Chanute Air Force Base
4 Installation Restoration Program Meeting. It's
5 February 10 in the year 2000. I want to discuss the
6 Landfill RI/FS Project, and where we're at is, you can
7 see we have four landfills: Landfill 1, 2, 3 and on
8 the far side is 4.

9 Okay. The Landfill RI/FS: The scope of
10 this is the four landfills: Heritage Lake, Salt Fork
11 Creek, and also, a Background Characterization Study.
12 Our approach is to use surface geophysics, geologic
13 and hydrogeologic characterization, and waste mass
14 characterization.

15 Our Accomplishments right now have included
16 Salt Fork Creek monitoring, continued comprehensive
17 groundwater characterization study. We've installed
18 our 58 Wisconsin wells and our 24 Illinois wells that
19 are in the first round of sampling on those wells. We
20 will also conduct a second round of sampling in the
21 June time frame.

22 We've completed our landfill perimeter
23 trenching to try and identify the perimeter of where
24 the landfills are at, and we are continuing our fish

1 tissue study. However, at this point in time, the
2 lake is a little frozen over for us to do much
3 fishing.

4 Our future work elements are an Interim
5 Record of Decision, a background characterization of
6 the surface water, the groundwater, and also sediments
7 in the Salt Fork Creek area, continued comprehensive
8 groundwater investigation of the Wisconsin and
9 Illinoisan groundwater and surface water and sediment
10 characterizations.

11 Our Key Milestones right now is: We hope
12 to have our field work completed here in March. Round
13 2 groundwater, again, I mentioned that earlier, is
14 June of 2000. Our RI Report is scheduled in August of
15 2000. The FS Report, the Feasibility Study Report,
16 should be out in September. And our Final Decision
17 documents should be June of 2001. And this should
18 keep us pretty much on track.

19 Our Landfills Remediation Action: We have
20 the Landfills 2 and 3 Work Plan. We are working on
21 Landfills 1 and 4 Remediation Action Work Plan, and
22 the containment of Landfills 2 and 3.

23 Our Approach is: We're going to take the
24 waste and consolidate it. We're look at putting on a

1 RCRA-Equivalent capping, looking at landfill gas
2 venting in a passive manner, and also looking at
3 leachate collection.

4 Landfills 2 and 3 right now are Remedial
5 Action Work Plans. We have a draft in February. Our
6 Draft Final should be done in May, and the Final in
7 2000. We hope to start construction this year, and
8 have it completed by December.

9 Landfills 1 and 4 we're scheduling for
10 fiscal year 2001 to do Landfill 1, and start and
11 finish Landfill Number 4 by September of 2002.

12 This is our OU-1 Sites Remedial
13 Investigation. We initially started out with ten
14 sites, as you can see them there. Our reconnaissance
15 discovered some additional sites, and we're also
16 involved right now in what we call the Veterans
17 Parkway Investigation.

18 Our Approach is two phases: One is our
19 Source Characterization, and then we're going to go
20 into the Remedial Investigation and the Feasibility
21 Study.

22 Our Accomplishments so far: We've done our
23 records search and our site reconnaissance and we've
24 completed that. We've identified the ten sites, and

1 also discovered a few more that we've added on. We're
2 working on a Draft Veterans Parkway Plan to assist the
3 City in getting the Veterans Parkway completed.

4 We're also doing a Source Characterization
5 Work Plan, and that's about 80 percent completed right
6 now.

7 Our Key Milestones in our field work is
8 site reconnaissance; we completed that in June of
9 1999. We have some screening work plans that we
10 completed in 1999. Our Veterans Park field work,
11 we're hoping to get out there and have that all done
12 in February, having our screening work, field work
13 done in February, and then actually get out and do the
14 field work in the summer.

15 Our RI Report is due in May of 2000,
16 following closely with the June of 2001 for the FS
17 Report. And then, hopefully, we'll have our Decision
18 Documents in September of 2001.

19 The Veterans Parkway Time Critical Removal
20 Action: The scope of this is to go in and excavate
21 and dispose of former coal pile storage areas from
22 around the City to build Veterans Parkway. We're
23 going in and we're going to be doing some confirmation
24 sampling, and then we're going to be doing a Closure

1 Report.

2 Our Approach and Schedule right now is to
3 develop our work plans, and get in there and have the
4 removal started in March, and hopefully have it
5 completed on the April deadline that we've worked out
6 with the City.

7 Okay. Our OU-2 Sites Remedial
8 Investigation. We have eleven sites. They're down in
9 this greenish shaded area down at the bottom, and they
10 include the fire training areas and some of the older
11 buildings, the jet test cells, and the facilities
12 there.

13 Our Approach for this is screen level
14 characterization, and then we want to follow it up
15 with definitive sampling to identify the risk and what
16 type of remediation objectives we may need to
17 accomplish the clean-up in those areas.

18 Our Accomplishments to date: We've done a
19 surface geophysics. We've done our site
20 characterization. We've gone in and actually done the
21 drilling and logging. We've gone into a shallow soils
22 investigation, and also into the shallow water
23 investigation.

24 We're in the process of finalizing the

1 Draft Report, and we'll be initiating the Draft Phase
2 Work Plan and Sampling Action Plan here shortly. Our
3 future work elements include submitting the Draft and
4 Final Phase 1 Reports, Phase 2 Work Plans, the Final
5 Phase 2 Sampling and Analysis Addendums to the Base
6 Wide Sampling and Analysis Plan.

7 We're looking at Field Sampling Plans, the
8 Quality Assurance and Project Plans, and then also
9 performing our definitive sampling. Basically, what
10 this does is it builds a platform for us to go out and
11 do OU-2 sampling and investigation.

12 Our Key Milestones to date is we should
13 have our Phase 2 Field Work done in the spring - early
14 summer. Our RI/FS Report will be done in the winter
15 of 2000, and our Decision Documents should be in place
16 somewhere in the neighborhood of January 2001.

17 Our Underground Storage Tank Program: We
18 have several underground storage tanks that have
19 either been removed or have some characterization
20 issues.

21 Buildings 502, 503, 747, and 937: We went
22 out and did additional sampling at 937; we completed
23 that January the 25th. We submitted a Closure Report
24 for Building 502 and 503, but that was withheld and

1 delayed because we had to go back out and do some
2 sampling at 937, and we needed to put those results
3 in, some of the sampling that we got back and comments
4 that we got back before we were able to get the plan
5 actually submitted, and said hey, this is an error.
6 We need some more samples to clear it up.

7 Our Building 747 45-day Report was
8 submitted to the IEPA. That involved a former
9 underground storage tank area that had some
10 contamination, and we asked the IEPA to issue -- or
11 excuse me, IEMA, Illinois Emergency Management Agency,
12 to issue us incident numbers so that we could track
13 those in accordance with the regulations, and part of
14 that is to submit a 45-day Report as to what we're
15 doing for cleanup and that type of thing.

16 We went in and removed soil December the
17 17th, and we're submitting the Completed Action
18 Enclosure Report. I think it's already been
19 submitted, as I recall. Okay, it just got submitted,
20 real recently.

21 Building 700: We've done our soil and
22 groundwater analytical results, and they do meet the
23 TACO Tier 1 remedial objectives. We prepared a report
24 instead of the Tier 2 Evaluation Report, we submitted

1 a Closure Report to the Illinois Environmental
2 Protection Agency, and we're right now waiting for
3 them to finish their review on that, and give us
4 approval for Final Closure, and that ties in very
5 closely to the Veterans Parkway Project.

6 Building 950: Our Closure Report again was
7 submitted, and we're not trying to pin down the IEPA.
8 These closure reports do take some time to review and
9 all, so we're waiting for them to finish their report,
10 and we can get some closure there.

11 Also Buildings 64, 711, and 902 just got
12 submitted, and we're waiting again for that to be
13 reviewed. Now, all of these are what we kind of
14 consider a low-hanging fruit, due to the fact that we
15 have a lot of other projects that are a higher
16 priority, and we don't expect the IEPA to be able to
17 drop everything they're doing to take a low-hanging
18 fruit and get it back to us, you know, as a critical
19 item.

20 We're allowing them some space and some
21 time to work the projects and work the critical items,
22 and then reply to these as they can.

23 Our OWS, AST, and UST and Miscellaneous
24 Sources Program: This is being done by Montgomery

1 Watson, and it includes the removal of oil and water
2 separators we call OWS's. We're looking to obtain
3 closure at three OWS Sites under the IRP Program.
4 We're obtaining closure of miscellaneous sources of
5 Building 950 - things like pipes and plumbing and
6 pumps, things like this - associated with fuel and
7 contamination sources.

8 Sampling five of the original 76 AST Sites,
9 and this is due to a visual inspection of these sites.
10 We found some staining on the ground, and what we want
11 to do is make sure that that is not a large, extended
12 contamination; and if it is, get it cleaned up.
13 Mr. Boudreaux?

14 MR. BOUDREAUX: Are you planning on removing any
15 additional OWS's at this time, or the ones that were
16 currently closed a long time ago and certified as
17 clean, they're going to stay in the ground?

18 MR. PITTS: We have a --

19 MR. BOUDREAUX: 728, for instance?

20 MR. PITTS: To answer your question, we have not
21 reached that point of discussion yet. It was brought
22 up: Why don't we just leave them in the ground? We
23 can clean them, and certify them clean, and we can get
24 a letter that they're clean and there's no

1 contamination around them, instead of removing them,
2 why don't we just leave them? That was -- it is being
3 addressed at this immediate point in time, and the
4 removal is part of the original scope.

5 So, if we can modify that and save some
6 money, and make the regulators happy, and make the
7 Village happy at the same time, then we are looking at
8 that as an issue.

9 MR. BOUDREAUX: Well, I'd like to be involved in
10 that decision when it's made.

11 MR. PITTS: I'll be more than happy to address
12 that at the appropriate time.

13 MR. BOUDREAUX: Thank you, very much.

14 MR. PITTS: Where was I? Remove Targeted AST's:
15 We have approximately 16 above ground storage tanks,
16 and for various reasons, we want them removed. It's
17 an attempt to remove some of the liability by having
18 the tank turned over to a lessee, or something like
19 that, and have them improperly use it for a chemical
20 product, or whatever, that it doesn't -- that the tank
21 wasn't originally intended for, and then we have leaks
22 and spills and future problems.

23 We want to eliminate that. We've
24 identified some of these. We have one or two tanks

1 that contain sulfuric acid and various other things,
2 for water cooling towers in the past, and we
3 definitely want to make sure that those are taken out,
4 so that there's no chance of anybody getting anything
5 on them or have any problems.

6 We also are looking at obtaining some
7 administrative closure at 2 AST Sites and 15
8 miscellaneous sources, and also, we're sampling 14 UST
9 Sites and associated sites, fuel lines, and that type
10 of thing, that have been removed, taken out of the
11 ground, and need to be closed. We need to get some
12 formal closure, so we go in and sample them, and make
13 sure everything is okay.

14 My Residential Well Sampling Program: We
15 sampled four wells off base at four residences in the
16 time period of 6 January of 2000. We have one more
17 round of residential sampling that we will be doing.
18 We planned that approximately in the May 2000 time
19 frame. We're still continuing to provide the
20 residents in those homes with bottled drinking water
21 until we get this study all done and completed.

22 Any questions?

23 MS. RAUCH: How many samplings do you plan to do?
24 I mean, is this the last one?

1 MR. PITTS: One more. We have one more to do.

2 MS. RAUCH: After May?

3 MR. PITTS: May, is it.

4 MS. RAUCH: May, is it?

5 MR. PITTS: Yeah, this is third round we're on
6 now, and we have one more to do.

7 MR. BOUDREAU: Any results of the previous two
8 samplings?

9 MR. PITTS: I'm going to defer that one to Virlon
10 Suits, due to the fact that -- that number 1, I wasn't
11 here during the previous two samplings, and I would
12 hate to step on my toes by saying something that
13 wasn't correct.

14 Virlon, can you give any input as to the
15 results of the previous two rounds of samplings? Am I
16 putting you on the spot? I don't mean to.

17 MR. SUITS: Well, you have put me on the spot.
18 You're taxing the memory, and I don't know. Gary or
19 Ron, can you help me?

20 MR. BOUDREAU: There must not have been any red
21 flags.

22 MR ADAMS: I think there are enough people here
23 from the Air Force who are more intimately familiar
24 with the data, and can answer that question.

1 MR. BOUDREAUX: If you don't remember, there were
2 probably no red flags.

3 MR. FLEMING: Back to the first one, obviously,
4 there were two samples taken at one location, and
5 there was high levels of lead, or elevated levels of
6 lead at the one location. The other sample did not
7 show lead, and then we have very low levels of dioxins
8 and furans.

9 MR. BOUDREAUX: And the second sample was?

10 MR. PITTS: There wasn't anything.

11 MR. FLEMING: There wasn't anything in the second
12 sample. It did not show --

13 MR. FLEMING: And that's why we're doing an
14 additional two rounds.

15 MR. PITTS: Fire Training Area --

16 MR. FLEMING: We'll defer that after the reuse
17 and community involvement.

18 MR. PITTS: Right. Ray Boudreaux, would you like
19 to discuss community re-use issues?

20 MR. BOUDREAUX: Yes.

21 MR. PITTS: Ray, I need to emphasize something
22 here. I realize that we still have about another 40
23 minutes to go, you don't get all of the 40 minutes,
24 okay? Just kidding.

1 MR. BOUDREAUX: Many tire kickers in the area
2 this winter, not like most winters. We've shown
3 Hangar 3 several times, Smith Hall several times,
4 Hangar 2 several times. A gentleman will be holding
5 an auction in Hangar 3. I'm sure everybody's seen a
6 lot of activity around that building.

7 The gentleman will hold an auction in
8 Hangar Number 3 in March. I'm sure you've seen a lot
9 of activity around the building. They're bringing in
10 equipment and stuff they want to sell from all over
11 the country. There will be a big auction. The
12 gentleman still has the building leased through the
13 month of June. We hopefully will have that building
14 leased before the end of that.

15 The Textron addition is nearing completion.
16 The first press to go into that new building - this is
17 a press for automotive plastic parts - will be
18 delivered in two weeks. Last month, we had a lot of
19 questions about White Hall and the hospital. I tried
20 to answer those as best I could, but I did invite
21 tonight Mr. Harold Miles, the developer for both of
22 those properties, to come in and address this forum
23 and maybe help answer your questions.

24 Harold is over here on the -- Harold, if

1 you'd please stand, and maybe give the RAB Members a
2 little bit of an idea of what's going on with the two
3 projects.

4 MR. MILES: Okay, thank you, Ray. I've hired
5 Charles Foley - he's an associate from out of
6 Springfield, and we are exploring the possibilities of
7 a nursing home in the hospital. We've done market
8 surveys, and we're doing a lot of other surveys of
9 different inner things that would go with the
10 hospital, and I think we're going to -- by March,
11 we're really going to know which direction we're
12 going.

13 And as far as White Hall, I've hired --
14 what we're trying to do is take White Hall and the
15 hospital and kind of make those two work together.
16 And we are looking at -- we've got two architect
17 firms, engineering firms - we haven't decided which
18 ones we wanted to go with - but they've got many
19 different possible uses for White Hall, and especially
20 for the hospital.

21 And the way they've been saying it, they
22 really think there's a lot of potential there. And as
23 far as -- I think within another -- the 1st of March
24 or 1st of April, we'll have more update on that.

1 Thank you. Any questions or anything?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's that building
3 called by White Hall?

4 MS. RAUCH: People's Center.

5 MR. MILES: People's Center.

6 MR. BOUDREAUX: Building P-16.

7 MS. RAUCH: I mean, that has been a terrible
8 mess.

9 MR. MILES: Okay, yeah. We are looking, and
10 we're thinking about -- it depends on what the
11 architect's plans are on that building there.
12 Something is going to be done with it. Either a new
13 roof or tear it down, or -- we're just waiting for
14 more survey on that.

15 MR. BOUDREAUX: Thanks very much, Harold. We put
16 in the budget for this next year, a demolition line
17 item so that we can start the demolition program, as
18 you all have brought up many times. You're interested
19 in some of the older buildings to be demolished. And
20 I guess next year we've put 826, which is the
21 two-story barracks that has Mirage Drum and Bugle
22 Corps sign out in front of it, so that is the plan for
23 this next year is to demolish that.

24 Of course, that budget has to be approved

1 by the Village Board, and that process is under way.
2 The new boiler conversion project and to shut down the
3 steam plant, you know that happened in the fall. The
4 new boiler project though will continue with a lot of
5 little problems, and those problems are being worked,
6 and the project looks to be quite successful and
7 nearing the completion.

8 The new power line construction also that
9 impacted some of the sites around here is also nearing
10 completion. Very few problems with that project.

11 The Balloon Championship voted unanimously
12 to hold a competition again this summer: August 4
13 through 13 this year. We've begun looking for
14 sponsors and supporters. Invitations to competitors
15 go out in two weeks, and for your information, we've
16 been put on the list for a B-2 and F-117, and for an
17 A-10 this year as far as the fly-by is concerned.

18 The runway project that I briefed last
19 meeting has been changed. We will be continuing to do
20 a Phase 2 of 09/27 rebuild, but that project will only
21 be at 5/8 inch overlay of a very high tinsel strength
22 asphalt coating which will then act as an inner layer
23 when we get into Phase 3 of that project.

24 We'll be doing an environmental update this

1 year for extension of the runway and purchasing some
2 land off the east end. We have a looker for Smith
3 Hall, as I mentioned earlier. I should know by next
4 meeting whether we have a new occupant for that
5 building. And that's all I have, unless there are
6 questions.

7 MS. WIRGES: What did you say for the balloon?

8 MR. BOUDREAU: August 4 through 13.

9 MR. PITTS: Outstanding. Thank you, Ray. As
10 always, you're very articulate, and you got it right
11 down to the minute. Outstanding. I have a letter.

12 MR. FLEMING: We'll now get to the Fire Training
13 Area, Building 932 Project. There's been a lot of
14 controversy going on about it. The Air Force
15 supposedly making some changes. I know that the
16 Village has got a statement that they want to present.
17 We have a letter from a Miss Vickie Flam of
18 Harristown, the west edge of Decatur that she wants
19 read at the meeting.

20 I know both of the agencies want to speak
21 to this matter. What the Air Force is stating is that
22 we will be disposing of contaminated soil based on
23 risk base clean-up levels at both FTA 2 and Building
24 932. The only issue -- the issue that's come up and

1 that we're proposing to make some changes to is the
2 question of how much soil will be removed.

3 What the Air Force is proposing at this
4 site is different from what our previously announced
5 decision was, and I emphasized it's not endorsed by
6 either regulatory agency. The previous clean-up
7 objectives, as proposed by USEPA and IEPA, and
8 admittedly agreed to by the Air Force, we're proposing
9 to reevaluate those.

10 We believe that if these values are used,
11 they would not represent a judicial use of the
12 taxpayer dollars, and they don't, and so we're looking
13 at making a change. And the reasons we're doing it is
14 that we believe the technical assumptions that were
15 used were not valid based on standard engineering and
16 industry practices, and it is our opinion that the
17 clean-up objectives that were proposed, we cannot meet
18 them as they are currently proposed.

19 We also state that the Air Force believes
20 it has gone above and beyond what would normally be
21 required. The results of the risk characterization
22 indicated that remedial action is not warranted at
23 either site base on commercial/industrial use of the
24 property. Even when residential use was considered,

1 remedial action would not be warranted based for
2 adults, and may or may not be for children.

3 The two choices: residential and
4 industrial/commercial based on re-use are what we're
5 looking at. We will be using standard engineering
6 industry practices. The re-use we'll look at is from
7 an industrial/commercial standpoint. Residential, we
8 will look at comparing it to TACO Tier 1 or a redesign
9 PRG.

10 It's very important to remember that this
11 is an interim action only, and it is going to be
12 followed by a completed remedial investigation and
13 Feasibility Study which will determine the appropriate
14 and final remedy for this site.

15 Regarding groundwater, as far as
16 groundwater being affected by the soils left in place,
17 this issue will be resolved through the OU-2 RI/FS,
18 which was briefed earlier. Be assured that the Air
19 Force will take any and all necessary actions to be
20 protective of this site, or any site at Chanute.

21 And why did we agree to do this in the
22 first place? I really cannot answer that. I really
23 can't. I was not involved in it. But we believe -- I
24 believe that it was an error, and we're looking to

1 rectify it. And we will be looking at, as I stated,
2 we will be looking at industrial/commercial and
3 residential, and be making a decision based on
4 risk-based numbers.

5 MR. BOUDREAUX: Would you please explain what you
6 just said to the RAB Members who I know? You are
7 saying now that the planned project which had been
8 planned to remove this soil is not what you're going
9 to do?

10 MR. FLEMING: No, we are going to remove soil.
11 We are going to remove soil. That is a given. The
12 only issue is right now, is how much soil, and how
13 much soil is going to be predicated on the risk
14 associated and the clean-up objectives that are
15 calculated. We are proposing to go back and
16 recalculate what the cleanup objectives are.

17 MR. BOUDREAUX: You want to go ahead and read
18 your other thing before you have me do this?

19 MR. FLEMING: As I said, this is a statement from
20 a Vickie Flam, F-L-A-M, of Harristown, the west edge
21 of Decatur.

22 "The evening of Thursday, February
23 3, 2000, many concerned citizens of
24 Harristown, Illinois, met with

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

1
Illinois EPA, Macon County Landfill
Manager and the press to obtain more
information pertaining to the
possible disposal of soil from
Chanute Air Force Base.

Many of the residents were angry
about not being informed by the
landfill and the US Air Force Base.
The fact sheet that Mr. Suits was
kind enough to send to me was read
at the meeting.

We invited as many people in our
community as we could hoping to
inform them as factually as
possible. Our purpose was to obtain
more information, and offer our
neighbors and friends what
information we had gathered. It
would have been very beneficial to
our community if a representative
from the US Air Force could have
been in attendance. That, however,
did not happen.

1 Bits and pieces of information
2 that may or may not explain all the
3 facts lead to speculation and
4 doubts. Concerns were raised about
5 the fact that information was
6 published in the Rantoul News and
7 meetings were held in Rantoul
8 informing the public about your
9 proposal.

10 We are sure that the citizens of
11 Rantoul are relieved that they will
12 reclaim the property from the Base
13 after Federal tax dollars have been
14 used to clean it up.

15 The residents here are very angry
16 about the reasons why no one
17 bothered to inform our community of
18 this potential plan. The residents
19 of Harristown have urged our
20 legislators to push for a public
21 hearing in our community before any
22 bids are accepted on this proposal,
23 and we would like to encourage the
24 US Air Force to do the same thing.

1 Many residents spoke out in anger
2 and are concerned that the people
3 who seek to gain the most from this
4 proposal are the landfill owners and
5 operators. The price tag slated for
6 this operation is quite a lot, and
7 paid for, in part, by the citizens
8 who are asking for some
9 consideration in this situation.

10 The very least you can do is
11 inform the public of your intention
12 and notify them in their own
13 community.

14 In closing, I would like to add that
15 the people in government whom the
16 American public put their trust must
17 be responsible and held accountable
18 for their actions. It is my hope
19 that this kind of horrible
20 environmental contamination never
21 happens again.

22 What a terrible waste of our
23 resources and extreme cost to the
24 American public. I personally do

1 not want to see this soil hauled
2 into my neighborhood and dumped into
3 the local landfill.

4 I am very concerned about the
5 inhalation problem coming from the
6 landfill, and now add to that the
7 soil from your base filled with,
8 just to name a few: insecticides,
9 pesticides, metals, dioxins, etc.,
10 etc.

11 I can only hope that you people
12 know what you are doing, and that
13 you are not sacrificing my
14 neighborhood and home because it is
15 the cheapest and most efficient way
16 to deal with your problem.

17 Sincerely, Vickie Flam."

18 MR. BOUDREAUX: The Mayor called me in my office
19 at 6:00 after seeing -- or at 6:30 after seeing the
20 6:00 news tonight, and asked that I bring a question
21 to you on behalf of the citizens, but it is a request
22 from the Mayor, and he does ask that: Have you
23 considered keeping the soil on the site and using low
24 temperature volatilization much like we did with the

1 UST soils and the soils from the 700 underground
2 storage tanks and several other underground storage
3 tanks, and would you be willing to consider that?

4 MR. FLEMING: I can answer that it was considered
5 as part of the original analysis, and it was
6 determined that that was -- there was better use; that
7 was not the way to go. Can we look at it again? We
8 probably could. However, I think there would be
9 issues raised by the agencies in terms of doing
10 on-site thermal.

11 MR. BOUDREAUX: It's a volatile situation.

12 MR. FLEMING: We can and we will go ahead and
13 look at it again, but I can't --

14 MR. BOUDREAUX: The Mayor's concern is the way
15 it's been presented on TV, and, of course, there's no
16 way that we can control what a person on TV is going
17 to say. But the fact is that it's Rantoul's dirt
18 that's going someplace else, and that is what concerns
19 the Mayor. If there's any way we can maybe mitigate
20 that, because, as you know, the Mayor is doing some
21 work to try and change our image, as we've been doing
22 for now nine years, and to continue that process to
23 bring people to town, but Rantoul's got bad dirt.

24 That's what he's concerned about, and

1 Rantoul doesn't have bad dirt. We have an area that
2 needs to be looked at, so he's very concerned about
3 that. And I'm a messenger just bringing that message
4 to this forum, and if you'd like to have the
5 opportunity to respond from the IEPA, that would --

6 MR. STEWARD: Ron Steward with the IEPA. You
7 bring up a good point, and I guess I have big concerns
8 with re-evaluating this CERCLA because we did -- did
9 go through the evaluation. We came to a decision, and
10 that was the Air Force that put together the
11 evaluation that we considered. And we came to the
12 off-site disposal as being the best solution, and even
13 more than was discussed there, we believed it was the
14 most cost-effective solution.

15 There's a lot of unanswered questions with
16 the -- how appropriate the low temperature thermal
17 absorption will deal with everything. But I think
18 there have been about a half dozen project managers
19 from the IEPA that worked on this project. And I
20 guess it was declared a BRAC site from back in '88.
21 And I know the more recent ones that I've been able to
22 talk to express their frustration that it's taken all
23 of this time.

24 They've thrown out two complete remedial

1 investigations, and they still haven't remediated
2 anything. And I've only been working on this for six
3 months, and now I thought we came to the decision for
4 a significant action, and it seemed like we were all
5 in agreement at one time, and it was the Air Force's
6 evaluation that we agreed to, and now I'm hearing the
7 second guessing of that evaluation and going back and
8 starting over from scratch on this one removal action.

9 MR. BOUDREAUX: Do you think there's any
10 possibility we might be able to do some kind of a
11 public education process? I'm not an environmentalist
12 nor am I an engineer nor do I have a clue of how any
13 of those things work. But I do know that what you
14 have told me in the past is the fact that it's being
15 taken to a landfill that's licensed and built and
16 constructed and everything else for this particular
17 purpose.

18 Is there any way that we can educate the
19 public so we don't get a black eye?

20 MR. STEWARD: Yes. I've been spending a lot of
21 time trying to respond to letters from concerned
22 citizens, and I went to the meeting that Vickie Flam
23 talked about to try and address the concerns and
24 answer questions, and I know that we've offered to

1 have a public availability session for a chosen site
2 to specifically address people's questions regarding
3 the landfill or the contaminants or the disposal.

4 Because, like I said, we went through this
5 entire evaluation, and that was our determination of
6 what was the most protective of the environment and
7 most cost effective way to deal with it. So, I think
8 that we are dealing with a communication problem as
9 far as addressing people's concerns.

10 MS. RAUCH: You say you're going to change it
11 now. I hate to hear that. I understand the dilemma.
12 Nobody wants it and the minute you start saying that,
13 you know, you don't think this thermal thing is going
14 to take care of it because it's severe, why -- I mean,
15 it's just an emotional issue.

16 But, my goodness, we have got to do
17 something, but how in the world can you say we're
18 going to take less dirt and take it somewhere when
19 they don't want any of it? I don't see how that's a
20 solution either.

21 MR. FLEMING: We're still evaluating -- or still
22 looking at different landfills. The landfills that I
23 think are in Mr. Black's district and Mr. Mitchell's
24 district, we've ruled those out. We are looking at

1 possibly -- the ones that we're looking at right now
2 very closely: Joliet, CID south of Chicago, and
3 possibly Terre Haute, Indiana, and see whether or not
4 they would meet the off-site determination and whether
5 or not they could accept.

6 Our issue with what was proposed is that we
7 don't -- do not feel we can meet those final
8 objectives no matter how much we took out, how much
9 soil. We're looking at trying to do something a
10 little bit more realistic. We're still going to move
11 the dirt.

12 Now, the issue right now that Ray brought
13 up, and that we're going to have to sit down and
14 re-address it, with the coordination of the agencies,
15 is whatever we decide, or how much we decide to move,
16 do we take it to a landfill or do you try and find
17 something on-site to do with it? I don't know. I
18 don't have that answer. It will be done, and it will
19 be done this year. That, I give you my word.

20 MR. BOUDREAUX: If you plan to use -- and I've
21 been to all these meetings for how many years now, and
22 I can tell you that you have done very good, due
23 diligence in working this problem. Now the question I
24 would have: How soon will you have selected a site

1 for disposal, if that's the way you plan to go?

2 MR. FLEMING: I would say we'll have a potential
3 site within the next 30 days, and that's being
4 conservative on the outside. The issue that we have
5 to do is work with the agencies to determine what
6 we're going to remove.

7 MR. BOUDREAUX: Now that you have made that
8 change, can I ask you -- and I don't know the clean-up
9 objectives. I know that there were 70,000 cubic
10 yards, or something like that, of soil. Has that
11 changed? Is that what you're saying now?

12 MR. FLEMING: Based on the All Pathways, we would
13 be required to remove 70,000 cubic yards, and that
14 probably would not -- we would not meet the clean-up
15 objectives. If we went to a residential, I believe,
16 against Tier 1 or Region 9 PRG's, we would probably be
17 able to cut that to 40,000.

18 If we went based on the earlier numbers
19 that were done, if we went as industrial/commercial,
20 adding 10 to the minus 6, which was a normal point of
21 departure, we would be removing probably about 10,000
22 cubic yards. And those are just preliminary numbers.
23 That doesn't mean that's what would be removed.

24 MR. BOUDREAUX: And that doesn't mean that that's

1 what would be approved by the agencies and that still
2 has to be approved by the agencies.

3 MR. SCHAFER: I would like to make a statement at
4 this juncture for my agency. Please bear with me. My
5 voice is -- I hope you can hear me. I would like to
6 take it back to our October RAB meeting, where there
7 were two proposals about what the volumes were going
8 to be at. There was a 90,000 cubic yard volume and a
9 64,000 cubic yard volume.

10 The discussions we had in the October BCT
11 regulators felt, and continue to feel, that the All
12 Pathways Remedial Objectives are appropriate. Those
13 are not based on residential readings. That's what
14 is, I think, being misleading to you here - those
15 standards of -- based on protection of the groundwater
16 beneath the site.

17 It has nothing to do with whether or not
18 there are going to be houses on that property. It has
19 everything to do with the amount of contamination in
20 the soil, and the ability of that contamination to
21 make it down into the ground water, and proceed out in
22 the surface water bodies and beyond.

23 What my Agency was confronted with today
24 was basically, the Air Force is instructing us that

1 the agreements that we have reached and that you have
2 heard about in the previous BCT meetings were off the
3 table. My Agency's position, for the record - and
4 this has been expressed to the Air Force on a number
5 of levels, and we will continue to do so - is that any
6 change in the clean-up objectives is unacceptable to
7 my Agency. That's the bottom line.

8 We felt we had an agreement. I've got RAB
9 meeting minutes. I've got approved documents, and
10 I've got a final action memorandum issued by the Air
11 Force to me on November 23 that talks about the
12 importance of conducting remedial action as it's been
13 selected.

14 This is an Air Force document. This is
15 found in the Administrative Record. You can find this
16 in the library under File 4830. Some of the important
17 parts to consider here is there is a discussion of why
18 the Air Force selected the larger volume; the
19 technical basis, if you will.

20 Under Section 6, page 9, under expected
21 change in situation should action be delayed or not
22 taken? Failure to implement the proposed removal
23 action would greatly increase the potential for
24 continued exposures from the contaminants from FTA-2.

1 The on-site contamination has the potential to spread
2 from the soil to the nearby surface water bodies
3 and/or leach into the ground water system.

4 Contamination of these water systems,
5 especially leaching of contaminants into the
6 groundwater, has the potential to impact drinking
7 water supplies in the surrounding areas. Now, again,
8 that is from an Air Force document based on data
9 collected by the Air Force and generated by the
10 contractors and evaluated as same.

11 Now what we're hearing now is the Air Force
12 doesn't believe any of that is true, and the Air Force
13 wants to go and reconsider all of this, and that is
14 unacceptable to my Agency.

15 MR. STEWARD: It's unacceptable to my Agency as
16 well.

17 MR. BOUDREAUX: I don't have any other questions.
18 I got more answer than I had planned.

19 MS. RAUCH: What does that mean?

20 MR. BOUDREAUX: I'll tell you what that means:
21 There's going to be a lot of talking between these
22 guys and these guys in the next 30 days if we're going
23 to have a final decision made, and I can tell you what
24 the City would probably want to do is ensure that we

1 have the cleanest possible site.

2 That was the basis on which the Air Force
3 came in and said that they would do. They've always
4 said that they would clean up the area. It may not be
5 back the way the Good Lord made it, but it would be
6 very close. So the idea would be that we want a safe
7 site, and the an Air Force in all of our past
8 dealings, they want a safe site.

9 The IEPA and the EPA want a safe site. So
10 there's going to have to be some talking done in the
11 next 30 days in order to get that done, so we can have
12 a closure to this issue, and it needs to be done this
13 year, because the money is available and we need to go
14 and ahead and get the work done. I think the answer
15 is we've raised a very critical issue, and that
16 issue -- I think that the bottom line is the issue
17 will be solved with everybody working together.

18 MR. FLEMING: One way or another.

19 MR. BOUDREAUX: Thank you.

20 MR. FLEMING: Anybody else have any other
21 questions?

22 MS. RAUCH: Is there some way that the RAB
23 Members can be informed when this is decided?

24 MR. FLEMING: Yes, ma'am.

1 MR. BOUDREAUX: In fact, I wouldn't mind having a
2 special meeting of the Members to make sure.

3 MR. FLEMING: We can do that.

4 MS. WIRGES: I have a question in the back of my
5 mind tonight: Do the people really understand what
6 contamination means? Is there a true understanding of
7 that term when it goes out to the public or the lay
8 people?

9 MR. FLEMING: That's probably where the biggest
10 issue is, and I think Ron touched on it that it's
11 communication. I don't think that -- I think it's
12 being blown way out of proportion in terms of what
13 contamination is. Yes, it is contaminated soil.

14 Is it hazardous, contaminated soil? No.

15 MR. BOUDREAUX: There's a difference.

16 MR. FLEMING: There's a significant difference in
17 the levels of contamination in the soil than something
18 that would propose a significant --

19 MR. BOUDREAUX: Remember, Lorraine, early, we
20 looked even at - with this particular soil - taking it
21 and spreading it out on a farm field. I think the
22 reason it was turned down is because of the smell or
23 something. I forget. It's been a long time ago.

24 MR. SCHAFER: Gary Schafer, USEPA. The other

1 side of the story is the EPA has a different
2 perspective on the levels of contamination. The
3 levels do not make a hazardous waste by definition for
4 disposal purposes, hazardous, as in the law.

5 But the levels are there with the Air
6 Force's own data and calculations show that it's
7 contaminating the groundwater. That was the reason
8 the Air Force selected the removal, and that was the
9 reason the legislators agreed. So, whether it's
10 hazardous or not, the levels are there. It is
11 contaminated soil.

12 This was a 4 million dollar project, 64,000
13 cubic yards. And the Air Force is now proposing to go
14 back, as I understand it, the soil only containing the
15 chemicals which are going to yield approximately 9,000
16 cubic yards at a cost of somewhere around 50,000
17 dollars, if the numbers I've seen are accurate.
18 That's what, an 85 percent reduction in the amount of
19 soil being removed?

20 That will leave soil in place that will
21 continue to contaminate the groundwater. It will
22 continue to allow the groundwater to move into the
23 creek and contaminate the creek. These are the
24 findings that are in the Air Force's studies that have

1 supported this action. So, conditions out on the site
2 have not changed. What has changed is the Air Force's
3 view of their own data.

4 MR. FLEMING: That's true. I might add, too,
5 that the development of this was with the input from
6 both agencies, and, yes, we are looking at the soil
7 only RO's, but we are looking at residential clean-up
8 numbers. It's not just that, just to clarify the
9 record here.

10 So, we have not made a decision. It's
11 going to be based on what we see and what we come up
12 with. As I stated, the numbers that All Pathway RO'd,
13 we cannot meet. We can sit there and dig up 70,000
14 cubic yards, 64,000 at Fire Training Area 2, and about
15 9,000 cubic yards or so at Building 932, a double
16 site, and we would still be at the same position that
17 we could not meet.

18 MR. SCHAFER: With all due respect, that's the
19 Air Force's opinion. The USEPA disagrees with that
20 opinion, and I do believe the State does as well.

21 MR. STEWARD: That's correct.

22 MR. FLEMING: Is there any other discussion?

23 MS. MARSH: I would like a clarification as to
24 what would happen. What would happen if it did

1 contaminate the water? You're talking hazardous, not
2 hazardous. If it contaminated the water, what would
3 be the result?

4 MR. SCHAFER: Well, under the conceptual site
5 model that we're working on right now, the result
6 would be, I believe, that we're contaminating at least
7 the superficial aquifer, the upper water bearing zone,
8 which right now I believe everybody believes is
9 interacting with the creek. That would lead to
10 contamination moving into the creek. The
11 contamination could be moving down into the lower
12 aquifers.

13 That's inconclusive at this time, but that
14 is a possibility. That's acknowledged in the portion
15 of the document that I read to you verbatim from the
16 Air Force. If the soil is left in place, the longer
17 time that material is left in place, this process
18 continues. The only way to stop this process is to
19 remove this source, and that is what both the State
20 and USEPA advocate, and to move it to levels where the
21 leaching process down through the groundwater is
22 halted.

23 There were standard calculations. They
24 were calculations proposed by the Air Force that are

1 used, I believe, in part they were generated under the
2 State regulations, if I'm not mistaken. There's
3 nothing unusual about using these numbers. So, the
4 Air Force believes those numbers and calculations.

5 MR. BOUDREAUX: You remember the difference
6 between groundwater and drinking water and what kind
7 of levels, and all that stuff.

8 MR. FLEMING: And with all due respect to the
9 agencies, we do not believe that that is the condition
10 or the case at this site. So, I mean, that's where
11 our disagreement lies. There's not any indication
12 that supports that.

13 MR. MAY: Gary May. How old is this site?

14 MR. BOUDREAUX: Thirty years.

15 MR. MAY: I mean, just ball park.

16 MR. SUITS: It goes back to 1960, as I recall.
17 Mid-'60s. Forty-five.

18 MR. MAY: And it became a concern the day the
19 base closed, or was there prior concern?

20 MR. SUITS: The concern came in in the '80s when
21 the IRP program started. That has been one of the
22 sites that has basically turned from an area of
23 concern into an IRP site.

24 MR. MAY: Landfill 1, 2, 3, and 4 is in

1 encapsulation, so you're not as concerned about those
2 as the training area, correct?

3 MR. SUITS: Well, they will be.

4 MR. MAY: They will be what?

5 MS. RAUCH: They're not encapsulated yet.

6 MR. FLEMING: No, but they will be. That's the
7 meeting at 8 that we're going to talk about.

8 MR. MAY: And the fire training is dig and haul.

9 MR. FLEMING: What has been proposed and what
10 we're still looking to do --

11 MR. MAY: And you gentlemen have put that on
12 hold.

13 MR. FLEMING: Well, we put it on hold due to the
14 controversy based on the letter from Miss Flam and
15 some of the other issues coming from Mr. Black,
16 Mr. Mitchell, Congressman Schimkus, Congressman
17 Phelps. Yes?

18 MR. MAY: So when you say that it's going to be
19 removed, do you mean removed and trucked to Terre
20 Haute, or do you mean it's going to be removed --
21 excuse me, I've got a mint in my mouth. Do you mean
22 it's going to be removed on base and maybe moved 1,000
23 feet so to speak?

24 MR. FLEMING: The current project is to - once it

1 is initiated - is to remove it and send it to a
2 landfill. We have not done -- changed from that.

3 MR. MAY: And I don't know why I'm doing all the
4 talking on this thing, but I think what bothers most
5 people, and maybe would help clarify it, is to say you
6 have to move all this stuff 70,000 cubic yards, or
7 whatever, but yet on the other hand, the other hand
8 says there's nothing wrong with the dirt.

9 I think that's been a confusing issue with
10 you people all along. If there's nothing wrong with
11 it, why are we spending the money to move it?

12 MR. STEWARD: Well, there's different levels of
13 what's wrong with it. I mean, we've said it's not
14 hazardous, and that has it's own definition as far as
15 handling, but even regular municipal garbage has a lot
16 of contaminants in it, that if it's not properly
17 disposed, will leach out and contaminate the
18 groundwater and in effect the creek and so forth. And
19 so, that's the different levels that we're looking at.

20 MR. MAY: How deep is this?

21 MR. FLEMING: Not that deep.

22 MR. MAY: 20 feet.

23 MR. BOUDREAUX: 6 feet.

24 MR. MAY: Only 6 feet deep?

1 MR. FLEMING: The risk assessment that was done
2 on it, using an industrial/commercial setting, has
3 shown at both sites to be between 10 to the minus 5
4 and 10 to the minus 6, which falls within, I don't
5 know if you've -- falls within a risk management range
6 in which a decision is made whether you do remedial
7 action or you leave it in place.

8 If you're lower than 10 to the minus 6, you
9 don't have to do anything; if it's greater than 10 to
10 the minus 4, then you have to do something. You have
11 no choice. 10 to the minus 4 and 10 to the minus 6,
12 it's a range that we can negotiate with the agencies,
13 and we can come up with different options.

14 MR. MAY: And what level are you?

15 MR. FLEMING: Based on a commercial/industrial
16 setting, the numbers that we have calculated are 10 to
17 the minus 5 and 10 to the minus 6.

18 MS. RAUCH: Is that what they agree with?

19 MR. FLEMING: I don't know if they've seen those
20 numbers.

21 MR. STEWARD: I believe you're looking at the
22 impact to the human workers, and that's not addressing
23 the groundwater.

24 MR. MAY: And you have the option of going

1 commercial, residential or industrial?

2 MR. FLEMING: Well, it's usually -- when you do a
3 risk assessment, it's usually predicated on what the
4 re-use is going to be and other perimeters.

5 MR. MAY: How many acres is there?

6 MR. BOUDREAUX: It's about a 10-acre site.

7 MR. MAY: Is it vital to have a home on it?

8 MR. FLEMING: It's zoned industrial. The re-use
9 is going to be the -- from my understanding of what
10 the LRA, it's going to be industrial/commercial.

11 MR. MAY: Does it have to be re-used? With all
12 the property in this base, does it have -- is the 10
13 acres --

14 MR. BOUDREAUX: No. That has nothing to do with
15 anything. It has to do with what our plan would show
16 the use of that ground might be, and, of course, we
17 would probably develop a lot of other ground first.

18 MR. MAY: Right, that's what I'm saying.

19 MR. BOUDREAUX: I think the issue has to do with
20 groundwater and where that stuff is migrating to, and
21 if it's migrating, and those issues that are very
22 important, and from a City's perspective, that we want
23 it cleaned up so we don't have to worry about that
24 stuff migrating all around the property.

1 MR. MAY: Is there a flume?

2 MR. FLEMING: The Air Force will ensure that that
3 does not occur and that does not happen. Part of the
4 follow-on study and remedial investigation and
5 feasibility study for that operable unit includes a
6 groundwater study at that site, in which definitive
7 laboratory testing will be done.

8 MR. MAY: How much money was spent on testing
9 this?

10 MR. FLEMING: How much have we spent on the base
11 so far?

12 MR. MAY: No, just at your fire training or the
13 fire school?

14 MR. FLEMING: Between 2 and 3 million we've spent
15 on this facility so far. Since '88, in excess of 50
16 million dollars, and another 32 million on proposed or
17 contracts.

18 MR. MAY: And who is the contractor? Who's
19 benefitted from the --

20 MR. FLEMING: There's been a number of
21 contractors out here that have done work.

22 MR. MAY: More than two or three?

23 MR. FLEMING: Yeah, I do believe so.

24 MR. MAY: Five?

1 MR. FLEMING: Yes, at least five.

2 MR. MAY: And this is what they've come up with?

3 MR. PITTS: I hate to interject. We are at our
4 8:00 deadline, and if there's no other pertinent
5 questions that need to be answered at this time, if we
6 can answer at a future point in time, I'd like to make
7 a Motion that we move on to the next agenda item.

8 The next meeting we're proposing for April
9 the 6th at 7 PM. That's two months from now.

10 MR. FLEMING: If there's a requirement for one
11 before that, a special meeting, we will notify
12 everybody with the proper notification, and let them
13 know the schedule.

14 MR. PITTS: I'd like to ask the co-Chairs if
15 there's any objection to adjourning at this time?

16 (No audible response.)

17 MR. PITTS: Okay. 8:00, Landfills. The public
18 meeting for the Landfills Project will commence in
19 approximately five minutes. We'll start a little bit
20 late just to give everybody a break and a chance to
21 move around. So, if it can start at five after, we'd
22 appreciate that.

23 HEARD AND TAKEN

24

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, H. Lori Bernardy, a Notary Public,
Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that
on the said date, February 10th, 2000, the foregoing
RAB Board Meeting was taken down in shorthand by me
and afterwards reduced to typewritten form, and that
the foregoing transcript contains a true and accurate
transcription of all such shorthand notes.

I further certify that I am a disinterested
party to the proceedings herein, and that I am not a
relative of any of the parties hereto, or their
attorneys, that I am not in the employ of any of the
attorneys for the parties hereto, and am not otherwise
interested in the outcome of this cause of action.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my
hand affixed my seal this 18th of February A.D., 2000.

H. Lori Bernardy
Notary Public and
Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 084-004126



FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE