

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

FORMER CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NOVEMBER 21, 2013

Rantoul Business Center
601 South Century Boulevard
Rantoul, Illinois

1 (Restoration Advisory Board
2 Meeting commenced at 12:02 p.m.)

3 MR. CARROLL: Good afternoon. My name
4 is Paul Carroll. I'm the BRAC environmental
5 coordinator for the former Chanute Air Force Base. I
6 work for the Air Force. I'd like to welcome everyone
7 to the November 21st Restoration Advisory Board
8 meeting for Chanute. First off, I'd like to go
9 around and let the RAB members introduce themselves
10 and then we'll go around the outside and let the
11 members of the public introduce themselves.
12 Lorraine, go ahead.

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

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

17 DR. ROKKE: Doug Rokke, RAB member.

18 MR. SANDAHL: Bruce Sandahl, RAB
19 co-chair.

20 MR. FOTHERGILL: Caryl Fothergill, RAB
21 member.

22 MS. RAWLINGS: Debra Rawlings, RAB
23 member.

24 MR. HILL: Chris Hill from the

1 Illinois EPA.

2 MS. GILL: Diane Gill with CB&I.

3 MR. SPARROW: Howard Sparrow with
4 CB&I.

5 DR. BUMB: Amar Bumb, CB&I.

6 MS. MAY: Linda Cardiff May, public.

7 MS. WALSH: Mary Walsh, neighbor,
8 citizen.

9 MS. GEISSINGER: Linda Geissinger, Air
10 Force.

11 MR. SCHNEIDER: Nick Schneider, RAPPS
12 Engineering, TAPP contractor.

13 MR. CLAYTON: Bill Clayton, airport
14 manager.

15 MS. CLAYTON: Michelle Clayton,
16 citizen.

17 MR. STREFF: Michael Streff, resident
18 and FOTH Engineering.

19 MR. SMITH: Clarence Smith with the
20 Illinois EPA.

21 MR. PASSARELLI: Pete Passarelli with
22 the Village of Rantoul.

23 MR. WUBKER: Travis Wubker, CB&I.

24 MR. FARRIS: Butch Farris, CB&I.

1 MR. SHIELDS: Paul Shields, owner of
2 Shields Equipment, Rantoul.

3 MR. HUSBANDS: Jim Husbands with Booz
4 Allen Hamilton.

5 MR. TIMM: Jay Timm, Illinois EPA.

6 MS. CARSON: Maggie Carson with the
7 lieutenant governor's office.

8 MR. CARSON: I'm Bob Carson, Illinois
9 EPA.

10 MR. BAJEK: Bob Bajek, Rantoul Press.

11 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Welcome,
12 everybody. Jack, we didn't get to you. Go ahead and
13 introduce yourself while you're sitting down.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Jack Anderson, RAB.

15 (Dr. Ian Wang, RAB member, arrived
16 post introductions.)

17 MR. CARROLL: All right. Welcome.
18 There are a couple of visitors here who are hearing
19 impaired, so if we can all speak up when we talk. I
20 don't do a very good job of that. Hopefully I will.
21 If you can't hear me, please raise your hand and get
22 my attention. We'll take care of that.

23 We're getting to the action items, but
24 first I want to refer to the newsletter. If you've

1 all gotten the newsletter this month, on the second
2 page there's this little blue box on the bottom.
3 It's kind of a "How are we doing?" type thing, "How
4 are we getting the message across? Are the RABs being
5 effective?" and "How is our Website doing?" all the
6 means of communication that we have to disseminate
7 information to the public and to the RAB.

8 It's just a quick survey that you can take
9 by clicking on this survey monkey.com Internet site.
10 It lays it out right here. If you wouldn't mind
11 going to that, we would really appreciate you being
12 able to do that. You can also fill out any comments
13 about that in the comment card on the back page as
14 well. So we welcome any mode of comment concerning
15 how well we communicate the cleanup here at Chanute.

16 On the action items, first action item is
17 to approve transcripts from the August 22nd, 2013,
18 meeting.

19 MS. WIRGES: I move they be approved.

20 MS. RAWLINGS: Second it.

21 MR. CARROLL: All in favor?

22 (RAB members in favor voice aye.)

23 MR. CARROLL: Opposed?

24 DR. ROKKE: Nay.

1 MR. CARROLL: Is there a reason you're
2 opposing?

3 MR. WANG: He said nay.

4 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Do you want to
5 state a reason you're opposing or is there something
6 that needs to be corrected?

7 DR. ROKKE: Stuff that I'm concerned
8 with. We'll leave it at that for the moment.

9 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Motion carried.
10 The second action item is to add Proposed Plan
11 section to the Guide to Environmental Documents from
12 Dr. Schneider. He and I discussed that earlier, and
13 we're working to add that section. It's a general
14 section describing what Proposed Plans are and that
15 that's an important process in the CERCLA process, to
16 request and obtain public input on our cleanup
17 decisions. So we will follow through on that with
18 Dr. Schneider.

19 The second item concerning Dr. Schneider is
20 that Deb Rawlings is going to get with Dr. Schneider
21 on any issues or any additional comments she might
22 have had on the documents.

23 MS. RAWLINGS: Yes. I think I just
24 decided, since they were kind of style things, and I

1 don't know where my notes are at this point, so I
2 think we're just going to let that go.

3 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good deal. No.
4 4, community outreach opportunities. The first part
5 of that is to reach out to the high school science
6 teachers, and Denise Becnel has done that. Would you
7 like to give us a short report on that?

8 MS. BECNEL: Yes. I volunteered to
9 contact Rantoul High School and also the junior high
10 school. I was not able to contact anyone at the
11 junior high school yet, but I did speak with Ms.
12 Gowler and Ms. Hafer, who are science teachers at the
13 high school, and we discussed some possibilities.
14 These discussions are more or less ongoing. We don't
15 have anything positive at this point, but obviously
16 Chanute has great educational and historical value.

17 I mean, just all kinds of things can
18 happen -- chemistry, biology, careers, the
19 restoration, the whole environmental restoration
20 process, how many kinds of different careers there
21 are, engineers, geologists, project managers. Of
22 course, the historical value.

23 The whole restoration process, for example,
24 all of those different processes that were used to

1 restore the land, I mean, students can know that
2 right here in their own community a certain process
3 has taken place. They should be aware of that. So
4 the educational value, in my opinion, is enormous and
5 so we're just looking into some possibilities at this
6 point.

7 MR. CARROLL: Okay. On a related
8 topic, Doug Rokke was going to get in touch with Beth
9 at the middle school. Were you able to do that, Dr.
10 Rokke?

11 DR. ROKKE: Not yet.

12 MR. CARROLL: Okay.

13 MR. ANDERSON: If I could ask while
14 you're reaching out to middle schools that you
15 include St. Malachy. It is a feeder school for St.
16 Thomas More, and if we only give it to the high
17 school then the residents of our community won't have
18 access.

19 MS. BECNEL: Sure. Thanks for that
20 suggestion, yes.

21 MR. CARROLL: We look forward to
22 meeting with the teachers one on one and talk about,
23 kind of get them a little bit up to speed about our
24 cleanup activities. I'm sure they're not all that

1 familiar with it, but we would be glad to do that and
2 then we'd also be glad to also talk with their
3 students as well in the classroom situation, as well
4 as any civic groups, public groups. We still are
5 open to briefing them, meeting with them, talking
6 with them on that.

7 DR. ROKKE: I want to come back again
8 to the invitation I've expressed to you multiple
9 times to invite you to join me on my national feed
10 radio show for the military called Warrior Connection
11 on Sunday night. That's every Sunday night, again
12 from 6:00 p.m. Central time. It deals with health
13 and environmental effects, military installations,
14 bases and exposures, and helping veterans nationwide.
15 Again, Chanute is critical, and again I'd like to
16 express a direct invitation for you and I to
17 coordinate or whomever you deem necessary to join us
18 on our radio show.

19 MR. CARROLL: I've submitted that
20 request in the past to our PA folks and they've
21 turned me down on it, but I'll submit it again.

22 DR. ROKKE: I don't understand why
23 they keep turning it down.

24 MR. CARROLL: I'll submit the request

1 again. Okay. No. 5 is to consider moving RAB
2 meetings to once every six months instead of every
3 three months. We put that a little bit later in the
4 agenda so we can all talk about it, discuss it, and
5 have a vote on it. That'll be after Howard's
6 briefing.

7 Then the last one was No. 6, and we were to
8 contact Dr. Rokke's source, Mr. Michael Glasser, with
9 regard to herbicides used on Chanute. So Chris has a
10 short report on that.

11 MR. HILL: Yes. As Paul indicated at
12 the last RAB meeting in August, Dr. Rokke raised the
13 issue of alleged use and disposal of Agent Orange at
14 Chanute. Dr. Rokke indicated he had a new source of
15 information. He later identified that as Michael
16 Glasser who lives in Florida.

17 In follow-up, after the meeting, the week
18 after the meeting, I contacted Mr. Glasser by phone
19 and had a nice conversation with him. He stated that
20 he was stationed at Chanute from 1963 to 1964 and
21 indicated that he is on disability due in part to his
22 exposure to Agent Orange, and he claimed that
23 exposure occurred in his time here at Chanute.

24 I asked specifically if he handled a

1 product identified as Agent Orange, and he would only
2 say that he handled and disposed of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T
3 and asserted that it was the same as Agent Orange.

4 I asked again if he handled a product that
5 was specifically identified as Agent Orange, and he
6 said he didn't have specific information identifying
7 the use of Agent Orange at the base.

8 I asked him where he disposed of these
9 materials, and it sounds like he disposed of them in
10 Landfill 2 or, possibly, 3. He said it was kind of
11 near Heritage Lake. I offered to provide aerial
12 photographs from the time period of his service to
13 see if he could identify where the disposal took
14 place.

15 I provided him with an aerial photograph
16 from July 1960 and October 1966. That's as close as
17 we could get. He agreed to mark on there where the
18 disposal took place. To date he hasn't got back to
19 me on that.

20 DR. ROKKE: Also like to again at this
21 time, we submitted, as most members here have, a copy
22 of the Zumwalt report that Admiral Elmo Zumwalt wrote
23 regarding the misuse of Agent Orange, and his
24 testimony to Congress has been sent to members here

1 confirming the deliberate and willful disregard of
2 the health and environmental effects of the use of
3 Agent Orange, not only overseas but in the states.

4 So that Zumwalt report, which was obtained
5 from the Zumwalt family by an individual in the room
6 at this time, needed to be made public and everything
7 needs to get out. As of a few minutes ago, the
8 Danville VA is not providing that report to the
9 physicians providing us medical care and it was not
10 on the shelf of the Danville VA Medical Center as of
11 a few minutes ago.

12 So we need to ensure, the Air Force does or
13 the Department of Defense does, ensures that that
14 whole Zumwalt report is made totally public to
15 everybody and that the Danville VA provides that
16 Zumwalt report to all physicians providing medical
17 care to those of us exposed either there or here for
18 which was confirmed again by Michael Glasser.

19 So, again, we can discuss all this, but the
20 Zumwalt report needs to be made fully public with all
21 of the findings in it and the confirmations of the
22 health and environmental effects of Agent Orange and
23 the pesticides, however we do that.

24 MR. CARROLL: There's a good site

1 summary sheet that we've put out in the front that's
2 from the Illinois EPA that briefly mentions the
3 Zumwalt report and the fact that it does not mention
4 Chanute. It also talks about another report from DOD
5 that identifies the locations where Agent Orange was
6 used and tested across the world. So this report has
7 some good information on it concerning those
8 allegations about Agent Orange use on Chanute. In
9 our many, many documents, we have no indication that
10 Agent Orange was used on Chanute. I think we should
11 move on.

12 MS. RAWLINGS: Excuse me. Would you
13 indulge me, please, for a few minutes?

14 MR. CARROLL: Yes. Go ahead, Debra.

15 MS. RAWLINGS: This whole Agent Orange
16 thing and the Zumwalt stuff is just another example
17 of the witch hunt that you are on, Doug. You have
18 this thing about the federal government is lying to
19 us. You have a huge bias against it. You sent a
20 file to Bob Bajek that was titled "Lies by the USAF
21 2009." What it contained was a publication with
22 information that has been widely disseminated and
23 widely known by people all over the place.

24 So who is actually telling lies, Doug? You

1 claimed in the Rantoul Press and elsewhere that you
2 have a master's and a doctorate in physics and
3 education. What are your degrees in? What's your
4 bachelor's degree in?

5 DR. ROKKE: My bachelor's degree is in
6 physics.

7 MS. RAWLINGS: Yes. What's your
8 master's degree in?

9 DR. ROKKE: Education.

10 MS. RAWLINGS: Education.

11 DR. ROKKE: Physics and technology
12 education.

13 MS. RAWLINGS: Education. What was
14 the name of your -- what was the title of your
15 thesis?

16 DR. ROKKE: It's dealing with physics
17 education.

18 MS. RAWLINGS: No, it wasn't. Your
19 master's thesis, the title was "Necessity and
20 Educational Acquisition of Selected Vocational Skills
21 by Food Science Graduates." What about your doctoral
22 degree?

23 DR. ROKKE: That was dealing with
24 physics education.

1 MS. RAWLINGS: It was an education
2 degree, was it not?

3 DR. ROKKE: That is correct.

4 MS. RAWLINGS: What was the title of
5 your dissertation?

6 DR. ROKKE: Perceived Physics Concepts
7 Needed for Vocational Educational Technology
8 Procedure, something like that.

9 MS. RAWLINGS: Something like that.

10 DR. ROKKE: This is all irrelevant.

11 MS. RAWLINGS: No, it's not. Just
12 wait. You have monopolized these meetings for years.
13 You can let someone else talk.

14 So we've established that you do indeed
15 have a bachelor's degree in physics, but your other
16 degrees are in education. Now, you claim that you
17 were staff scientist for the agricultural engineering
18 and electrical and computer engineering departments
19 at the University of Illinois. What was your real
20 job title?

21 DR. ROKKE: Pardon me?

22 MS. RAWLINGS: You claim that you were
23 staff scientist at the agricultural engineering and
24 electrical engineering --

1 DR. ROKKE: Physical science is --
2 technical assistant and staff physicist in the
3 department.

4 MS. RAWLINGS: You were a lab
5 assistant, right, a lab assistant? A job that
6 required a high school diploma. That was from 1977
7 to 1979. You also claimed that you were staff
8 physicist for the department of food science at the
9 U of I. Staff physicist, those are your words. What
10 was your job title?

11 DR. ROKKE: That's what it is. That's
12 what we did.

13 MS. RAWLINGS: No. Your job title was
14 physical science technical assistant, a lab
15 assistant. You did that from 1979 to 1990. You have
16 also claimed that you were employed as a member of a
17 research team in nuclear physics at the University of
18 Illinois. What was your real job title when you
19 worked for the physics department?

20 DR. ROKKE: We were doing all of the
21 same stuff.

22 MS. RAWLINGS: Your job title?

23 DR. ROKKE: Why are you --

24 MS. RAWLINGS: Just be quiet and

1 answer my questions. What was your job title?

2 DR. ROKKE: It was physical science
3 and technical staff physicist.

4 MS. RAWLINGS: You were a lab
5 assistant. You set up experiments. You did stuff
6 like that. You claimed that you were, in an e-mail
7 to me, that you were recalled to active duty 20 years
8 after serving in Vietnam from my research job with
9 the University of Illinois physics department. You
10 were a lab assistant, weren't you? You claimed that
11 you were a staff physicist at the University of
12 Illinois for 19 years. Your official record says 17
13 years.

14 Doug, you have lied about your academic and
15 your working career, and there is much, much more.
16 Further, I have talked to people around this town who
17 know you well, and you have a pattern of
18 misrepresentation. So, Doug, who is lying? How is
19 anybody supposed to trust what you say about Agent
20 Orange or anything else that you drum up out of
21 elderly documents from this investigation? Thank
22 you, Paul.

23 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you, Debra.

24 MS. MAY: Excuse me. I'd like to ask

1 a question.

2 MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry. In the
3 essence of time, let us -- sorry, we want to complete
4 our --

5 MR. BAJEK: Mr. Carroll, this is an
6 open meeting.

7 MS. RAWLINGS: No. This is a meeting
8 of the RAB.

9 MS. MAY: My statement has nothing to
10 do with what just transpired. Could I please finish?

11 MR. CARROLL: I'll give you an
12 opportunity to say something after Howard's
13 presentation. We'll have the opportunity for public
14 comment. This is a Restoration Advisory Board
15 meeting, and any of the Restoration Advisory Board
16 members who have comments can comment now and the
17 public can comment later. We'll have comments before
18 we adjourn.

19 MS. MAY: Mine has nothing to do with
20 what just transpired. Okay?

21 MR. CARROLL: We'll give you that
22 opportunity.

23 MS. MAY: Thank you.

24 MR. CARROLL: Yes, ma'am.

1 MS. WIRGES: I have an objection to
2 the photos being taken without our consent.

3 MR. BAJEK: This is an open meeting.
4 This is an open meeting. If you have an objection,
5 are you trying to hide something?

6 MS. WIRGES: I beg your pardon?

7 MR. BAJEK: Are you trying to hide
8 something?

9 MS. WIRGES: Are you insinuating? I
10 take an offense to that. I'm an honest member on
11 this RAB board, and you are not to quote me.

12 MR. CARROLL: Let's move on with the
13 meeting. Thank you. Okay. Air Force's update. We
14 have, of course, two property transfers that are
15 hinging on the EDC, Economic Development Conveyance,
16 agreement. This Economic Development Conveyance
17 agreement is making good progress. The Air Force
18 intends to have that staffed towards the deputy
19 undersecretary of the Air Force by the end of this
20 month and it's intended to be approved by the end of
21 this year.

22 So by the end of this year we'll be ready
23 to transfer the first two main parcels of this
24 property, which will be 180 acres of EDC property, as

1 well as some FAA property that will go to the Village
2 via the FAA. We intend to transfer the entire
3 property by the end of fiscal year '14, which is
4 September 30th, 2014. So we're moving forward toward
5 that, and Howard will talk about the environmental
6 status toward that here in just a few minutes.

7 Next up is Dr. Schneider on the TAPP
8 contractor update. Dr. Schneider.

9 DR. SCHNEIDER: Well, I'm sorry I
10 missed the last fireworks in August, but meetings got
11 changed and I couldn't be here. I understand Paul
12 took care of my end of it fairly well.

13 In the last few months it's been kind of
14 quiet. There's been a few documents that I've gone
15 over, reviewed. They're pretty much straightforward
16 things, no further remediation at a LUST site and so
17 forth and so on. No real comments. I found nothing
18 wrong with the documents that were submitted.

19 User guide environmental documents is the
20 thing we want to complete and get done with. Paul
21 and I are working to get this new section in there to
22 tell readers about Proposed Plans and how to get
23 involved in that. Deb Rawlings does have some
24 comments. She's misplaced her notes, but I said to

1 her she can start all over again. It's not too late
2 to fix it.

3 Her concerns are basically in style. We
4 all have styles of writing and a way of writing, and
5 some of us are a little more technical than others.
6 I think, Deb, your idea was to try to smooth some of
7 the edges, and that's what we're going to try to do.
8 I know Denise and I have talked a lot about how you
9 say things so that everybody's happy. We'll work on
10 that and get that done.

11 What I really want to say here is this is
12 what I am, and this is Technical Assistance for
13 Public Participation. Now, the technical part and
14 the assistance part, that's RAPPS and Nick Schneider,
15 but that public participation is the RAB board. In
16 the last two and a half years or so, I think I've
17 been called once or twice.

18 Now, we've had a couple of study sessions
19 that we organized, which are very good because the
20 study sessions before a RAB meeting allow us to
21 discuss stuff that you might not understand. So I'm
22 going to plead again, if there are questions or if
23 there are documents, you see something that doesn't
24 make sense to you or you'd like more explanation, I

1 need to be called. I can deal with you, if you like,
2 on a one-to-one basis, or we can call a study
3 session, which is what we've done in the past.

4 And those study sessions, which they're the
5 usual -- I always say the usual suspects have
6 attended, but those of you that are interested in
7 stuff are there. I think we've been fairly fruitful
8 when we've had those sessions. We don't solve
9 everything, but we get a way to go.

10 So I'm just again appealing to the RAB, if
11 you have concerns that are technical in aspects. Not
12 political. I'm not an advocate. I've said that from
13 the very beginning. I don't advocate for the Air
14 Force. I don't advocate for anyone. My job is to
15 try to explain things if they're not clear or to look
16 up, find out, investigate if I have to.

17 So that's really all I have to say in my
18 little report today. Please make use of our
19 technical expertise. Any questions? Thank you.

20 MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Dr.
21 Schneider. As you know, the Air Force pays this
22 contract with Dr. Schneider as requested by the RAB
23 two years ago, and he's continuing to be on contract
24 so he's at your service. He is here for that

1 purpose, to help the RAB to understand cleanup. It's
2 a complicated cleanup, and it's his job to help be
3 the intermediary between us and you and to help you
4 understand things you may not understand. So please
5 use Dr. Schneider as you need to.

6 Okay. Next up is Howard Sparrow. He's
7 from Shaw, a CB&I company, and he will be discussing
8 the environmental cleanup progress.

9 MR. SPARROW: Okay. Thank you, Paul.
10 Appreciate the opportunity to be able to get here and
11 speak to everyone. I think this is probably the
12 largest group size we've had for a RAB meeting, so
13 it's good that we are getting public participation,
14 which is the intent of this meeting here today.

15 I want to give you first just kind of a
16 brief update of what we have been doing, CB&I, on
17 base for the last three months since the last RAB
18 meeting. Of course, CB&I is the contractor that the
19 Air Force has selected to do the restoration of 47
20 sites that were here remaining to be cleaned up.
21 I'll give you kind of an overview of the status of
22 all of those sites and where we stand to date with
23 those.

24 Just as a quick overview, over the last few

1 months we did complete the excavation of the soils at
2 the skeet range, and I'll go into a little bit more
3 detail about that. We do have some photos in here.
4 We also conducted a Public Meeting for the Water
5 Tower 968. It's the one on the far end of the base,
6 the last. It was removed, I think about a year ago,
7 but there is some environmental restoration to be
8 done on that site. We held a Public Meeting for that
9 since our last meeting.

10 We've been doing performance monitoring
11 again. A number of sites still have contaminants in
12 shallow groundwater for which we are continuing to do
13 the remediation. That remediation process takes
14 several years, so we are continuing to monitor that
15 treatment. There are also the four landfills. We
16 continue to operate, maintain, and monitor those
17 landfills in accordance with the state regulations,
18 and then we have completed some modifications to the
19 detention ponds around those basins. So there was
20 concern that water was standing in there, and so
21 we've just done some reconfiguration to allow the
22 water to drain from those ponds.

23 I did mention the skeet range. That's
24 really the major work effort that we've been doing

1 over the past three months. The first part of the
2 skeet range -- and, again, that was just a typical
3 skeet range that was used actually back in the 1940s
4 just for target shooting. There was lead
5 contamination from the shot that was used for the
6 skeet range, as well as contamination from the disc,
7 the skeet discs that are shot. So those skeet discs
8 were made out of -- you think that they're clay, but
9 they're made out of a pressed material that contains
10 some tars, basically, that are added so that they
11 stay together and stay formed together.

12 There was a remedial investigation
13 conducted on the skeet range a number of years ago
14 that identified some concerns with that. The Air
15 Force originally closed that site to an industrial
16 standard. It was okayed for any industrial use
17 there, but the Air Force came back and did a
18 modification and requested that that site be cleaned
19 up to a further standard that it actually is cleaned
20 up now to an unrestricted land use to a residential
21 standard. So there's no use restrictions or
22 impairments on that site now as we speak.

23 We did go out and collect additional
24 samples. Once we took the remedial investigation

1 information, we went out and collected. We started
2 in September. Seven hundred samples were collected
3 for lead, and then we collected about 130 samples for
4 PAHs, or polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Those were the
5 tars that were basically in the skeet that was shot
6 there.

7 That sampling and analysis allowed us to
8 delineate the extent of where the contamination was,
9 and then we went back out and we started excavation
10 of those materials. Basically we started in October.
11 It took us a couple of weeks. We hauled out over
12 5,000 tons of materials, I'm not sure, 300 truck
13 loads of soils that were there, and basically you
14 could find the little shards of the skeet that were
15 there. So we excavated all that material, and then
16 we've been backfilling that with clean topsoil.

17 So that backfill process is almost
18 complete. We've got maybe another couple of days and
19 all that site will be restored and all the lead
20 contamination, and PAH contamination removed to
21 unrestricted land use requirement for that. We're
22 looking at the end of November to complete that site,
23 so we should be done completely by that time.

24 I did mention the Water Tower facility,

1 968. This is the picture of the water tower
2 previously. Again, that water tower has been
3 removed. We did hold a Public Meeting on October the
4 16th here in this room to discuss the remediation of
5 the soil. There is some soil beneath that water
6 tower that has lead-based paint in that, and that is
7 above the residential unrestricted land use
8 requirement for that.

9 So the Proposed Plan for that again was to
10 go out and do some more excavation. There was a
11 public comment period. After that public comment
12 period we complete a Record of Decision, and then
13 that Record of Decision will finalize the Remedial
14 Actions to be implemented. Again, the recommended
15 Remedial Action is simply to go out and excavate that
16 material and take that to an off-site disposal
17 facility, place that into a secured landfill.

18 We anticipate going out and doing
19 additional sampling to make sure we've identified
20 where lead-based paint materials are in April, and
21 then do the excavations for that site in May.

22 I told you we'd give you a status of all of
23 our sites, and I want to just review through because
24 again one of the major purviews of this RAB is to

1 become involved in the decision-making process and
2 make sure that the community and information has
3 circulated through the community.

4 The first part of the public involvement
5 process begins with Proposed Plans, which I mentioned
6 we've gone through. We have actually completed 43 of
7 43 Proposed Plans for this restoration. So we're
8 done with the Proposed Plans. There should be no
9 more unless there's another action that the Air Force
10 needs to take at some other site. With the current
11 contract and the current information, there are no
12 more Proposed Plans to be provided.

13 Public Meetings come right during the
14 Proposed Plans and through the public comment period,
15 so we've completed all of the Public Meetings for
16 this. We are finalizing, as I mentioned, the Records
17 of Decision, both for the water tower. We're in the
18 process of doing the final approvals of that through
19 the regulatory agencies, and we also have the Records
20 of Decision for the four landfills that are there.
21 Those Records of Decision, we've held Public Meetings
22 on those and the Records of Decision are being
23 finalized.

24 So those should be finalized in the next

1 several months. I say several. It could be up to
2 six months before the Records of Decision are
3 completed, signed and approved. That's all the
4 decision-making process that we really have. We do
5 have Remedial Action work plans.

6 Once we decide through that Record of
7 Decision what has to be implemented, we prepare work
8 plans that describe how we're actually going to do
9 the remediation. We've got 34 of 35 sites. The only
10 work plan that's remaining is the one for that one
11 water tower. That gets reviewed by the Air Force, as
12 well as the regulatory agency, and then we go out and
13 do the work after that.

14 Remedial Actions, we've implemented 34 of
15 35 remedial actions. The only one, again, to be
16 implemented is the water tower. I want to be clear.
17 I don't want to misconstrue this. I say implemented
18 Remedial Action. For the sites where there's
19 groundwater contamination, those Remedial Actions are
20 still ongoing. The treatment is still going on in
21 place.

22 Those sites have not been closed yet. They
23 haven't been finalized. We haven't met the
24 groundwater standards on those sites, so there's

1 still additional sites for which we will be on-site,
2 we'll be monitoring, and we'll be optimizing that
3 remediation process. That should go on actually for
4 the next two and a half years. So by the next two
5 and a half years, we should reach closure on all of
6 those sites.

7 This is kind of a bar graph we've used for
8 a long time here. Kind of gives you a status. You
9 can see this green wave has finally reached to the
10 far right side of this. I've kind of gone through
11 the sites for which there are any more Records of
12 Decision or Remedial Actions to be implemented. The
13 bar graph on the right is the one that I kind of want
14 to point out. That shows where we have met cleanup
15 criteria on those sites.

16 So to date we're about 17 sites for which
17 we've met the cleanup criteria. There are eight more
18 sites we have actually met the criteria, but we're in
19 the process of getting the final documentation and
20 proof to the agencies that those sites have met the
21 remedial goals. That should be completed within the
22 next, say, six months. So there are eight more sites
23 that have actually met cleanup criteria, and they're
24 just in the documentation process of that. So that

1 should put us somewhere around 25 sites completed,
2 actually completed on-site, of the original 42 that
3 were covered under this CERCLA process here.

4 The same kind of goes, we talked again,
5 there are some sites that are not covered under the
6 CERCLA process. Those are UST sites. So again, to
7 give you a quick status of that, we've completed the
8 corrective actions for all of those sites. The
9 completion reports of those sites are being prepared
10 and approved.

11 There is one of those sites for which there
12 is still active treatment going on. The other four
13 sites they've already met the cleanup goals. So
14 there's only one of the UST sites that has not met
15 its cleanup criteria yet.

16 To give you an overview of what's going on
17 for 2014, again we've implemented all of the
18 corrective actions with the exception of the water
19 tower itself. What's going to happen over the next
20 year, we're going to monitor the progress of this in
21 situ treatment. So it's really a matter of going out
22 and doing sampling.

23 Actually, at this point, we started out
24 monitoring every three months. We are on a cycle now

1 that's about every six months. So it's semiannual
2 monitoring that we're going to be doing. Not a lot
3 of information coming in on a monthly basis here.
4 We're actually doing one of these rounds of
5 semiannual sampling this month, and we're not going
6 to do another one until next May.

7 So the time period of information, it's
8 kind of slowing down. All of the major Remedial
9 Actions have been completed. It's kind of a slow
10 down process. We just have to be patient and wait
11 for the treatment processes to remediate.

12 We will continue the landfill operation and
13 maintenance. That's dominantly doing the mowing of
14 the landfills, the testing of the groundwater, and
15 testing of the gas vents from the landfills. That's
16 just routine monitoring that will be going on for the
17 next 30 years or so at the landfills.

18 Then I did mention the Water Tower 968 with
19 the excavations that should be going on there next
20 April or May. I guess May would be the time frame
21 for doing the excavations. That's really the plan
22 for next year. You can see that there's really not a
23 lot of active remediation going on. So, Paul, I can
24 turn it back over to you. I don't want to use too

1 much time.

2 MR. CARROLL: Do we have any RAB
3 member questions for Howard?

4 MR. STREFF: Yes, I do. Maybe this
5 should be to Chris. Are the UST sites, are they
6 going to be required to have vapor monitoring in
7 intrusive areas for those sites that have not been
8 closed?

9 MR. SPARROW: The UST sites you're
10 asking about? Four of the UST sites are completely
11 remediated and clean. There's only one for which
12 there is an in situ treatment going on. There's no
13 vapor intrusion issues with that site. I don't know.
14 Which site is that? Is that way away from the
15 building or something?

16 DR. BUMB: The building is no longer
17 there, and all you have left is open ground. We have
18 done injections and we are just waiting for the in
19 situ bioremediation to work.

20 MR. STREFF: Chris, are they going to
21 be required to do that, to get an NFR letter since
22 those sites are closed?

23 MR. HILL: I haven't considered that
24 yet. I haven't had that presented to me. I know

1 that under the new tank regulations there's a vapor
2 intrusion requirement, and I'll have to look into
3 that to see if that will be required or not.

4 MR. CARSON: Chris, that will depend
5 on the concentrations of the contaminants. We can
6 look at the contamination levels there and look at
7 the vapor intrusion regulations and see if it
8 triggers any further action.

9 MR. SPARROW: We had a couple other
10 questions. If you can keep them brief, but that's
11 fine. Go ahead.

12 DR. ROKKE: Okay. On the plants and
13 operations, it's my understanding of the agreements
14 that the U.S. Air Force Department of Defense will
15 initiate actions to take White Hall and the steam
16 plant down. Okay. When we start taking both of
17 those facilities down, obviously the concerns I have
18 are air, soil, groundwater, subsurface contamination
19 as those structures are taken down. What protocols,
20 procedures, everything are going to be taken to
21 ensure the health and safety, any groundwater
22 contamination, any water contamination, any of the
23 waters coming out here, air, water or soil, as those
24 structures are removed? It seems to me we're going

1 to have an extraordinarily solid plan.

2 MR. SPARROW: I'll just speak for Paul
3 for a second and try to answer your question pretty
4 fast because I think I know the answer. Before the
5 Air Force goes in and does demolition projects like
6 that, they put into place air monitoring for asbestos
7 materials that are coming off. So the Air Force
8 hasn't given us a contract for that. I think there
9 may be one for the boiler plant that's out, but they
10 do incorporate all of those requirements in their
11 contract before they do that.

12 So that's not part of the overall
13 environmental restoration program right now. That's
14 a building demolition program. I don't know whether
15 that's part of this RAB purview or not, Paul.

16 DR. ROKKE: One of the things that
17 concerns me is --

18 MR. SPARROW: I think Paul has the
19 floor.

20 DR. ROKKE: Until we complete those
21 remediations and monitor the creeks and the streams
22 and everything, we're not going to know what happens
23 to those. So to preliminary sign off on the health
24 and safety of the creek until --

1 MR. SPARROW: Could you let Paul
2 speak?

3 DR. ROKKE: -- those remediations are
4 completely done to me seems to be premature.

5 MR. CARROLL: Well, White Hall and the
6 steam plant demolition planned projects are not
7 happening until we get an EDC agreement signed, so
8 I'm not really at liberty to talk about those yet.

9 As we have done with every report so far,
10 we've briefed to the RAB what we're going to do,
11 we've discussed how we're going to account for public
12 health and safety of all those activities that have
13 taken place. You all know the process. It's a very
14 systematic process, and we go through that. We'll
15 brief the RAB before that happens.

16 MR. SPARROW: Any other questions for
17 me? All right. Thanks for your time. I appreciate
18 it.

19 MR. CARROLL: Okay. One more topic
20 before I open up as I promised for public comment.
21 RAB member topics of interest from the floor. As
22 we've been talking about at the last two or three
23 RABs, RAB adjournment is on your slide, on your
24 handouts, but we changed that to RAB meeting

1 frequency discussion because I think at the last RAB
2 we decided it's not time to adjourn yet. It is time
3 to talk about whether we want to keep the RAB
4 meetings quarterly or go to semiannually with the
5 meetings. I'll open that up to the RAB members to
6 discuss amongst yourselves. Dr. Wang.

7 DR. WANG: I think while I've been on
8 this board and monitoring whatever participating
9 process, I think generally say I feel the process
10 went smoothly. I think reduce the meeting to twice a
11 year I think is reasonable. Some RAB members
12 mentioned in the past if there is need for call for
13 special meeting, if we have that option, I think I
14 would prefer reduce the meeting from quarterly to
15 every six months.

16 MR. CARROLL: Thank you. Any other
17 input? Bruce?

18 MR. SANDAHL: I would agree with what
19 Dr. Wang has said. Based on the information that
20 Howard Sparrow just went through and the amount of
21 activities that are going to be taking place, it
22 seems appropriate that six month intervals would work
23 out best.

24 MR. ANDERSON: I concur.

1 MR. CARROLL: All right. Thank you,
2 Jack.

3 DR. ROKKE: I would suggest four
4 months.

5 MR. CARROLL: Four months was brought
6 up.

7 MS. WIRGES: What about considering if
8 something special comes up, just call a meeting and
9 we can advertise that?

10 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Any other input?

11 MS. RAWLINGS: I'm good for six
12 months, too, especially because we have Dr. Schneider
13 to call upon if we need to in the meantime. You are
14 in frequent contact with Bruce, right?

15 MR. CARROLL: Yes. We talk once a
16 week now, at least.

17 MS. RAWLINGS: So if he had any
18 concerns that he felt we should know about, he could
19 communicate with us, let us know, call a meeting.

20 MR. CARROLL: Anyone else? I know
21 there's a couple members that haven't commented yet.
22 Denise?

23 MS. BECNEL: I'm not sure. I'll just
24 say I'll concur with whatever the group says, but to

1 be honest I'm not sure whether we'll need it or not.
2 I can't say, but I guess it's reasonable if something
3 does come up a meeting can be called. So I suppose
4 that's okay.

5 MR. CARROLL: Any input, Caryl?

6 MR. FOTHERGILL: Every six months is
7 fine.

8 MR. CARROLL: Would the board like to
9 put it to a vote?

10 MR. FOTHERGILL: Every six months with
11 the option of a special meeting being called would be
12 in order.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Is that your motion?

14 MR. FOTHERGILL: Sounds good to me.

15 MR. CARROLL: All in favor? I'm
16 sorry. Second?

17 DR. ROKKE: With Caryl's comments at
18 six months with special needs as required.

19 MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry?

20 DR. ROKKE: I said with Caryl's thing
21 that you set it at six months where we can call an
22 extra meeting as required based on events that are
23 happening, what Caryl just said.

24 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, I'll second his

1 motion.

2 MR. CARROLL: Okay. Put it up for a
3 vote. All in favor?

4 (RAB members in favor voice aye.)

5 MR. CARROLL: Anyone opposed? All
6 right. Motion carries, and we'll go forward with
7 that. So the next slide, mark out February 13th and
8 keep May 15th, 2014, at noon for the next RAB
9 meeting. I always ask for topics of interest for the
10 next meeting or RAB proposed action items, agenda
11 items for the next meeting. As always, we'll have a
12 very good briefing by Howard on the environmental
13 cleanup to get you up to date on what's happened
14 since the last RAB.

15 So we'll do that, and of course I'll inform
16 everyone of the EDC application, which should be
17 approved by then, and then that'll be the time where
18 we'll be able to talk about the steam plant and White
19 Hall and environmental issues related to those as
20 well and then the property transfer. Any other items
21 of interest to the RAB?

22 MS. BECNEL: I would just like to put
23 something on record, which is an item that I
24 mentioned before. Since we have the head librarian,

1 if you don't mind being mentioned, of the Rantoul
2 library, if we could please have some kind of
3 enclosure or sign or something for the documents that
4 are there because you could just pass right by it and
5 not know that all of that information is there. So
6 would it be possible, I mean, not necessarily coming
7 from the library, but maybe from, I don't know, the
8 Air Force, we could create something? I'm not sure
9 what, but something so that, you know, now it's just
10 almost invisible. You just pass right by it.

11 MR. CARROLL: Well, every time I've
12 visited the library before, I go to the front desk
13 and they always know where those documents are at.

14 MS. THOMPSON: We can put up a sign if
15 you tell me how it should be worded.

16 MS. BECNEL: Okay. We can talk about
17 it.

18 MR. CARROLL: Okay, good. You guys
19 know exactly where they are and you can tell anyone
20 who asks.

21 MS. THOMPSON: Yes, that's right.

22 MR. CARROLL: Anything else? Well, if
23 there are no further agenda items for the next
24 meeting, no further -- I'm sorry. One more thing.

1 Public comment. I almost forgot. Ma'am, you had a
2 comment.

3 MS. MAY: Yes, I do. My name is Linda
4 May, and I'm a member of the public but I was invited
5 here. There's been considerable discussion about the
6 use of Agent Orange on Chanute, and one of the things
7 that I have is a U.S. Air Force document signed by a
8 U.S. Air Force colonel stating that seven tons per
9 year were used on Chanute Air Force Base,
10 specifically for the entire time that it was
11 available for use in the Air Force, and it was used
12 in the area where the wells are that supply the city
13 water.

14 The thing that concerns me is it also talks
15 about Agent Blue. As we all know, Agent Blue is a
16 mix of Agent Orange plus arsenic. As we all know,
17 TCE was used on Chanute, and when Chanute was
18 determined to be a Superfund site it was determined
19 that it was twice the severity of Camp Lejeune.
20 That's in federal documents.

21 In a federal document in 2008, the federal
22 government warned the city of Rantoul and Chanute Air
23 Force Base that they should notify all children,
24 elderly, and infants with health problems or anyone

1 with a health problem that the water had contaminants
2 and that they should not drink the public water
3 supply.

4 MR. PASSARELLI: You don't even know
5 what the heck you're talking about.

6 MS. MAY: Let me finish and then you
7 can have your turn. The issue has come to me and I
8 went searching for documents that I got from the
9 federal government, very nicely on letterhead from
10 the Feds. The other issue is we have some children
11 in this community who have cancer. I think what the
12 public needs to be concerned about is while there was
13 testing of private wells, those private wells were
14 found to be contaminated.

15 The additional issue is that the public
16 wells were not. Now, we all know about the PCBs in
17 the Clinton landfill, and that's a concern. I used
18 to be a health inspector, both city, state, and
19 county. The issue right now is the bigger issue.
20 The Mahomet aquifer is contaminated by the three
21 wells on Chanute Air Force Base with dioxins, TCE,
22 and additional contaminant of arsenic as determined
23 in the 2008 federal report from the toxins registry.

24 The state, federal, U.S. Air Force do not

1 test for any of these toxins. They're done by
2 specialty lab. They have not tested any of the wells
3 since 1998 to 2000 where they found the dioxins.
4 They offered those residents bottled water for a
5 number of years and then they cut them off and let
6 them drink out of the contaminated wells.

7 My question for the U.S. EPA and the Air
8 Force is would you please do testing on the water
9 wells publicly in a manner so everyone can see it and
10 take dual action to control it since we now have the
11 documents with the proof to the public.

12 MR. CARROLL: We don't have documents
13 to prove to the public that I've seen. If you'd be
14 willing to share that.

15 MS. MAY: Welcome to the public
16 documents.

17 MR. CARROLL: Thank you. We'll take
18 that and take a look at it. All of our
19 investigations have determined there is not Agent
20 Orange on the former Chanute Air Force Base, and the
21 sampling that was done on off base water wells was
22 done for 11 rounds. That sampling indicated that
23 there were dioxin detections in laboratory reports,
24 but those were determined to be from laboratory

1 interference and not from the wells themselves. So
2 at least those couple of questions I can answer right
3 now. Any further questions we can answer to you
4 later.

5 MS. MAY: I think there's some other
6 people in the room that wish to speak that have
7 issues.

8 MR. CARROLL: Any other public
9 comment?

10 MR. PASSARELLI: Paul, I would just
11 add the Village's water supply system is rigorously
12 tested monthly through a certified lab and it meets
13 all of the U.S. EPA required levels to meet the clean
14 water that's there. Not only are the wells tested,
15 but water throughout the distribution system is
16 tested on a bimonthly basis. We have consumer
17 confidence reports that we mail out to residents
18 every year that explains the testing protocols that
19 we use and shows the level of quality that our water
20 has. I can make those available to anybody. It's on
21 the Village's Website, in fact.

22 DR. WANG: I get it in the mail I
23 think once a year.

24 MR. PASSARELLI: Yes, they're mailed

1 every year to every postal patron in the Village of
2 Rantoul.

3 DR. ROKKE: Your tests, does that
4 include for dioxins and trichloroethylene and other?

5 MR. PASSARELLI: It's tested for a
6 wide variety of potential contaminants. There are
7 many different tests that it goes through.

8 MR. CARROLL: Everything that's
9 regulated under the EPA safe drinking water standards
10 must meet EPA MCL requirements. Any public water
11 supply must meet those requirements, and Rantoul's
12 does as well. They're required to provide that
13 report that Pete talked about every year to its
14 citizens.

15 MS. RAWLINGS: I would suggest that
16 any media outlet that is covering this meeting and
17 particularly Linda May's comments should check first
18 of all on her credibility.

19 MS. WALSH: If I may speak as a public
20 citizen, I wonder about Ms. Rawlings' background.

21 MR. CARROLL: Ma'am, can you state
22 your name?

23 MS. WALSH: She seems to be
24 questioning everyone else's credibility.

1 MR. CARROLL: Can you state your name,
2 ma'am?

3 MS. WALSH: My name is Mary Walsh. I
4 live two miles south of Chandler Road on a farm in
5 the country. I think that out there we're concerned
6 about -- there's talk about the groundwater being
7 tested on Chanute, maybe even into Rantoul. But what
8 are we supposed to do? Check our own wells?

9 MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry. Something is
10 going on over here.

11 (Mr. Carroll acknowledges
12 interruption. Rantoul Police officers advise
13 everyone to clear the room at 12:58 p.m. Proceedings
14 continued thereafter at 1:04 p.m.)

15 MR. CARROLL: All right. Let's call
16 this meeting back to order, please. Since we didn't
17 get the opportunity to adjourn, this is going to take
18 about three seconds. We've gone through the entire
19 agenda and we've given an opportunity for RAB
20 comment, public comment, and we have --

21 MS. MAY: I think she had a question
22 to ask before you adjourned. She was in the middle
23 of trying to stand up. Will you let her finish?

24 MS. WALSH: I just had one question

1 about when there is going to be testing of these
2 wells, not only just on Chanute Air Force Base but
3 out into Rantoul, south of Chanute Air Force Base,
4 say, for five miles where they say that the
5 groundwater is quite likely to be contaminated.

6 MR. CARROLL: I don't know where you
7 heard that information, but it's not off of Chanute
8 Air Force Base. Those wells just adjacent to the
9 base were sampled 11 rounds, so they were determined
10 to be clean.

11 So if everyone is in favor of adjourning
12 the RAB now, please say aye.

13 (RAB members in favor voice aye.)

14 MR. CARROLL: Okay. We're adjourned.
15 Thank you.

16 (Meeting concluded at 1:05 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2 COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN) SS

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

I, JANET E. FREDERICK, CSR, do hereby
certify that the foregoing is a true and correct
transcript of proceedings had in the above-entitled
matter, taken at the time and date as hereinabove set
forth.

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