



CHANUTE AFB ILLINOIS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3362

AGENDA

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

6 August 1998

7:00 P.M.

1. Introductions
 - RAB members
 - Review of AFBCA mission/plan/strategy
2. Old Business
 - Minutes from last meeting
 - Other
3. Landfill OU-2
 - History and progress of RI/FS
 - Contaminants of concern
 - Fencing
4. Seven Sites OU-2
 - Site Reconnaissance
5. Areas of Concern OU-1
6. Reuse Progress
7. Community Involvement
8. Next Meeting
9. Adjourn



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR FORCE BASE CONVERSION AGENCY**

October 08, 1998

AFBCA/DB Chanute
501 E. Condit Drive, Suite A
Rantoul IL 61866

SUBJECT: Corrected Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes, August 6, 1998

SEE DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. The quarterly RAB meeting for Chanute Air Force Base was held at 1 Aviation Center in the Village of Rantoul on August 6, 1998 at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Suits facilitated the meeting and introduced himself and asked all attendees to introduce themselves. He also requested that all attendees log themselves in on the sign-up sheet.
2. Mr. Suits reviewed the mission of the Air Force Base Conversion Agency (AFBCA) by reading the official mission statement as follows: "The mission of the AFBCA is to execute the environmental programs in real and personal property disposal for major Air Force bases in the United States being closed or realigned under the authorities of the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988 and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. He also passed out "fact sheets" supplied by Ms. Shirley Curry of Headquarters AFBCA which explained the make-up of our agency. Responsibilities of the agency are three pronged, the third being the care of facilities until a lease or transfer by deed has been accomplished for the properties. Most of the Chanute facilities are either under long term lease or have been transferred by deed. For those leased properties, the primary emphasis is the execution of the environmental programs in order that those properties can also qualify for transfer. There is an existing plan for the environmental cleanup which consists of conducting a Remedial Investigation (RI) to determine the Remedial Actions (RA) that are required to satisfy the environmental conditions required for transfer.

Mr. Suits described the "expedited field work exercise" that was conducted on the landfills during the past winter. The mild winter made it possible to proceed with the work. The methodology used was that of excavating eight test pits on each of the four landfills. Surface and subsurface soil samples were taken. The results of the investigation were put together in a report by Jacobs Engineering. This report was presented to and reviewed by a special "peer review" group of environmental experts whose function is to evaluate the investigation results and determine whether the proposed RAs should be funded and/or make recommendations for future actions. The recommendation of the peer review group was that additional studies be carried out in order to have a complete remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) before funding any RA. As a result, the AFBCA decided not to fund any RA until the RI is complete. Results of last winter's tests indicated there were elevated levels of some substances, primarily lead and benzene, present in the landfills.

The price of the RA for the four landfills has been estimated to be on the order of 36 million dollars which is a substantial percentage of the BRAC Cleanup fund account. Also, because of the Chanute landfills RI/FS not being complete, RA work could not have started for many months. Therefore the delay of Chanute landfills RA funding allowed work to proceed at other bases that could begin RA work immediately. There is, however, concern that money will not be as readily available in subsequent years for funding RA. In reply to these concerns, the AFBCA headquarters has issued a letter indicating the Chanute environmental program will be "fully funded." "Fully funded" means that money will be forthcoming at the time the RI/FS process is complete. Mr. Suits noted that once the RI/FS is complete, there is a process of public notification, the issuance of a "Record of Decision" and then Remedial Design and RA. In the future there will be a "fact sheet" mailed to RAB members prior to each meeting which will give you information regarding the status of environmental work. Also tonight and at future meetings, previous meeting minutes will be passed out with a request that they be reviewed and then changed, if necessary, and approved at the following meeting. On the agenda, there is an item called "community involvement" which is for the purpose of allowing members to express any concerns or raise questions they may have. There were no concerns or comments.

3. Mr. Suits moved on to agenda Item 3 and asked Mr. Bryan Rundell of Jacobs Engineering to present a brief review of the RI/FS on the landfills. Mr. Rundell began by saying that in the previous meeting the geophysics data was discussed and that since then the data collection efforts of the expedited field program were finished. Jacobs gave a detailed presentation of those results to the peer review team in late April. Jacobs also completed a detailed report of the findings which is available for anyone to see in the Administrative Record and also in the Rantoul Public Library. Samples from three of the landfills test pits failed toxicity characteristic leaching procedures (TCLP) for lead. TCLP is a test that measures the potential of the contaminant to leach into the environment. If that potential, for any contaminant, is greater than the threshold level set by the EPA, then that contaminant is considered hazardous waste by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). At landfill three, there was a sample that failed TCLP for benzene. Three samples failed TCLP for lead. Benzene is a compound in gasoline fuels which means that the landfill probably received fuels or waste solvents -- not an unusual occurrence for landfills. Other contaminants detected were heavy chain hydrocarbons (PHs) found in fuels and dioxins which also result from incomplete burning of fuels. Those compounds are fairly toxic, are cancer-causing agents and show a high risk (when compared to the EPA's screening levels). There is a lot more investigative work to be done to complete the RI/FS including soil, sediment, surface water and groundwater testing. A revised work plan is being developed in accordance with USEPA and IEPA comments on the original work plan, and the revised plan is now being reviewed by the EPAs. The hope is to be in the field in a few months to finish out the RI.

Mr. Schafer (USEPA) added discussion regarding the slide that Mr. Rundell had on display. Because of the contaminants present, the EPAs consider the landfills to be hazardous waste landfills. That determination triggers a certain set of requirements for the cleanup of these landfills. When these landfills are capped, there is a specific design that needs to be followed as specified by the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA). So that is an important piece of information that the EPAs feels can be used right now to make decisions to cleanup the site. Mr. Fothergill asked for more detail. Mr. Schafer replied that the RCRA cap is a hazardous waste cap, has many more features, requires more engineering and is more costly than other landfill caps

that are defined under state rules for capping landfills. Mr. Nussbaum added that the other landfill regulations that may be considered is the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) would be the state solid waste landfill caps, which would be what is required on any municipal waste landfill that is currently permitted. The hazardous waste determination is what triggers the ARAR. If risk is found, the Super Fund regulations or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) regulations that we are working under right now requires that two "threshold criteria" be met: (1) Protection of human health in the environment and (2) That ARARs are met. Mr. Nussbaum said therefore when contaminants exceed TCLP, that means a hazardous waste cap is the only cap considered. (The only other possible remedy is exhuming the landfills or all the hazardous waste from the landfill). The EPAs identified it as a must-do thing that could be funded now and could get us further down the road in terms of getting remedy money secured for Rantoul -- but the Air Force chose not to fund it now. Mr. Schafer said that his agency did not support that decision and is afraid that the money will not be available because of shrinking money beyond 1998.

Mr. Fothergill asked about the three samples taken, and Mr. Rundell explained that there were eight test pits at each of four landfills, three samples were taken at each test pit. Three of all these samples failed for lead and one for benzene. Two failed for lead at landfill one and one at landfill two. The one that failed for benzene was at landfill three. Mr. Rundell said that one sample was over 20 milligrams per liter and the other two above 5. Mr. Schafer added that the concentrations mentioned trigger certain regulations, but that doesn't mean that other things of lesser concentrations would not be addressed. Costs for RA were again discussed and it was pointed out that currently, the program calls for the RA to happen in the FY2000, and availability of funds is down in both FY1999 and FY2000. Mr. Nussbaum (IEPA) pointed out that at the request of Headquarters AFBCA the expedited program was carried out (because of the scarcity of funding in the future) and a lot of effort and team work was put toward this effort, and when it was finished the decision was made by the Headquarters not to fund the RA at this time. This was very disheartening to the entire team. It also caused a nine month delay in the work for the non-accelerated RI/FS. So the accelerated effort cost time and lots of money leaving the team frustrated.

Mr. Fothergill asked whether there was anything Rantoul residents could do to get the project back on the front burner and Mr. Suits replied that it was too late in the fiscal year to get 1998 funding and that 1999 funding would require quite a concentrated effort. He then put up the chart showing how the BRAC Cleanup funding changed for the years 1998, 1999 and 2000. At one point in time (red line on the chart) the BRAC funding goes away and the cleanup would be funded out of the Operations and Maintenance fund of the Air Force where there would be increased competition for the available money. Ms. Fothergill asked how many bases are being closed and Ms. Curry replied 33. Mr. Suits pointed out that most of these are farther along than Chanute having completed their RI/FS and are ready now for the RA stage. The 33 bases include the 1993 and 1995 closure rounds. Discussion ensued regarding the budgets and number of bases for the various rounds of closure and the relative "dirtiness" of Chanute. Mr. Wirges asked what remedies would be used for cleaning up the landfills. Mr. Suits replied the most likely remedy would be to cap the landfills in accordance with Illinois regulations. An unlikely alternative would be to dig up and remove all the old waste to an alternate location, as this would be an expensive way to go. Groundwater must also be tested and treated if contaminated. Mr. Schafer added that his agency has developed the "presumptive remedy" as a generic remedy for sites such as

Chanute. The generic remedy which (from their experience) seems best for Chanute is "containment" -- i.e. a cap that prevents precipitation from percolating through the landfill wastes and thereby contaminating the water table below. Any existing groundwater contamination must be dealt with separately. Both EPAs believe the presumptive remedy is appropriate for Chanute without further study except for the groundwater, however, the Air Force apparently feels they need more information before proceeding with any RA. Mr. Schafer expressed his belief that by proceeding now with the presumptive remedy, the scope of the project could be shortened and the remedy could be accomplished sooner with 1998 guaranteed dollars versus uncertain 2000 and 2001 dollars. Ms. Marsh asked whether the EPAs had authorized presumptive remedies at other bases that could serve as bench marks for Chanute. Mr. Flagg (a guest from Pease AFB) answered that Pease AFB had consolidated three small landfills into a larger one which they capped with a "composite" cap. Pease also had some other construction rubble dump type landfills which they covered with an earthen cap. Mr. Nussbaum added that the point he wanted to get to was that if the caps are put on the landfills, we can stop spending money on the investigative portion (digging around in the landfills) and then focus on groundwater fate and transport which is a concern because Salt Fork Creek runs between two of the landfills. (Interaction between the upper and lower groundwater levels is still a little unclear in the IEPA perspective). Mr. Nussbaum added that the decision not to fund with 1998 money was made by higher-up Air Force people and not at the local level. Mr. Fothergill added he wasn't blaming local people but wanted to know who could be contacted up the chain to get this back on the "front burner." Ms. Marsh asked how contaminated is Heritage Lake and Mr. Nussbaum replied we don't have any samples yet.

Discussion moved to fencing around the landfills. Fences are being installed to prevent potential population exposure to contaminants on the landfills. This is particularly significant in view of the upcoming balloon festival to be held on the base that will have thousands of visitors. Mr. Suits pointed out on a map the location of the fencing and what areas that will be blocked off, and if this creates problems for anyone, he would be glad to discuss it. Mr. Wilkinson, Parkland College, replied it did hamper his operations severely and asked if gates could be installed to overcome this. Mr. Suits said he would meet with Mr. Wilkinson in the area to discuss the problem. Agreement was made to meet soon. In reply to a question, Mr. Suits said University of Illinois property would not be fenced off.

Mr. Nussbaum went back to the issue of what community members could do to help with the funding issue. Mr. Rauch commented that they needed names and addresses of people to contact and asked who the program regional manager was. Mr. Suits replied the Program Manager is Mr. John Carr and he has not been attending the RAB meetings. Ms. Rauch asked what has the RI/FS done on other bases compared to this one. Mr. Suits replied that generally the AFBCA does a full RI/FS but that Mr. Flagg from Pease could help on that question. Mr. Flagg replied that the RCRA cap they applied was done in the 1992/1993 time frame after doing a complete RI/FS process (they had also broken out the landfill from a larger operable unit to move it along quicker). The process was probably about 1 1/2 years from start to finish. Mr. Schafer said that in that time frame, the USEPA had not yet published the presumptive remedy guides. He said that the Navy at the Naval Air Station, Glenview is considering digging up their small landfills and moving them or possibly using the presumptive remedy -- the decision has not yet been made. He said he thinks the Army at Fort Sheridan has elected to use the presumptive remedy. Mr. Nussbaum confirmed that they did an interim RA consisting of two different types of caps because

it was adjacent to Lake Michigan and they had some slope and stability issues to deal with. These landfills contained both hazardous and non-hazardous waste. Mr. Schafer said the presumptive remedies, advocated by the regulators, give the Air Force an opportunity to accelerate things as opposed to the public perception that the regulators are slowing things down. However, as the lead agency, it is the Air Force's decision regarding which direction to go. Ms. Marsh asked what the "thorough study" does for us. Mr. Nussbaum replied he didn't think it would change anything but the Air Force has concerns and they feel they need the security of more information, but that questions of this nature should be addressed to the Air Force. Mr. Suits said he would supply names of Air Force people that could be contacted regarding this (with the help of Ms. Curry.) Mr. Schafer said the expedited program was carried out under extremely difficult circumstances and time constraints and the contractors accomplished it giving information that the regulators believe was sufficient to validate the presumptive remedy approach which, for reasons not personally understood, was rejected by the Air Force.

4. Mr. Suits asked Joyce Miyagishima, Jacobs Engineering, to present on the activities of The Environmental Company (TEC). She reported on the Seven Sites (in OU-2) RI which include the Fire Training areas, sludge disposal pits and oil/water separators. TEC did a site reconnaissance which included reviewing reports and looking at aerial photographs. The intent was to be comprehensive and to identify all points of interest that may need to be included in the RI. As an example, Joyce chose to give a detailed description of their work in the Building 950 area which is a fuels systems training area. She identified, on a map, 19 key features (such as electrical man holes) which could possibly impact the investigation. A records check was used to help determine whether the points of interest may or may not be of concern (such as closure of an aboveground or underground storage tank under a petroleum oil lubricant program). Joyce pointed out the 20 ft x 20 ft sludge disposal pit at Building 950 as a key area of concern. In answer to Mr. Schafer's question, she said sludge from cleaning the two large aboveground storage tanks in the area was deposited in the sludge pit. Other points of interest in the area are the catchment basins around the aboveground tanks and the associated oil/water separator (where a release occurred from a 1993 overflow and became the subject of a subsequent Natural Attenuation study), a tank car load/off-loading area and drainage ditch that flows toward Salt Fork Creek. She also pointed out the pump house and areas where aboveground storage tanks had been located. Ms. Delgado asked whether the TEC approach to the RI would be acceptable to the agencies so that it would not be rejected as happened in the previous RI. She replied they were working hand-in-hand with the BCT to ensure the investigation will be done right. Mr. Schafer added that the previous investigation had problems with laboratory quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) as well as problems with the execution of the field work. TEC and Jacobs are putting forth a considerably more comprehensive effort than the previous one, the level of oversight by the regulators has increased exponentially and a great deal of effort and attention is being paid to laboratories. All this is slowing things down a bit, but hopefully will prevent errors of the past. Ms. Delgado then asked what the next deliverable for the seven sites would be and the time frame for that. Joyce replied that they now have a Work Plan and Sampling and Analysis plan that details the QA/QC and field procedures, that are being reviewed by the regulator and once those are approved the field work will begin. (Currently scheduled to start in November). Mr. Nussbaum added that the document review times are dictated by available agency resources (the agencies are having a difficult time keeping up with the large number of documents that are being generated) and the fact that closer scrutiny is being given to the sites than before. Mr. Schafer said that unfortunately, the field work seems to start when it gets cold which hampers the field work and

the expedited program has delayed the schedule on the order of six to nine months. Ms. Delgado noted that the landfills we schedule for remediation in the year 2000 and asked when the seven sites were scheduled to be remediated, and Mr. Skridulis replied it was scheduled for December 2000.

5. Mr. Suits asked Mr. Greg Hassett of Booz, Allen & Hamilton to report on his studies of the new areas of concern in OU-1. He reported he has been working on seven areas generated from different sources interviews and the Air Force going out and identifying areas believed to need additional research before transferring the property. The areas looked at are: (1) The oil water separator at the old Base (Bldg 711) fueling station. Discussion with Mr. Suits and documentation in his office indicated that the oil water separator is intact, has been cleaned and the operating permit withdrawn. In the past, the Village of Rantoul expressed an interest in retaining the oil/water separator and so the next step would be a dialog with the Village to determine if the Village still has an interest in the separator or if it should be removed; (2) The underground storage tank near Building 747. This one was discovered by utility workers scanning for an underground line. AFBCA records do not document this tank. The next step would be to continue the investigation and remove the tank.; (3) A carbon-tetrachloride disposal area (from some years back) was discovered during conversation between Mr. Nussbaum, Mr. Schafer and Mr. Suits with a former employee. The former employee indicated that in the early to mid 1940s it was common practice of workers cleaning parts in Hangar 3 to dispose of the used solvent (three to five gallons per week) at the edge of the apron near the northwest corner of current Building 20 (the building not then in existence). So this is a point of interest to be investigated. Previous to the 1944 to 1946 time frame, it was common practice to dump the used carbontetrachloride in a drain at the east side of Hangar 3. It is not known how much or for how long the solvent was disposed of there; (4) There are coal storage area sites that require sampling and analysis to determine what kind of impact they may have had to the soil and groundwater; (5) Fire fighting demonstrations were given at open house events during the 1970s. These occurred right off the runway. Aerial photos from the 1970s show little circular or square shaped areas where these demonstrations were held. Five such areas have been identified and need to be tested to determine if there is any impact to soil and groundwater from the residual fuels used in those demonstrations; (6) A former employee's daughter reported there was a Firing Range in the vicinity of Building 851 which is the Hospital. The Air Force intends to follow-up on this report and determine if there has been an impact on soil or groundwater. Mr. Hassett and Mr. Brady indicated the range was south of the Hospital, was possibly a small arms range bringing up the possibility of lead contaminants in the soil; (7) The final area of concern is the former playground area where several pieces of lead solder were found by a local resident using a metal detector. The IEPA took soil samples in the area and found discernible concentrations of lead in the soil. The chunks found were shown by analysis to have 50 percent or greater lead content. Lead based paint was also found on playground equipment which was subsequently removed and disposed of by the Air Force. Mr. Hassett said it is difficult to discern why the lead was there although one theory is that during the 1930s when facilities on this portion of the Base were being built, this might have been a construction staging area resulting in release of lead used in construction practices. As with the other sites, there needs to be some follow-on investigation. Mr. Suits added that the USEPA and the IEPA have requested that all these points of interest be rolled into one remedial investigation. He will make a concentrated effort to pursue these investigations. He noted that these new areas of concern are a result of input from residents and RAB members. He will be requesting funding from Headquarters for this effort.

Mr. Rauch asked the location of the Base fueling station and Mr. Suits pointed it out on the map and noted it was constructed in the recent history of Chanute. There is an oil/water separator there that the Village had indicated an interest in leaving in place. If the Village no longer wants it, it will be removed or if left, the transfer documents will indicate it is the Village's responsibility to maintain and obtain permits for use of the separator.

6. Since no one from the Village was there to report on re-use progress, Mr. Suits, made comments regarding that. He noted that the balloon festival would be occurring during the next nine days with expectations of 100,000 to 300,000 people. He then asked whether anyone had additional concerns they would like to express at this time. Mr. Nussbaum replied that he thought it would be prudent if copies of the AFBCA Community Relations Plan were supplied to RAB members as it is a good source of information regarding the Air Force strategy for transferring the Base and also gives names and telephone numbers of people to call for additional information. Ms. Marsh indicated she will be calling all the key people in the Air Force as well as the senator and congressman.

Ms. Rauch expressed a concern about a mass of wire located at the former gas station. The Village Inspection Department has tried to remove it but it is thick and embedded in the ground and they have been unable to get it removed. Mr. Rauch also expressed a concern about the condition of some of the property. In particular he thought environmental concerns in and around White Hall should be investigated. Additionally, the People's Center (Building 16) is said to be unsafe and should be demolished. Ms. Wirges added that those matters were discussed by the beautification committee and that it is a matter of Jack Hayes either paying up or the Air Force coming back on him. Mr. Suits replied that a package has been sent to Mr. Hayes giving a deadline for the transfer of the parcel property of August 19 and nothing has been heard from Mr. Hayes relative to that. Ms. Rauch asked if the property is transferred to him then the Air Force is no longer concerned with that property. Mr. Suits replied that as far as the building is concerned, it would be his. But from an environmental stand point, the Air Force remains responsible (to cleanup contaminants found on the property after transfer). Examples of this are the lead in the playground (a transferred parcel) and the firing range (if found) on Hospital property (a transferred parcel). The Air Force will remediate if contaminants are found. From the stand point of transfer of Mr. Hayes' parcel, that is in the hands of AFBCA Headquarters real estate property folks and the General Services Administration. Ms. Marsh said she was under the understanding that when these properties were turned over that the contract required they would have enough money to do whatever work was necessary to (properly maintain the property) and that he's obviously not doing that so how can the property be deeded to him. Mr. Suits said Mr. Hayes has already been sent a notice that the property is in disrepair, so he has been put on notice in that regard and that a letter from Headquarters has been sent to him and it did address the issue of what he needs to do. Discussion ensued regarding what Mr. Hayes needs to do to satisfy AFBCA, how much he has paid and that his bid price was (\$51,000.00). Also noted were the many code violations in White Hall. Mr. Suits said he would be glad to discuss the issues further in his office, and he pointed out the location of his office on the map. In answer to Ms. Rauch, Mr. Suits said that Mr. Hayes must make the building presentable inside and out and ultimately bring it up to codes in order to satisfy the lease. Mr. Rauch said he has been told it will cost three million dollars to bring it up to code. Other discussion ensued regarding the legal entanglements involved and that the Village and Air Force would have to straighten it out. Mr. Fothergill

wanted to go "off the record" with this discussion and Mr. Suits indicated it was not an environmental matter (which is the purpose of the RAB meetings) and once again offered to meet with anyone in his office regarding this. Ms. Wirges and Mr. Suits said we would know where we stand after the 19th of August.

Mr. Nussbaum noted that with increased community out reach, there may be people petitioning to become RAB members and the RAB may want to start considering how they want to go about adding new members.

7. Mr. Suits asked if it suited everybody's schedule to increase the frequency of the meetings to once every two months, and if Thursday night was a suitable night for the meetings. The next meeting was set for October 8, 1998 at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Nussbaum asked whether there was anything anyone wanted to hear about at the next RAB meeting. Typically there is a set agenda for each meeting but if anyone has anything they would like to see on the agenda, let Mr. Suits know. Ms. Rauch asked if they could have a map each time and Mr. Suits replied affirmatively. Ms. Rauch asked for copies of the names and addresses of key people to contact as compiled by Ms. Curry and Mr. Suits indicated the list could be duplicated on Mr. Boudreaux's copier as he was now in his office.

8. The meeting was adjourned.



VIRLON J. SUITS
BRAC Environmental Coordinator

Attachment:
Distribution List

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Mayor Joseph Brown
Gary Adams
Ray Boudreaux
Stephen Nussbaum
Clarence Smith III
Gary Schafer
Ken Tindall
Dennis Lundquist
Virlon Suits
Sylvia Crowell
John Carr
Al Loftin
Andrew Mendoza
Brent Evans
James Skridulis
Jacqueline Fothergill
Barb Rauch
Charles Sweitzer
John De Back
Dan Brady
Paul Rice
Jeff Villnow
Jay Flagg

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE