

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Hodge, Jeff

From: Thomas Alan1 C Civ 56 CES/CEVQ [Alan1.Thomas@luke.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2006 2:41 PM
To: Hodge, Jeff
Subject: FW: Five-Year Review
Attachments: Base - Jeff Rothrock.doc; Base - Alan Thomas.doc

From: Thomas Alan1 C Civ 56 CES/CEVQ
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2006 12:40 PM
To: Rothrock Jeff Civ 56 CES/CEV
Subject: FW: Five-Year Review

This is what I wrote ion the attached file, fyi.

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
BASE – ALAN THOMAS

1. What is your overall impression of the project? (general sentiment)

Highly successful. I believe that the team of the Air Force, contractors, regulators, and community have investigated the issues thoroughly together and have provided convincing assurance that there is no public health threat existing due to residual contaminants from historical activities at Luke AFB.

2. Is the remedy functioning as expected? How well is the remedy performing?

The selected remedies are complete except for institutional controls (which have been well-integrated into the base culture) and long-term monitoring. LTM has shown very minor changes in the monitored conditions, validating the baseline risk assessment scenarios.

3. What does the monitoring data show? Are there any trends that show contaminant levels are decreasing?

Minor changes in observed contaminant levels have generally been downward, as would be expected due to natural attenuation processes.

10/17/2006

4. Is there a continuous on-site O&M presence? If so, please describe staff and activities. If there is not a continuous on-site presence, describe staff and frequency of site inspections and activities.

The only CERCLA O&M action is annual inspection and as-needed maintenance of the concrete cap over PSC ST-18.

5. Have there been any significant changes in the O&M requirements, maintenance schedules, or sampling routines since start-up or in the last five years? If so, do they affect the protectiveness or effectiveness of the remedy? Please describe changes and impacts.

The only significant changes in the institutional controls and long-term monitoring plans have been due to the rising groundwater levels and land subsidence in the immediate area. Some of the monitoring wells may have to be replaced to provide the correct screen interval in order to capture floating contaminants. Sub-surface subsidence and shifting has also caused a few monitoring wells to collapse. These wells may also need to be replaced if they are judged to be still necessary for the LTM program.

6. Have there been unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the site since start-up or in the last five years? If so, please give details.

No, there have been no major surprises in the program.

7. Have there been opportunities to optimize O&M, or sampling efforts? Please describe changes and resultant or desired cost savings or improved efficiency.

There have been no changes but given the low level of observed contaminants and the relatively static groundwater conditions, it may be feasible and appropriate to reduce the frequency of sampling events.

8. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the project?

None other than the above.

Alan C. Thomas, PE, Civ GS-11, mobile (623) 341-9525 alan.l.thomas@luke.af.mil
Restoration Program Mgr, Luke AFB Environmental Flight, Bldg 302
56 CES/CEVQR, 13970 W. Lightning St, Luke AFB, AZ 85309-1149
(623) 856-3621 fax (623) 856-3817 DSN 896-3621

**LUKE AIR FORCE BASE
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
BASE - ALAN THOMAS**

1. What is your overall impression of the project? (general sentiment)
Highly successful. I believe that the team of the Air Force, contractors, regulators, and community have investigated the issues thoroughly together and have provided convincing assurance that there is no public health threat existing due to residual contaminants from historical activities at Luke AFB.

2. Is the remedy functioning as expected? How well is the remedy performing?
The selected remedies are complete except for institutional controls (which have been well-integrated into the base culture) and long-term monitoring. LTM has shown very minor changes in the monitored conditions, validating the baseline risk assessment scenarios.

3. What does the monitoring data show? Are there any trends that show contaminant levels are decreasing?
Minor changes in observed contaminant levels have generally been downward, as would be expected due to natural attenuation processes.

4. Is there a continuous on-site O&M presence? If so, please describe staff and activities. If there is not a continuous on-site presence, describe staff and frequency of site inspections and activities.
The only CERCLA O&M action is annual inspection and as-needed maintenance of the concrete cap over PSC ST-18.

5. Have there been any significant changes in the O&M requirements, maintenance schedules, or sampling routines since start-up or in the last five years? If so, do they affect the protectiveness or effectiveness of the remedy? Please describe changes and impacts.

The only significant changes in the institutional controls and long-term monitoring plans have been due to the rising groundwater levels and land subsidence in the immediate area. Some of the monitoring wells may have to be replaced to provide the correct screen interval in order to capture floating contaminants. Sub-surface subsidence and shifting has also caused a few monitoring wells to collapse. These wells may also need to be replaced if they are judged to be still necessary for the LTM program.

6. Have there been unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the site since start-up or in the last five years? If so, please give details.
No, there have been no major surprises in the program.

7. Have there been opportunities to optimize O&M, or sampling efforts? Please describe changes and resultant or desired cost savings or improved efficiency. There have been no changes but given the low level of observed contaminants and the relatively static groundwater conditions, it may be feasible and appropriate to reduce the frequency of sampling events.

8. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the project?

None other than the above.

**LUKE AIR FORCE BASE
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
BASE – JEFF ROTHROCK**

1. What is your overall impression of the project? (general sentiment)

This project was an environmental success story for Luke AFB and the Air Force. It validated Luke's commitment to environmental stewardship. Thru a team effort involving EPA, ADEQ, the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB), contractors and the Corps of Engineers, Luke became the first active duty Air Force installation to be de-listed from the EPA's National Priority List of Superfund sites. This was achieved because of a proactive, get it done, attitude by all the team members.

2. Is the remedy functioning as expected? How well is the remedy performing?

All remedial actions have been completed with the exception of on-going LTM of groundwater and a radiological site. Institutional Controls are also in place and functioning as intended.

3. What does the monitoring data show? Are there any trends that show contaminant levels are decreasing?

Slight detections in groundwater are still encountered but the overall trend is that contaminant levels are decreasing. The radiological monitoring has never shown a reading above background.

4. Is there a continuous on-site O&M presence? If so, please describe staff and activities. If there is not a continuous on-site presence, describe staff and frequency of site inspections and activities.

The base Restoration Program Manager is a non-ERA funded position that maintains a continuous on-site presence. The only O&M required is an annual inspection of the concrete cap at site ST-18 and any follow-on repairs that may be needed.

5. Have there been any significant changes in the O&M requirements, maintenance schedules, or sampling routines since start-up or in the last five

years? If so, do they affect the protectiveness or effectiveness of the remedy? Please describe changes and impacts.

During this year's (FY06) groundwater monitoring event it was discovered that some monitoring wells have collapsed and some screens have become submerged due to rising groundwater levels. This will be addressed as part of the Five-Year Review.

6. Have there been unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the site since start-up or in the last five years? If so, please give details.

No.

7. Have there been opportunities to optimize O&M, or sampling efforts? Please describe changes and resultant or desired cost savings or improved efficiency.

No.

8. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the project?

No.

* Jeff Hodge completed interview on 10-16-06 at 1640 CST.

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
NEIGHBOR/CAB - JOYCE CLARK

1. What is your overall impression of the project? (general sentiment)

- Personnel ~~Security~~ Respon^{sive} → Personnel were extremely responsive

- Very concerned → - Very Concerned

- Heed ^{CAB} Advice → - Heeded the advice of the CAB

2. What effects have site operations had on the surrounding community?

- Mitigation has ^{made} ~~been~~ safer → Mitigation has made groundwater safer.

3. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding the site or its operation and administration? If so, please give details.

- No

4. Are you aware of any events, incidents, or activities at the site such as vandalism, trespassing, or emergency responses from local authorities? If so, please give details.

- No

5. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the site's management or operation?

- No - Enjoyed participating, not active since implementation of CAB - RAB (Restoration Advisory Board). On call if situation would happen to arise.

↳ No, Enjoyed participating

- No Action Since RAB (Restoration Advisory Board) switched to CAB (Community Advisory Board).

- CAB → on-call if emergency situation would arise.

**LUKE AIR FORCE BASE
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
STATE – STACY L. DUFFY**

1. What is your overall impression of the project? (general sentiment)

Luke AFB has been diligent in their responsibility to the environment. At this point, the remediation at this site has shown to be effective. The Program Manager at Luke AFB has done a good job ensuring that the project continues to move forward, regardless of the obstacle of revolving Project Managers.

2. Have there been routine communications or activities (site visits, inspections, reporting activities, etc.) conducted by your office regarding the site? If so, please give purpose and results.

The communication between both the Luke Air Force Personnel and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality has been sufficient during the Long Term Monitoring phase. Communication occurs via telephone and e-mail. Reporting activities (i.e. LTM Reports) have been followed according to the 5-Year Review.

3. Have there been any complaints, violations, or other incidents related to the site requiring a response by your office? If so, please give details of the events and results of the responses.

No.

3. Do you feel well informed about the site's activities and progress?

Yes. The Luke AFB Program Manager, or Project Manager, has notified ADEQ when a report is going to be submitted or if there are other concerns regarding the project.

5. Do you have any comments, suggestions, or recommendations regarding the site's management or operation?

I would suggest that LTM work plans are submitted at least 60-days prior to the work being implemented. This allows the ADEQ sufficient time to review the documents

adequately. Otherwise, ADEQ is content with the management and operation of the project.