

## Lang, Kent

---

**From:** Rothrock Charles J Civilian 56 CES/CEVC [charles.rothrock@luke.af.mil]  
**ent:** Monday, August 13, 2001 7:30 AM  
**o:** klang@arcadis-us.com  
**Subject:** FW: Five-Year Review Project-Interviews

Kent,

Not exactly in the right format, but I guess we can include it.

Jeff

-----Original Message-----

**From:** MGperts@aol.com [mailto:MGperts@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2001 5:17 PM  
**To:** charles.rothrock@luke.af.mil  
**Subject:** Re: Five-Year Review Project-Interviews

Jeff; I'm still on the road....For some reason I could not open the file on my laptop and the Original is at home...So here is a letter that I hope will

keep your feet out of the fire...Sorry I let this slip....

Jeff

August 10, 2001

RE: "A Look Back"

Seven years, almost eight; it was early in 1994 that I saw the advertisement looking for Citizens to serve on the Luke AFB RAB.

I answered the advertisement with a letter and I am glad now that I did.

I liked the concept of civilian input into the matter of planning the clean up effort.

From the start we enjoyed a spirit of cooperation with both the Command and the Environmental Staff. The attitude was, "we have this problem and let's get it identified and do what we need to do to put it behind us".

Going about setting in place a structured system that would prevent these problems in the future was our goal.

As sites were identified, we looked at the best and most cost effective ways of mitigating the situation at hand.

We always felt we were well informed and included in the decision making regarding what could and had to be done.

Luke stands out as an example of how to do it right. This was very obvious when I attended a conference in San Francisco and found that of all the attendees from across the nation only Luke and one other East Coast Base

enjoyed a relationship with the Command and Staff that we did.

In most cases the RAB's had an adversarial relationship that made it hard to get anything done.

In our case at Luke the Base Commanders and the Environmental Staff established a situation of openness and trust that made us a team.

Now that the Base is cleaned up some sites require long term monitoring, so we feel it important that together, we, from time to time sit down and review just how things are going.

It has been a great joint effort that worked well and the Base and all the people involved should be commended.

Martin Jeffries

Luke AFB  
Five-Year Review  
Interview Questions  
Belle Matthews (Luke AFB)

1. What is your understanding of the overall project at the Site?  
I am thoroughly familiar with all the sites.

2. Please describe your involvement or participation at the Site.  
I am the IRP manager for the last three years

3. What is your general impression of the project (Site)?  
The projects were thoroughly investigated and appropriate remediation performed.

4. What effects have the site operation had on you (or the surrounding community)?  
The surrounding community participated in the restoration project. They partnered in the research investigation and choices of remediation.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding the Site or its operation and administration? Give any details.  
The community has addressed concerns for future continuity of the environmental program. The Restoration Advisory Board rewrote the charter and developed an ongoing community outreach called the Citizens' Advisory Board (CAB) which will continue to meet and be involved in the reviewing the environmental program.

6. Are you aware of any unusual events, incidents or activities at the Site (vandalism, trespassing, unauthorized activities, or emergency response)? Give details.  
No.

7. Do you feel well informed about the Site's activities and progress?  
Yes

8. Do you have any other comments, suggestions or recommendations regarding the Site's management or operation?  
Development of a newsletter by the CAB to keep the surrounding community informed about environmental operations.

9. Have there been routine communications or activities (site visits, inspections, reports, sampling, etc) conducted by your office? Give pertinent details.

10. Have any problems been noticed which may require changes in the remedial action taken for this Site or in any of the decision documents?

No

11. Please describe current O&M procedures.

12. Have there been any unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the Site? Give details.

13. Do you feel there are opportunities for optimizing the O&M or sampling efforts at the Site?

After the Five Year Review Program is completed, a comprehensive list of sampling and O&M should be developed. The sampling program should be orchestrated to reflect optimum savings. By mid-cycle, the sampling plan should be reviewed; and requests for reducing the numbers of sampling episodes should be explored with AzDEQ and US EPA. Funded through HQ AETC should be secured.

Luke AFB  
Five-Year Review  
Interview Questions  
Nancy Lou Minkler (ADEQ)

1. What is your understanding of the overall project at the Site?

Luke AFB was placed on the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL) in August 1987. This placement identified Luke AFB as a priority site for investigation and cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA). The sites were separated into two Operable Units, OU-1 and OU-2. The Records of Decision (ROD) were signed by ADEQ for OU-2 on January 10, 1994, and for OU-1 on August 16, 1999.

Luke AFB has satisfied the criteria for deletion in that the remediation selected in the OU-2 and OU-1 RODs have been fully implemented.

2. Please describe your involvement or participation at the Site.

I am the ADEQ Project Manager, and have worked on this site since September 1997.

3. What is your general impression of the project (Site)?

The Air Force has done/is doing a thorough job of the investigation, remediation and operation and maintenance of areas of concern at this Site.

4. What effects have the site operation had on you (or the surrounding community)?

I have worked with the Air Force during the drafting and finalization of the OU-1 ROD, the implementation of selected remedies and the delisting process.

5. Are you aware of any community concerns regarding the Site or its operation and administration? Give any details.

To my knowledge, the Air Force has always been informative and accommodating to the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB), now the Community Advisory Board (CAB), which has been actively involved for several years. This "oversight" has conveyed a greater sense of ease within the general community. Community issues are expressed in the RAB or CAB meetings.

6. Are you aware of any unusual events, incidents or activities at the Site (vandalism, trespassing, unauthorized activities, or emergency response)? Give details.

Not to my knowledge.

7. Do you feel well informed about the Site's activities and progress?

Yes.

8. Do you have any other comments, suggestions or recommendations regarding the Site's management or operation?

No, as long as the Institutional Control Plan (ICP) is enforced.. ADEQ will continue to oversee the O&M activities at Luke Air Force Base, and be involved in the 5-year reviews, as long as the base remains open.

9. Have there been routine communications or activities (site visits, inspections, reports, sampling, etc) conducted by your office? Give pertinent details.

The Air Force has been in regular contact with ADEQ. There have been regular site visits and inspections by our office. ADEQ split sample remediated soils during the lead shot removal activities at the shooting range on December 20, 1999. Occasionally, ADEQ will split sample during routine groundwater monitoring events, such as during the May 16, 2000 sampling event for monitor wells at SS-42.

10. Have any problems been noticed which may require changes in the remedial action taken for this Site or in any of the decision documents?

Not at this time.

11. Please describe current O&M procedures.

Long-term monitoring at SS-42 and at RW-02.. Base-wide groundwater monitoring is required during every 5-year review event. (Including this one)

12. Have there been any unexpected O&M difficulties or costs at the Site? Give details.

The only unexpected O&M difficulties or costs associated with the site at this time, to my knowledge, was the request of the EPA to install two additional monitoring wells at RW-02.

13. Do you feel there are opportunities for optimizing the O&M or sampling efforts at the Site?

Probably yes. After the Base-wide groundwater monitoring report is submitted, and after several rounds of monitoring, where required, there may be some modifications necessary. This would be determined later, probably during the next 5-year review.