

Final Meeting Minutes
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant (SFAAP)
Wednesday May 1, 2002

1. The twenty-sixth RAB meeting was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2002, in the Clearview City Ball Room.
2. Copies of the agenda and sign-in sheets are attached.
3. Mr. Tony Spaar, the Commander's Representative at SFAAP, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:10 pm. Introductions were made around the room.
4. Mr. Spaar then asked for comments regarding the draft minutes from the March meeting. Mr. Jimmie Oyler commented that he did not see the comments made by Ms. Katie Hopkins at the last meeting concerning her desire to leave the RAB policies (Charter) as previously approved. Ms. Spaar pointed out that her comments were in the minutes in Paragraph 4. Mr. Jason Fizell requested that the spelling of his last name be corrected from "Fizzel" to "Fizell." A motion to approve the revised minutes was made, seconded, and passed.
5. Mr. Spaar discussed the need to select a new RAB member to replace Mr. Ron West. Mr. Spaar stated that he had followed the RAB guidance and had advertised the vacancy, received applications, and placed the applicants on a spreadsheet that was subsequently distributed to the RAB members for consideration. It was stated that Mr. West was a property owner from Douglas County. Mr. Spaar pointed out that Ms. Lisa Larsen was from Lawrence. Ms. Micheline Burger moved to select Ms. Larsen as the new RAB member. The motion was seconded and passed.
6. Mr. Spaar asked that Mr. Tom Price and Mr. Gifford Knapp provide a brief summary of the 2002 Installation Action Plan (IAP). Both Mr. Price and Mr. Knapp stated they appreciated the thought, effort, and time that went into the IAP and encouraged other members to attend. Mr. Spaar thanked Mr. Price and Mr. Knapp for attending. Mr. Spaar discussed the cost to complete, which had previously been distributed to the RAB members. As currently projected, the cost to complete work at Sunflower is \$58,390,000, and work should be complete in 2035. Ms. Burger asked if Sunflower was still on track for the completion of cleanup by 2011, followed by long-term monitoring. Mr. Spaar confirmed.
7. Mr. Spaar stated that the next item on the agenda was the Army/DOD RAB Guidance and Sunflower RAB's Operating Procedures; however, this topic must be tabled until the next meeting because Mr. Bill Maasen, the other RAB co-chair, was snowed-in and would not be able to make it tonight. Mr. Maasen and Mr. Spaar had intended to discuss this topic collectively.
8. In regard to the status of the IRP actions, the Corps of Engineers has been distributing RFPs for the Stream Study, work towards completion of RFIs at SWMUs 21 and 22, and for long-term monitoring at SWMUs 11, 48, 49 and 44. OSC doesn't have any ER,A funds at this time. The money has not been passed from DA to AMC to OSC. Forty percent of the funds were held back due to: 1) conversion to the construction program (MILCON) and 2) Homeland Defense – must replenish the stock for the war in Afghanistan. OSC should be getting the money so that cleanup and investigation at SFAAP can proceed. Ms. Meier explained that nothing much has changed since the last meeting

concerning the status of the long-term monitoring and briefly updated the RAB on the proposed schedule.

8. Mr. Keith Walker with IT Corporation then gave a PowerPoint presentation of the work conducted by IT at SWMUs 2, 18, 32, and 33-35. During the presentation, Mr. Walker fielded several questions. Mr. Charles Benjamin asked how it is determined that the soil meets residential standards. Mr. Walker explained how IT would excavate and collect samples until they receive confirmation back from the laboratory that the sample concentrations were below residential standards. Mr. Walker was asked what “leach” means, which he then discussed the low mobility of metals and the toxicity characteristic leaching procedure (TCLP). Mr. Benjamin asked who determines whether the soil is excavated to residential or industrial standards. Mr. Spaar explained that the cleanup to industrial standards and the associated future use restrictions is weighed against the cleanup to residential standards with no restrictions. If it costs more to clean up to residential standards, Mr. Spaar must get approval from Headquarters. Mr. Benjamin asked who knows which areas were cleaned to residential versus industrial standards. Mr. Spaar explained that this is handled by deed restrictions. Mr. Oyler asked if this information would be on their CD Rom. Mr. Spaar said that it would be. Ms. Vickie Selzer asked if the data collected (by IT) had to be collected using GLP – Good Laboratory Practices. Mr. Ken Herstowski stated that it was collected using GLP and that the laboratory conducting the analyses had to be certified by KDHE and the Corps of Engineers. Ms. Meier explained that 10% of the samples are split and are also analyzed by the Corps of Engineers QA laboratory in Omaha. Mr. Walker was asked to explain exactly what was done with the seeps at SWMU 18. Mr. Walker explained that IT compacted clay on top of the seeps to serve as a temporary barrier until a final remedy had been selected. Ms. Hopkins asked Mr. Walker to explain what is meant by “positive drainage.” Mr. Walker explained that “positive drainage” means that the water won’t pond in place, and that “negative drainage” means that the water will pond. A question was asked about the differences in data validation discussed for the different sites. Mr. Walker explained that a chemist from IT can give preliminary approval for the field crew to continue based on their review of the data. Final validation of the data occurs when the results of the split samples are received from the Corps of Engineers QA lab and are compared to IT’s data. Ms. Meier further explained that at SWMU 18, IT was sampling for worker safety, so if there would have been exceedences, IT would have had to stop work and reevaluate, while at SWMUs 33-35, IT was sampling to meet regulatory requirements. Ms. Selzer asked if this involved the use of reference standards. Mr. Herstowski explained the use of reference standards for calibration. Mr. Herstowski was then asked if the same procedures would be used for the LTM program, and Mr. Herstowski confirmed that they would be, as far as QA was concerned. Mr. Benjamin asked for a copy of the presentation. It was then decided that copies of the presentation would be sent with the meeting minutes.
9. Mr. Shawn Blackshear from the regional Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry office gave a brief synopsis of the Public Health Assessment that had previously been distributed to the RAB members. He stated that as long as remediation goes as planned, there should be no risk. He welcomed questions and comments and stated that he can be reached at 913-551-1311 or zkr3@cdc.gov.
10. Mr. Oyler asked if the Doctor would sign off on the work that has been done. Dr. Randy Carlson stated that KDHE is satisfied with the work completed to date.
11. Mr. Price asked how many acres were in AOCs or SWMUs. Mr. Spaar stated that he did not know. Mr. Herstowski stated that EPA and KDHE haven’t been concerned about the exact area – they just want to see that it is all remediated.

12. Mr. Price asked about the 1,700 acres that he had heard were clean and ready for sale. Mr. Herstowski stated that he was probably talking about the northeast area, which includes SWMU 1 that is not ready to be sold. Ms. Meier stated that the investigation of SWMU 1 is planned for this year. Mr. Benjamin stated that Johnson County had given the State legislature the impression that the area was ready for sale. Mr. Spaar explained that theoretically, any area could be sold at SFAAP that is not a SWMU, except that currently all property sales and transfers are on hold because of an ongoing lawsuit. Ms. Meier added that they are not expecting a lot of contamination to be found at SWMU 1. Mr. Benjamin announced that there was new legislation allowing landowners' reimbursement for attorney fees if they sue the Federal government for damages resulting from contaminated property. Mr. Spaar stated that if property gets sold and the new owner finds contamination resulting from Army activities, the Army is still obligated to clean it up to a level that is protective of human health and the environment. Mr. Benjamin also announced that there was currently a proposed bill to turn over some portion of SFAAP to Johnson County Parks and Rec. Mr. Herstowski stated that turning over some of the land for public benefit has always been part of the plan, but this bill would just guarantee the transfer. Mr. Herstowski pointed out that the same thing would happen to the water treatment plant. Ms. Hopkins stated not to forget K-State.
13. Mr. Walker was asked for an update in regard to the amount of soil that IT had excavated and hauled off site. Mr. Walker stated that 47,000 tons at SWMUs 10 and 11 and 5,400 tons at SWMUs 33-35 had been treated on-site and hauled to Johnson County Landfill for disposal. Mr. Walker pointed out that by treating the soil on-site, the Army was saving a large amount of money. Mr. Walker stated that it costs \$175 per ton to send the untreated soil to either of the two closest hazardous waste landfills, versus the much lower cost of \$20 per ton to treat the soil on-site and dispose in the Johnson County Landfill.
14. Ms. Hopkins asked if all the money for cleanup was available today, how long would it take to cleanup the entire site? Mr. Herstowski and Mr. Spaar stated that their best guess would be around 5 years due to the additional investigation and the certain steps that are required in the cleanup process. Ms. Hopkins asked if a road were to be constructed through SFAAP, would this change the cleanup strategy. Mr. Herstowski stated that it probably would because some of the contamination could be left in place. Ms. Meier stated that if a road went through, we would not clean the site to residential standards. Ms. Selzer asked for confirmation that they were still completing the Risk Assessment. Mr. Herstowski stated that Risk Assessments were being completed at each site individually and some sites required additional investigation. Ms. Selzer asked if it was true that they still didn't know what to do with some of these sites. Mr. Herstowski stated that although that statement is somewhat true, certain types of contamination can be treated the same. Mr. Spaar stated that unless something new is found, they have a good idea what to do with each site. Mr. Herstowski stated that SFAAP is working on getting approval to ship offsite whenever they have the money.
15. Mr. Spaar then thanked Mr. David Rhodes for the use of the building. Ms. Meier asked if the members liked presentations like Mr. Walker's, and many of the RAB members said that they did. Mr. Fizell stated that he would like to see the sites. Mr. Rhodes offered his 15-passenger van. It was decided to have a tour of SFAAP at the next RAB meeting instead of a regular meeting.
16. Ms. Hopkins made a motion to have the next RAB meeting on July 10. The motion was seconded and passed.
17. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 pm.