

Final Meeting Minutes  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant (SFAAP)  
Wednesday September 4, 2002

1. The twenty-seventh RAB meeting was held on Wednesday, September 4, 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 6:02 pm. Introductions were made around the room.
4. Mr. Spaar then asked for comments regarding the draft minutes from the May meeting. After a brief discussion, a motion to approve the revised minutes was made, seconded, and passed.
5. Mr. Spaar stated that the next item on the agenda was the Army/DOD RAB Guidance and Sunflower RAB's Operating Procedures. Mr. Spaar explained that he had stated that modifications to the RAB's Operating Procedures would have to be made, but in March, the RAB had voted to keep the old version. Mr. Spaar had notified his superiors, as required. Mr. Spaar and Mr. Bill Maasen had then discussed the thoughts of his superiors who are requiring the RAB's Operating Procedures to be changed and who had suggested that Mr. Spaar try to discuss the required changes with the RAB members again.

Mr. Spaar pulled the discussion in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Management Guidance Manual regarding community involvement and handed out copies to all of the RAB members. Mr. Spaar specifically read on page 22 Section 10.7.1.2, which discusses that everyone's opinion should be heard – no matter how small. It was pointed out that the main decision makers for SFAAP are Dr. Randy Carlson with KDHE, Mr. Ken Herstowski with EPA, and Mr. Spaar as the Commander's Representative. Mr. Spaar then read on page 23 Section 10.7.3.4, which discusses the fact that only ERA issues should be discussed at RAB meetings. Mr. Maasen asked Mr. Spaar if the RAB was in conflict with the required RAB guidelines and if so, where. Mr. Spaar referred the members to page 1, paragraph 1, sentence 3 of the SFAAP RAB Operating Procedure Policies, where it discusses primary functions. He said that "focus on" had been replaced with "limit discussions to". Mr. Jason Fizell asked, "Why impact to human health and the environment?" Mr. Spaar explained that "impact to human health and the environment" was a standard phrase. Ms. Judy Meier explained that Mr. Spaar was comparing DERP guidance to the RAB's policy. Mr. Spaar stated that although "impact to human health and the environment" was a standard phrase, it was accurate. Mr. Maasen asked if anyone was concerned about this change. Ms. Micheline Burger stated that she thought that Mr. Spaar would explain all changes and then ask for a discussion when finished. Mr. Spaar then asked if that's what everyone wanted to do. As it appeared he received no comments indicating the desire to do otherwise, he continued. He referred members back to page 1 and stated that the sentence "The RAB can make recommendations to those agencies involved in the SFAAP environmental restoration process." was replaced with "RAB members may individually make recommendations and/or provide opinions to those agencies involved in the SFAAP environmental restoration process." He then referred the members to Item p on page 5 where the sentence "A quorum must be present before the RAB can develop a formal recommendation" was replaced with "No recommendation will be voted on as a group. Recommendations may only be provided by individuals." Mr. Jim Oyler stated that he doesn't have any problem with these changes.

Ms. Burger then asked if the floor was now open for discussion. Mr. Spaar confirmed that it was. Ms. Burger stated that these weren't the only changes she saw. For example on Page 5 of 5, the existing procedures state, "A consensus consists of 75% of members present." This statement has been deleted in the new version. Mr. Spaar stated that the referenced statement had already been deleted. Ms. Burger stated that she had previously asked if the policies had been changed and that Mr. Spaar had said no. Ms. Burger stated that the policies have never been changed. Mr. Spaar apologized, but said that he had received his book from Mr. Tom Stutz and he didn't know that everyone else did not have this update. Ms. Burger stated that she doesn't want to be forced to change the policies. Mr. Maasen stated that Mr. Spaar has a copy of the September 2000 revision and that the RAB members didn't receive it. Mr. Oyler stated that the policies had one or two original writers that didn't consider what the Army mandated the RAB to do. Mr. Maasen stated that a subcommittee of the RAB had written the policies. Ms. Burger stated that she had gone through the minutes and developed a chronology about how these policies were originated. Ms. Burger then passed out a handout of her chronology and read it to the members. Ms. Burger pointed out that she is disturbed that EPA, KDHE, and the Army had previously been given the opportunity to comment on the old policies and now wants the RAB to change. Ms. Burger doesn't see any need to make these changes and doesn't believe the Army can disband the RAB. Mr. Fizell gave his support to Ms. Burger's viewpoint, but wondered if everyone was hung up on semantics. Mr. Fizell stated that he was disturbed that the group may be broken up. Mr. Maasen stated that the issues discussed in the past may have been in conflict with the required policies. Mr. Oyler stated that there may have been a group letter. Ms. Burger stated that this group submitted a public comment to ATSDR. Mr. Spaar stated that now that the minutes are posted on the internet, his superiors were reading the minutes and have stated that the RAB is not in compliance with policies. Ms. Burger stated that the letter with recommendations from the RAB was sent as a public comment. Mr. Spaar asked if everyone had the RAB guidelines. Mr. Fizell stated that it's clear – we can make recommendations. Mr. Spaar referred members to page 9, Section 6.0. Mr. Oyler stated that we can still send in individual comments. Mr. Spaar then read from the guidance that, "...All advice and recommendations provided to the Government by RABs must be offered by the members in their individual capacities, rather than by the consensus of the RAB..." Mr. Darrel Zimmerman then asked what the term "RAB" means and was told "Restoration Advisory Board." Mr. Herstowski stated that when you present a consensus, it looks like a Federal Advisory Committee, which has more regulations and can lead to the Army and EPA later being questioned, which could slow down the restoration progress at the Plant.

Mr. Spaar stated that DOD had found that RABs become non-functional when there is a political push from a few individuals who are pushing their own agenda. This led the Federal government to require individual opinions rather than group opinions. Ms. Burger stated that the guidance Mr. Spaar had read from was dated April 1998, which pre-dates our policies that were dated May 1998. Ms. Burger stated that this language has not changed, so if we are not in compliance today, we were not in compliance in May 1998, but the Army signed off on it. Mr. Spaar discussed the letter Ms. Burger sent with Gale Smith and the RAB definitely cannot vote on recommendations. Mr. Maasen asked, "Recommendations for what?" Mr. Herstowski stated "Recommendations for action." Mr. Maasen stated that the RAB couldn't vote on IAP actions. Ms. Burger stated, "We recognize that we are not a FACA, but we have a problem being strong-armed into not being able to vote as a group. What if we say that we are not acting as a FACA, but as a group?" Mr. Spaar stated that the RAB can vote as a group to make changes on procedures. Mr. Oyler commented that we could submit comments only as individuals, not as a group. Mr. Maasen suggested that Mr. Spaar provide the group a marked-up copy of the policies and that we vote on them at the next meeting. Ms. Burger stated that she thought this was a good idea, and that we were not going to operate as a FACA. Mr. Maasen stated that we can make some decisions as a group, but not on IAP actions. Mr. Oyler suggested that members try to provide input into the IAP at the annual IAP Workshop. He stated that as a result of his input, the

stream sampling is now in place. He said that members could comment as much as possible at the IAP meeting. Ms. Burger made a motion that Mr. Spaar would provide a marked up copy of the policies and that we vote on them at the next meeting. The motion was seconded. Ms. Vickie Selzer asked about numbering/dating the revisions. Mr. Maasen stated that numbering/dating the revisions were part of standard SOPs. A vote was taken and the motion passed.

6. Mr. Keith Walker with Shaw was then asked to discuss the materials shipped to the Johnson County Landfill. Mr. Walker then discussed a handout, which was provided to the RAB members. Mr. Walker stated that the materials shipped to the landfill were used for ground cover after the soil passed the required tests, which ensure that the material won't burn, react, explode, or leach. Mr. Walker referred members to the IAP to get an estimate of the amount of soil needing to be remediated. Mr. Walker reminded the members that this was just a rough estimate and that the estimates may change from year to year. Mr. Walker encouraged the members to participate in the annual IAP Workshop to see that a lot of effort is expended to get a cost-effective solution.
7. Discussion moved to the presentation of current and ongoing IRP projects. Mr. Spaar referred to a list of FY02 fully funded projects, which had been distributed to the RAB members. Ms. Burger asked if the money in the funded column was money required or money received. Mr. Spaar stated that it is usually the same; however, headquarters may occasionally make a change. Ms. Meier stated that the Appropriations Bill will not likely be passed until January. Mr. Maasen referred members to Site SAAP-002, which shows several funding events. Mr. Spaar stated that at the first of the year, the Corps applies for prior-year funding for the Corps to oversee carry-over work. Ms. Meier stated that the Corps uses the funds they receive to provide field oversight, develop scopes of work, and contract the work. Ms. Meier then stated that current actions are divided into the LTM, which is being conducted by ECC and RI/FS, RD, and RA work, which is being conducted by Shaw Environmental. LTM work awarded in FY01 was for SWMUs 13, 27, 41, and 50. LTM work awarded for FY02 also included SWMUs 11 and 48. RD/RA/RI/FS work previously awarded for FY01 was for SWMUs 2, 10/11, 18, and 32-35. RFI work awarded in May was for SWMUs 1, 14, 21, 39, and 45/47. Work for an RA was awarded for SWMU 22. Mr. Herstowski explained that Mr. Spaar's funding list shows money that is in the bank for SFAAP. Mr. Maasen stated that he heard that the FY03 budget wouldn't be passed until January. Mr. Herstowski stated that if we go to war with Iraq, who knows when it will be passed.
8. Mr. Brady Bigelow with ECC passed out a handout, which he then discussed, regarding the LTM work currently underway with Burns & McDonnell. Mr. Bigelow discussed the upcoming geoprobe investigation. Mr. Herstowski explained how direct push works for water sampling. He explained that water is sampled through a rod, but no well is actually installed, which makes the direct push method more cost-effective. Ms. Meier stated that everyone involved had thoroughly discussed where to put the borings based on hydrogeology, previous investigations, prior test results, etc. Mr. Herstowski stated that they had gone back to the existing wells that were last inventoried in 1994 and checked groundwater flow patterns and re-evaluated current conditions to make sure that they place the probes in the correct location based on the available information. Mr. Spaar pointed out that the water system used to have lots of leaks and is now shut down, which has changed the water table conditions. Mr. Spaar then explained the difference between overburden versus bedrock wells. Mr. Herstowski explained that overburden at SFAAP was approximately 10-30 feet deep and different drilling technologies were used for drilling through overburden versus bedrock. For overburden, screw-type augers are used, but for drilling into bedrock, grinding the rock is required. Mr. Herstowski then explained that temporary wells were open holes in the rock without a permanent installation due to the high cost of the permanent installation. Mr. Spaar explained that most of the contaminated groundwater is in the overburden because the bedrock in this area is not very fractured. In addition, the lower aquifer is small and slow moving. However, some of the old wells had screens

through both the overburden and the bedrock aquifers through which mixing occurred, primarily in the Nitroguanidine Area. Mr. Spaar stated that these wells were plugged during 1994-1996 when the mistake was recognized. Ms. Lisa Larsen asked how many new samples were planned. Mr. Bigelow stated that he didn't know and that he would have to read the plan to know the exact number. Mr. Herstowski guessed that there were approximately 20 new wells and 50 soil samples planned. Mr. Oyler questioned the use of the term "aquifer". Mr. Spaar and Mr. Herstowski said that the term "aquifer" was used loosely, but SFAAP did not have a true overburden aquifer. They stated that one could never get a large volume of water from the overburden. Next followed some discussion regarding how much water was needed for sampling. Mr. Herstowski stated that some wells are dry.

9. Mr. Keith Walker with Shaw then discussed the work conducted by Shaw at SWMUs 2, 18, 32, and 33-35. Mr. Walker stated that the Corps' risk assessor was currently reviewing the report for SWMU 2. Mr. Walker then explained how the water flowed into the two ponds at the river water treatment plant when the potable water treatment plant pumped water from the well field by the Kansas River to the potable water treatment plant. The ponds are now drying as the water lines that branched off from the main line have been plugged. Mr. Walker is trying to close the ponds in accordance with KDHE closure regulations. Mr. Spaar stated that the ponds will be removed. Mr. Walker stated that the samples collected from this area indicate no contamination, so there is not a hazardous waste problem, but the berms are considered solid waste. Mr. Walker is attempting to create a reuse plan for the sludge berms. Mr. Walker discussed SWMU 18 – the old Sanitary Landfill where there were some impacted areas in the cap that needed to be repaired. Artesian effects have eroded some of the cover on the landfill. The Corps has hauled dirt and covered these areas. At some point it will be brought to closure, but not in the near future. At SWMU 35, Mr. Walker had planned to create a man-made pond for cattle; however, after re-evaluating the risks with regard to lead below regulatory levels, Shaw may regrade to delete the pond. The Final RA Report should be sent to the Army by Friday, September 6, and will then be reviewed by the regulators and Army, with a revision sent to the library by mid-October. Mr. Walker stated that Shaw has also been tasked to complete SIs for SWMUs 1, 45/47, 39, and 14. The work at SWMU 14 is actually the Stream Study, which consists of an evaluation of the discharge points from SWMUs with known contamination that could impact the quality of water down-stream. Samples will be collected from Kill Creek, Captain's Creek, Spoon Creek, and Hanson's Creek in three phases. The first phase will be the preliminary characterization. The second phase will depend on the results of phase one, and AOCs will be identified and a seasonal sampling strategy will be developed. The third phase will evaluate how severe the contamination may be in any part of the stream and will determine the effect on human health and other species. The question, "Does rainfall affect the results?" was then asked. Mr. Walker stated that the Army is trying to determine how to evaluate the risk, and they have had a lot of discussions regarding how to collect representative samples and have considered the drought. Mr. Walker explained that the plans for sampling are being developed now, but the sampling will not occur until November. At SWMU 21, Shaw will be conducting additional groundwater and soil sampling to address regulator comments and to collect data to select a remedial remedy. Mr. Maasen asked for confirmation that no cleanup was being conducted at SWMU 14 and that "SWMU 14" was just being used for the stream study. Mr. Spaar stated that "SWMU 14" is just a tag because he can't get funding for work unless the work is attached to an existing DSERTS site. Mr. Spaar stated that this work will eventually become SWMU 66.
10. Next the question was asked, "If the material going to Johnson County Landfill is treated and is so good, why does it have to go to the landfill?" Mr. Spaar stated that the material has to go to a landfill because SFAAP does not have a permitted solid waste landfill. Mr. Spaar also stated that the material in question is considered a special waste.

11. Mr. Spaar then asked if there was any new business. There was some brief discussion regarding Mr. Oyler's points regarding the minutes. Mr. Oyler then asked Mr. Herstowski and Dr. Carlson if the Army has released any SWMUs from CERCLA or RCRA cleanup. Mr. Oyler asked if any SWMUs have been completely cleaned up to either industrial or residential standards. Mr. Oyler was told that SWMU 23 had undergone RCRA closure in September 1999 and had been closed to residential standards. In addition, Mr. Oyler was told that SWMUs 28 and 29 had been closed in April 1980 and had been cleaned up to residential standards. Mr. Oyler asked about SWMUs 10/11. Mr. Spaar stated that work hasn't been completed at these sites. The sites have been cleaned up, but are still undergoing long-term monitoring. SWMU 10 was completely clean, but it was decided to clean SWMU 11 in association with SWMU 10. In addition, other adjacent areas were added to SWMU 10 for cleanup. SWMU 11 is clean, but is undergoing long-term monitoring. Mr. Oyler asked if sites could be written off if under LTM. Mr. Herstowski said that they couldn't. Mr. Herstowski also stated that although most areas at SWMU 10/11 were remediated to residential standards, there are some places that were only cleaned to industrial standards. Mr. Oyler asked if there were any areas under LTM that can't be written off because of sewer lines. Mr. Spaar stated that SWMUs 13, 27, 41, and 48 fell into that category. Mr. Oyler asked Mr. Spaar if he had budgeted for the explosive foundations. Mr. Spaar stated that he had planned for them in his program but not under ERA. Mr. Herstowski explained that the explosive foundation cleanup falls under a different program; however, EPA doesn't make those distinctions. Mr. Herstowski stated that EPA won't close a SWMU until all areas within the SWMU are clean. Mr. Oyler asked Mr. Spaar if he always asked for funding. Mr. Herstowski and Mr. Spaar stated that they did always request money for all of their programs. Ms. Meier stated that there are no sites ready to close that are waiting strictly on sewers or foundation cleanup.
12. Next the discussion moved to questions and answers. Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that the bunkers were clean, but that it is the area around them that still needs remediation. Mr. Spaar stated that his summary was fairly accurate for SWMUs 15 and 16. According to Mr. Spaar, the buildings could be sold, but the sale would require a disclosure regarding the asbestos. Then Mr. Zimmerman asked if the buildings could then be sold after the soil study and possible remediation, with the asbestos disclosure in mind. Mr. Spaar stated that the buildings could then be sold without asbestos removal, provided that there would be an asbestos disclosure; however, a lead-based paint study may also be required. Ms. Katie Hopkins then asked if this area was part of the property that Senator Roberts and Johnson County Parks and Recreation District are trying to purchase. Mr. Maasen stated that most of the buildings aren't in the area that they are trying to acquire.
13. It was stated that the next RAB meeting would be on November 6. Agenda items for that meeting would include a 10-15-minute presentation by the Corps regarding risk screening, a 20-minute review of policy and procedures, and an LTM update.
14. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 pm.