

Final Meeting Minutes  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant (SFAAP)  
Wednesday November 6, 2002

1. The twenty-eighth RAB meeting was held on Wednesday, November 6, 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. Bill Maasen, the RAB Community Co-chair, then asked for comments regarding the draft minutes from the September meeting. A motion to approve the 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 distributed copies of the RAB's Operating Procedures depicting the changes, which he briefly explained. On page one, first paragraph, last sentence, the words "as individuals" were inserted. On page five, paragraph 4, the words "formal recommendation" was replaced with the words "decision on a formal matter before the RAB." After paragraph 4 on page 5, the following sentences were added, "All advice and recommendations provided to the Government by the RAB must be offered by the members in their individual capacities rather than by the consensus of the RAB. The RAB is not to act as an advisory committee as that term is used in the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 USC Appendix 2. The RAB should not become a sounding board for non-restoration environmental issues or other community concerns. The RAB should maintain its focus on environmental restoration issues." After some discussion, Mr. Bill Maasen stated, "We are not a FACA. That's why this language is in here." Mr. Ken Herstowski stated that if this group was a FACA, the government would have to publish the meeting time and place in the Federal Register. He also stated that the Army doesn't want RABs to become FACAs because that was not their intentions when RABs were first established. Mr. Bob Morton stated, "The name should be changed. The term 'Advisory' means 'I give advice'." Ms. Katie Hopkins asked, "If we're a 'board' and not a 'committee', what's the problem?" Mr. Spaar stated that there wasn't a problem. Mr. Spaar stated that "since the RAB is paid for by ERA funds the focus of discussions must be on environmental restoration issues," and explained that is why the half-hour had been added following the RAB meeting so that regulators and the Army would be available to answer non-ERA questions. Mr. Jimmie Oyler stated that at the CEPR, they discussed RABs for BRAC and other defense sites. Mr. Oyler stated that at Badger, a lady had asked, "Why, as a RAB member, can we not discuss the burning of buildings, asbestos sewer pipes, etc.?" According to Mr. Oyler, the reply by Ms. Shelly Goodman under former Defense Secretary Cohen was that most RABs for the Navy and the Air Force have gone along with answering these types of questions." Mr. Oyler went on to explain that we can't close SWMUs 10 and 11 because of RCRA/CERCLA contamination. Mr. Oyler blames the EPA and KDHE for not making the Army clean it up. Mr. Oyler wants the Army and the Department of Defense to combine total cleanup costs. Mr. Oyler stated, "We just want some quick answers – we're not trying to create policy." Mr. Oyler stated, "We look at you two guys as a check on this type of information." Mr. Spaar explained that for quick questions, he would't stop from answering them unless it takes away from the ERA discussion. Ms. Micheline Berger stated that she would like to thank Mr. Spaar for rewriting the operating procedures and paring down what needed to be approved. Ms. Berger stated that she questioned the changes before and feels more

comfortable with the existing proposed changes. Mr. Spaar stated that when changes are made, a revision tracking system is needed. Mr. Maasen suggested putting the date modified in the footer. Mr. Spaar agreed that when changes were made, the date modified and adopted would be placed in the footer. Mr. Oyler stated that he would go along with everything as proposed. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to accept the proposed revisions. Mr. Maasen thanked the members for their approval of the revisions in such a timely manner.

6. Discussion moved to the presentation of current and ongoing IRP actions/status. Ms. Judith Meier stated that the Department of Defense is under CRA – Continuing Resolution Authority - which means that no new actions can start.
7. Mr. Keith Walker with Shaw then provided members with hand-outs regarding the work Shaw is conducting at SWMUs 1, 2, 14 (Stream Study), 18/19, 21, 32, 33-35, 39, and 45/47, which he then discussed. Ms. Meier stated that at the next RAB meeting, we will tell you what reports are available for review in the library. Following Mr. Walker's discussion regarding the Stream Study (SWMU 14) and the proposed work at SWMU 21, Mr. Charles Benjamin asked if all the streams drain into the Wakarusa. Mr. Spaar replied that they did not, and that they all drain into the Kansas River. Mr. Benjamin then asked if there was any indication that these contaminants are in the water. Mr. Spaar stated that's the reason we are doing the study - to find out. Mr. Benjamin asked if any fish studies had been conducted. Dr. Randy Carlson stated that an ecological study had been conducted on clams and crawfish. Dr. Carlson stated that there are also some fish sample data that were collected by KHDE. Mr. Benjamin asked if Dr. Carlson remembered what the results were. Dr. Carlson stated that pesticides were found – chlordane and atrazine, in particular. Mr. Herstowski explained that this is an ongoing study. Mr. Spaar stated that the Ecological Assessment is available in the library for review. Mr. Benjamin asked if there has been a fish advisory between I-435 and Lawrence. Mr. Maasen stated that he didn't know of any. Mr. Oyler thought that EPA had put one out. Mr. Spaar suggested contacting the Kansas Department of Health to get more information. Mr. Walker also stated that the Army does conduct National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) sampling. Mr. Tim Davis explained that since the late 1970s/early 1980s, Sunflower has conducted extensive sampling for their NPDES discharge permit.

Next, discussion moved to ITS data. Mr. Spaar asked if everyone knew what was meant by "ITS data". Ms. Meier explained the ITS (Intertek Testing Services) data integrity problems and that the data were considered unreliable by EPA. Ms. Meier went on to explain that 10% of the samples had been sent as duplicates to the Corps' QA lab, and these data were usable. However, the regulators were requiring that 40% of the ITS samples be recollected and reanalyzed. Ms. Meier had explained that the Corps had received a settlement from ITS to be used toward the costs of the resampling and reanalysis. Ms. Berger asked, "How much money is coming back?" Ms. Meier stated that she didn't have an exact figure, but it was around \$500,000. Ms. Meier stated that the money won't necessarily be divided by SWMU like it was originally. She further explained that some SWMUs had data gaps prior to the ITS data problems and required additional sampling anyway. Ms. Meier stated that they would try to use the money wisely. Mr. Oyler asked if perchlorates had been found because they were found at Badger. Mr. Herstowski stated that we are sampling for them for the stream study. Mr. Richard Brazukus asked how deep the contamination is at SMWU 21. Mr. Walker stated that all we can judge by is by what we can see. He stated that there's a 12-foot difference in elevation between the creek and the upper bank of SWMU 21, and now the contamination is visible about 2-3 feet above the water level. Mr. Walker assumes the lens of contamination is consistent back to the burn tank, but geoprobe samples will confirm that contamination is present. Mr. Walker stated that they will only be trying to determine where the contamination is and not what the concentrations are at this point. Mr. Spaar explained that SpecPro had put a boom on the water when the sheen was noticed. Then Shaw had an emergency kit that was also put in place along the bank as well. Mr. Walker explained

that they had a semi-permeable boom that rises with rising water. The concern is that although the water level is low now and the lens of contamination is above the water level, the water level could rise and we'd get a large release. Ms. Meier stated that now two booms could be seen – one across the river and one along the bank. Mr. Benjamin asked what caused the sheen. Mr. Spaar stated that it was most likely diesel. Mr. Walker explained that within the last two years since the RFI field work, the bank has eroded considerably.

8. Representing ECC, Ms. Michelle Beckman with Burns & McDonnell passed out a handout, which she then discussed, regarding the LTM work currently underway with ECC and Burns & McDonnell. Work under the LTM is being conducted at SWMUs 11, 13, 27, 41, 48, and 50.
9. Mr. Dave Daniel, risk assessor for the Corps of Engineers, provided a handout to the members and gave a slide presentation regarding risk assessments.
10. Mr. Spaar asked if there was any new business. Hearing none, it was suggested that the next meeting date be moved from January 1 to January 8, 2003. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to approve the January 8, 2003 date. Agenda items for that meeting will include an update on IRP actions, an update on the LTM, an update on the budget, and the FY03 Obligation Plan. Mr. Spaar announced that if he had not distributed copies of the FY03 Obligation Plan, that he would do so at the next meeting.
11. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:10 pm.