

Final Meeting Minutes
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant (SFAAP)
Wednesday, January 8, 2003

1. The twenty-ninth RAB meeting was held on Wednesday, January 8, 2003, in the Clearview City Ball Room.
2. Copies of the agenda and sign-in sheet are attached.
3. Mr. Tony Spaar, the Commander's Representative at SFAAP, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 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 November meeting. A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes as written. The motion passed.

Mr. Spaar asked for a discussion regarding the budget. It was noted that the FY03 defense budget had passed on December 20, 2002. No work from first quarter awards occurred, but instead will start in the second quarter.

5. Mr. Spaar distributed a handout regarding the FY03 Obligation Plan, which he then discussed. Ms. Judith Meier stated that the first quarter awards would be moved to the second quarter. Contract actions for SWMUs 11, 13, 27, 39, 41, 48, and 50 will begin in second quarter. The work for SWMU 22 will be moved to the third quarter since it is not fully funded in FY03. SWMU 21 work may overrun funds and require the use of the funds set aside for SWMU 22. Part of the RAs and RIs were partially funded, and a request was made for the remainder of the funds needed for completion. Mr. Bill Maasen asked what S & R was. Ms. Meier stated that S & R stood for Supervision and Review and S & A stood for Supervision and Administration – this is the money required for the Corps of Engineers to oversee the project and to collect and analyze QA samples at a 10 percent frequency. Mr. Bob Morton asked what the amount shown really meant. Mr. Spaar further explained the funding. Mr. Ken Herstowski referred the members to the cost to complete in the IAP for further information and breakdown of the funding. Mr. Jimmie Oyler asked if there was any funding to finish the SWMUs that have been cleaned-up so that they can be closed. Mr. Spaar stated that some SWMUS needed long-term monitoring before they could be closed. Mr. Oyler stated that he had thought more money was needed – like for the additional clean-up at SWMUs 10 and 11. Mr. Spaar stated that SWMU 10 had been cleaned-up, but the area was expanded to include new AOCs. Mr. Spaar explained that these areas need to be monitored for a certain period of time before they can be closed. Therefore, none of these sites will be closed anytime soon. For example, the integrity of the cap at SWMU 50 needs to be ensured before closure. Mr. Oyler commented that the SWMUs that have been cleaned-up are never going to be written off. Mr. Spaar stated that five years of monitoring with no hits are needed. Mr. Oyler then asked about the funding for the non-ERA portions. Mr. Spaar stated that no additional funding had been obtained for the non-ERA projects.

6. As a representative for Environmental Chemical Corporation, Ms. Michelle Beckman with Burns & McDonnell then provided members with a summary of the LTM actions, which she then discussed.

7. Mr. Keith Walker with Shaw Environmental and Infrastructure provided a series of handouts regarding their work at SFAAP, which he then discussed. Mr. Oyler asked if Mr. Walker had received any results from the stream study. Mr. Walker stated that 15 of 34 locations had been sampled and they should have some results by the next RAB meeting. Mr. Oyler stated that he wants to get some samples to the lab as soon as possible and get some results. Mr. Oyler stated that he is upset that it has taken so long to get results. In response to the work being conducted at SWMU 21, Mr. Maasen stated that in the 106 process, those areas along the streams may be particularly sensitive to Native American remains and asked if there were any particular archeological requirements. Mr. Spaar stated that in this case, since the area of SWMU 21 has been modified through repeated construction activity, bioremediation could be conducted without concern of affecting possible remains. However, if soil removal is necessary in areas not disturbed by construction activities, the Army would check with the tribes and get permission to relocate the remains, or if this is unsuccessful, the areas may have to be left alone and their use be restricted. Mr. Oyler asked when the analytical data would be back for SWMU 21. Mr. Walker stated that it should be back on January 17. It was asked if Mr. Walker knew how much volume of soil was contaminated. Mr. Walker stated that Shaw has completed some preliminary studies. Shaw had no on-site laboratory capabilities for this work, but collected samples based on visual observations and the highest OVA results. Based on past experience, Shaw personnel have estimated that approximately 7,800 cubic yards of soil will need to be staged for treatment based on the OVA results obtained in the field. Mr. Walker then explained how the OVA field results will be used to show correlation with the fixed laboratory results when they are received. At that point, Shaw could better estimate the amount of impacted soil. It was then asked if they had any idea of what type of contamination was present. Mr. Spaar stated that if it was fuel oil, it would eventually naturally degrade. Mr. Walker stated that the samples had been analyzed for dioxin, metals, herbicides, pesticides, nitrates, sulfates, VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, and perchlorates, which were all not detected or were detected at low levels in preliminary studies. The samples were analyzed for PAHs and both DRO- and GRO-range TPH, which were found at high concentrations. Based on their preliminary results, Shaw is convinced that the burn tank was the source of contamination. Ms. Meier stated that as far as the stream was concerned, the samples collected from the stream study would detect potential contamination in the stream. Mr. Spaar reminded the members that the Army currently has a boom in place to contain contamination. Mr. David Rhodes asked whether the sewers present at SFAAP were storm sewers or surface sewers. Mr. Spaar stated that they were talking about storm sewers. Mr. Rhodes asked if there was any protection against a rush of contamination to the sewers? Mr. Walker explained that they had similar concerns at SWMUs 10 and 11. Mr. Spaar pointed out that there were three types of sewers at SFAAP – 1) storm sewers, 2) sanitary sewers, and 3) process sewers. Mr. Maasen stated that many of the storm sewers were merely ditches that ran into settling ponds and were completely separate from the sanitary sewers. Mr. Spaar added that they were also separate from the process sewers. Mr. Spaar stated that when they're

talking about 30 miles of potentially-contaminated sewers, they're talking about process sewers. It was then clarified that when they're talking about storm sewers, they're primarily talking about ditches, not an underground concrete network.

8. Mr. Spaar asked if there was any new business. The question was asked if there had been any staff problems at SFAAP in regard to the budget. It was stated that the IRP has not been impacted. Mr. Milton Bland provided an update on SpecPro at the Plant and stated that his position on the RAB Board was being replaced by Mr. Terry Dunavin, the new Site Manager for SpecPro.
9. Ms. Micheline Burger asked who the members of the TRC were. Mr. Spaar began answering and stated "EPA, KDHE..." Ms. Burger asked who the community member was. Mr. Spaar stated that the TRC is different from the RAB and doesn't include a community member.
10. Mr. Oyler then asked about the perchlorates. Mr. Herstowski stated that the results will be coming back this month. Mr. Oyler asked from where the samples were collected. Mr. Herstowski stated that they were from the stream. Mr. Oyler asked about the caves. Mr. Herstowski stated that they hadn't been sampled yet. Mr. Oyler asked what the [risk] limits were. Dr. Randy Carlson stated that they didn't have any yet, but California had a guidance. Mr. Oyler asked Mr. Herstowski if he had seen any limits. Mr. Herstowski stated that EPA did not have any limits either. Mr. Oyler asked if anyone knew what it would take to kill someone, and stated that he is tired of not being able to eat the fish. Dr. Carlson stated that the California guidance will likely be used. Mr. Oyler asked why we'd use the California guidance. Dr. Carlson asked why would we create our own if someone else has already done the work. Dr. Carlson stated that he has seen various numbers of 4-18 ppb. Mr. Oyler stated that he hasn't seen any numbers presented. Dr. Carlson stated that nothing has been seen because it hasn't been published in a ROD. Mr. Oyler asked what is being done about the nitrates heading for Clearview City at SWMUs 45 and 47 and wanted to know if it had gone off site. Mr. Spaar stated that he didn't know. Ms. Vickie Selzer asked if the risk levels were estimated based on laboratory animal testing. Dr. Carlson stated that they often were and that the tumors are often studied to predict how the chemical will affect humans. Research has found that perchlorates affect the thyroid like iodide.
11. Mr. Spaar clarified the operating procedures that he had distributed.
12. The next meeting date was set for March 5. Mr. Oyler asked that the data received by Shaw be presented at the next meeting as an agenda item.
13. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:15 pm.